1958

January

Volume No

1995

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

1958

January

VOL. IV No. 1

CONTENTS

CEYLON

Trade Agreement Signed 1

CZECHOSLAVAKIA

Nehru-Siroky Joint Statement 1

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Broadcast 3

FRANCE

Economic and Technical Co-operation Agreement Signed 4

HUNGARY

Trade Agreement Extended for Two Years 6

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Protest against Mangla Dam Project 6

INDONESIA

President Sukarno's Visit 7
Trade Agreement Extended 8

ITALY

Trade Agreement Extended 8

RUMANIA

Trade Agreement Extorted 9

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister Macmillan's Visit 9
Mr. Nehru's Speech 10
Mr. Macmillan's Speech 11

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid to India 13

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

<Pg-v)

FRANCE HUNGARY INDIA INDONESIA UNITED KINGDOM ITALY USA

Date: Jan 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Trade Agreement Signed

Indian and Ceylon Signed a Trade Agreement in New Delhi on Jan 13, 1958. A Press Note issued on the subject stated:

A Trade Agreement between India and Ceylon was signed in New Delhi on 13 January 1958 following the discussions between the official Trade Delegation from Ceylon and representatives of the Government of India. The Agreement was signed by Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Sir Richard Aluwihare, Ceylon's High Commissioner in New Delhi, on behalf of the Government of Ceylon.

Under the Agreement the Government of India have undertaken to permit the import of specified quantities of Jaffna chewing tobacco during the next four years at a concessional rate of import duty of Rs. 400/- per candy. The quantity of Jaffna tobacco to be permitted for import in 1957-58 has been fixed at 1,500 candies, in 1958-59 at 1,200 candies, in 1959-60 at 960 candies and in 1960-61 at 770 candies

It has been agreed that the import of Jaffna tobacco will be made

through the port of Trivandrum. Imports through other ports as well as imports in excess of the specified quantities will be subject to the Indian tariff rate applicable to the import of unmanufactured tobacco.

The Government of Ceylon will facilitate the import of Indian-grown tobacco for the production of cigarettes and other tobacco manufactures in Ceylon. Ceylon has also agreed to allow the import of fixed quantities of Indian bidis during the next four years at the prevailing rate of duty. The quantities are: 1957-58--20 lakh Ibs; 1958-59--16 lakh Ibs; 1959-60--12.8 lakh Ibs; and 1960-61--10.24 lakh Ibs.

If there are temporary gaps in Ceylon's requirements and production of bidis the Ceylon Government will issue supplementary licences for import of bidis from India whenever necessary. The Government of India on their part will issue supplementary quotas for Jaffna tobacco.

Subject to the approval of the two Governments, the Agreement will come into force immediately and will be valid until 31 August 1961.

INDIA USA SRI LANKA RUSSIA

Date: Jan 13, 1958

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Nehru-Siroky Joint Statement

The Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Villiam Siroky, visited India in January at the invitation of the Government of India. The following joint statement was issued in New Delhi on Jan 06, 1958 by Prime Minister Nehru and Prime Minister Siroky:

At the invitation of the Government of India the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Viliam Siroky, accompanied by the Foreign Minister and other representatives visited India.

During his stay in Delhi, the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia had friendly and cordial talks with the Prime Minister of India covering Indo-Czechoslovak relations and current international problems.

The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the "Declaration concerning the Peaceful Co-existence of States" recently adopted by

the United Nations unanimously. They firmly believe that the proper implementation by all countries of this Declaration will contribute to the relaxation of international tension and the furtherance of world peace.

<Pg-1>

The Prime Ministers have repeatedly declared their adherence to Five Principles of Co-existence, namely,

- (a) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- (b) non-aggression;
- (c) non-interference in each other's internal affairs for any reasons, economic, political or ideological;
- (d) equality and mutual benefit; and
- (e) peaceful co-existence,

and reaffirm them. They note with gratification that the Declaration of the United Nations also affirms and supports these principles.

The Prime Ministers are convinced that the most urgent and vital problem of international concern is that of Disarmament. They reiterate the view that the immediate cessation of the testing of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons would be a first and concrete step which can be taken forthwith. Such a measure will create that atmosphere in which progress can be made towards a generally agreed scheme of Disarmament and abandonment of the use and production of nuclear, thermo-nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The Prime Ministers expressed the hope that in the immediate future discussions, including meetings on the highest level, will be held to achieve this end.

The results of scientific research have convincingly demonstrated the tremendous possibilities offered by atomic energy for raising the welfare of nations and the Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful purposes.

The Prime Ministers reviewed the important international problems in different regions. They noted with satisfaction that recently peace was maintained in West Asia through the intervention of the United Nations and the support of world public opinion. They agreed that these problems can only be satisfactorily solved by means of peaceful negotiation and without any interference with the independence and sovereignty of the countries concerned. They are convinced that the creation of military pacts and blocs is one of the more important causes of international tension and distrust among nations and only serves to increase them. As declared by the United Nations in their

unanimous resolution of 14 December 1957, policies of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States irrespective of their divergeneces or the relative stages and nature of their political, economic and social development, will help to resolve tensions and promote peace.

The Prime Ministers are convinced that nations can fully develop their creative capacities and their resources only under conditions of freedom and independence. They expressed their sympathy with the struggle of peoples striving for freedom from colonial rule.

The Prime Ministers deeply regretted that the proper representation of China in the United Nations has not yet been achieved, thereby reducing the effectiveness of this great international organisation. They will continue their endeavours to ensure that China is represented without delay by her true representatives.

The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the development and the results of co-operation between their two countries in economic, cultural and technical fields. They are particularly happy that an agreement has been concluded between their two countries under which Czechoslovakia will help to establish a foundry-forge plant in India, thus making a further contribution towards the fulfilment of India's planned development. They look forward to continued co-operation for the increase of trade between their two countries as well as for the growth of economic, industrial and technical relations between them.

The Prime Ministers welcomed the present opportunity of personal discussions. They felt certain that the personal contacts established would further strengthen the friendly relations existing between their countries.

<Pg-2>

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA CHINA

Date: Jan 06, 1958

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Broadcast

President Prasad made the following Republic Day Broadcast on Jan 25, 1958

On this day, the Eighth Anniversary of our Republic, I send my

greetings to all my countrymen. Today we have completed eight years of our existence as a Sovereign Republic and are entering the ninth year with renewed hope and enthusiasm. A day of national rejoicing as it is, every one of us should observe it in a spirit of happiness and good cheer. At the same time it is a day of dedication when every Indian citizen should take the pledge of service of the nation and renew his resolve to contribute his or her mite to the building up of the India of our dreams. It is on such occasions when the passing out and the incoming years meet that one is apt to review the happenings of the year which is ending and welcome in a spirit of hope and preparedness the year which is to begin. These two processes are in a way interdependent and indissolubly linked with each other.

As all of you know, the principal feature of our life these ten years has been a collective endeavour on a nation-wide scale to reconstruct our economy, to improve our social conditions and to enrich our cultural life. Though for better living progress in all these directions is essential, it is economic development which has claimed first priority. Eradication of poverty, the spread of education so that ignorance and illiteracy are liquidated and the provision of minimum civic amenities and domestic comforts--all these call for material resources without which the urge to progress may get blunted and popular enthusiasm chilled. Therefore, those responsible for shaping our policies have given due place to the development of the nation's material resources in our programmes. For the achievement of this object and in order to raise the level of India's prosperity we have resorted to modern planning. The successful implementation of the First Five Year Plan and the results achieved therefrom have been a source of encouragement to us. Nearly in all spheres we were not only able to reach the targets but in some cases actual production even exceeded them. With redoubled confidence and vigour we launched the Second Five-Year Plan last year. As is perhaps inherent in the phase of development through which we are now passing, we have come up against difficulties here and there. These difficulties, far from discouraging us, should be--and actually have been--a force prodding us to still greater effort. I am glad to say that in face of the difficulty caused by the gap in the required outlay and the available resources the whole nation has responded to the Government's call to co-operate with official measures. We are determined to find a way out, and God willing, we shall succeed in implementing the Plan.

Let me also refer on this occasion to scarcity conditions prevailing in certain areas affected by drought and subsequent failure of crops. Though we know that in our agriculture chance plays a big part and that natural calamities which can affect adversely the outcome of the cultivator's efforts are not always unexpected, yet I am not inclined to gloss over the grave food situation in the country. The very idea of having to import large quantities of food grains from foreign countries piques us and gives a set back to our Planning as a whole, besides putting a terrible strain on our foreign exchange resources.

Self-sufficiency in food is our basic requirement without achieving which our projects in other spheres can hardly carry conviction with

the common man. It is a task to which every Indian must address himself. Those employed in agriculture must do their utmost to get the maximum yield from land. I believe that agricultural production can be greatly enhanced if we diligently and intelligently apply ourselves to it, because our land is fertile and steps are being taken to provide facilities for irrigation, improved seeds and manures. If our farmers make proper use of these facilities and use their inherited experience and intelligence, the shortage of food can easily be removed. Those who follow other avocations have to observe austerity in the use of foodgrains, changing their food habits where necessary, so that the needs of the various regions in India can be met and properly adjusted. Our target

<Pg-3>

should be to build up sufficient reserves of foodgrains so that we can meet all situations and in case of failure of crops for one reason or another we may be able to do without importing grains from other countries.

In the face of difficulties and hardship we have been able to make progress in other notable spheres. It is indeed gratifying that we were able to hold the second general elections, sending again the world's largest electorate to the polls. The manner in which these elections were held and the way in which administrative machinery at the Centre and in the States has been functioning in the country, should gladden the hearts of all those interested in the progress of democracy in the world. Whatever one might think of India as a whole or of any one of our problems, the one thing which is beyond the pale of doubt, is the fact that we are pledged to follow the democratic way of life and nothing can deflect us from our resolve to follow this path we have chosen for ourselves. We are determined to give effect to our decision to reconstruct our society and that in a way not incompatible with the liberty and dignity of the individual. The good of the community as a whole is no doubt a supreme consideration, but the individual forming an integral part of the community is guaranteed certain fundamental rights upheld by our Constitution and sanctified by our age-old traditions.

I want to appeal to my fellow-country-men to keep abreast of the developments in the world and the great need of their adjusting themselves to them. The world today is witnessing great events in the realm of science and other spheres of knowledge.

Vast vistas are opening up and knowledge and resources being placed in the hands of man which can add infinitely to his material prosperity all the world over, if only man knows how to utilize them in the proper way for the benefit of all and not of any limited sections of humanity. Herein comes the necessity of understanding and accepting those moral and spiritual values which alone can conquer distrust, selfishness and fear, and let in an era of peace.

No one who fails to respond to these developments with an open mind

and in a scientific spirit can hope to play his part for the good of society at large and to his own advantage. Let us therefore pause and coming out of old ruts and grooves think of the great developments that are taking place in the wider world. These developments will inevitably result in bringing the various countries together and broadening human outlook on pain of total extinction in case of maladjustment with the latest scientific discoveries. We hope, and to the best of our capacity we are also striving, for the establishment of peace in world so that all of these achievements could be used to humanity's advantage towards constructive ends. In fact this desire on our part has been the main feature of our foreign policy. We stand for peace and non-aggression--object which we believe can be achieved through the principle of co-existence.

Once again I wish you all the best of luck and pray that the coming year may bring you greater happiness and prosperity and that each one of you may be able to contribute more to the well-being of india as a whole.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA

Date: Jan 25, 1958

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement Signed

India and France signed an agreement for establishing closer economi and technical cooperation between them at New Delhi on Jan 23, 1958 1958. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:

India and France signed an agreement for establishing closer economic and technical co-operation between them.

Shri B. K. Nehru, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, signed on behalf of India; His Excellency the French Ambassador to India. Count Ostrorog

<Pg-4>

signed on behalf of France.

The agreement is the culmination of negotiations undertaken by Shri B. K. Nehru with French Government officials in Paris in 1956-57; these discussions continued in New Delhi since November 1957 with Mr.

S. de Tschaikowsky, Economic Counsellor to the French Embassy, Mr. J. Hirsch-Girin, Financial Counsellor to the French Embassy, and Mr. Y. Plattard, Commercial Attache to the French Embassy.

Under the agreement, the Government of France will facilitate the financing of the manufacture and delivery by French suppliers up to 25 billion francs (approximately 28 crores of rupees) during the next 12 months, of capital goods necessary for projects in the Second Five Year Plan, a tentative list of which, classified according to priority has been annexed to the Agreement. The contracts, to be eligible under this scheme, will have to be approved of by both Governments. The terms of each contract, including credit, will have to be negotiated separately and in each case between the purchasers and the suppliers and the text of the agreement makes this specific; no direct credit is involved between the two Governments and the figure of 25 billion francs mentioned in the agreement does not constitute a line of credit.

The French Government will also help in making available to India technical experts and provide scholarships for Indians for higher studies and training in France.

Welcoming the agreement signed, Shri B. K. Nehru said that this was the first time that we have had an agreement with France on financial and economic matters. It was his hope that this cooperation would grow and flower.

Replying, Count Ostrorog said: May I Say first that I have no knowledge of financial matters and the merit of negotiating this agreement comes to Mr. de Tschaikowsky, Economic Counsellor to the French Embassy, Mr. J. Hirsch-Girin, Financial Counsellor to the French Embassy and Mr. Plattard, Commercial Attache to the French Embassy, who have the knowledge and they discussed these matters with you. But all the same, I may just add one thing and it is that this agreement seems to be special because as you see, this is the first time that we conclude some financial agreement between us and this is a new agreement added to many others.

The relations between our two countries are very friendly and these are progressing for the last few years. Of course, as we are free countries, we are free in our opinion and may disagree on certain subjects. This is normal. But on very many other programmes, economic and cultural, I have seen those relations getting closer every day. Last year, my country, as many others, thought India has certain difficulties in enforcing the Second Five Year Plan and we have followed that with deep sympathy. Financial difficulties are not unknown to us. France, as you know, after the Second World War, was a devastated country and we experienced difficulties to build it again. Well, we endeavoured to do that and I think we have succeeded and we have done it in the normal way and not in a drastic way. And we know that in India, it is the same, so that all those Five Year Plans appear an expression, a symbol of the policy followed by Mr. Nehru, your Government's Prime Minister. We know very well that the Indian

Government after independence has established a status based on liberty and equality and I may tell you that such principles are our own principles and very dear to us. It is a thing which we follow with great sympathy. What we are doing to help India is not very large. Will you please accept it and take it as a token of sympathy and understanding, adding to those principles of liberty and equality, the motive of human brotherhood, which is also familiar to us. Little by little, this experience of brotherhood will expand between other nations too so that the general status of world relations between countries be based on a feeling of cooperation and friendship.

<Pg-5>

FRANCE INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Jan 23, 1958

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Mr. Nehru's Speech

The following is the full text of the speech of Prime Minister Nehru on the occasion:

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have met here as you know to welcome and to honour the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. This is considered some kind of a formal welcome but you, Sir, Mr. Prime Minister have already received many informal welcomes during your brief stay here till now a day and a half, and you have seen the welcome in the eyes of the large numbers of the people in Delhi city as well as in some villages round about. But in any event our people would have liked to honour you as the holder of a high office, but apart from that there is a good deal of a dramatic element in the relations of India and the United Kingdom. Those relations lasted some hundreds of years. They brought conflict and it may be that your view of that relationship may not be quite in line with our view, but the fact is that during that fairly long period, the impress of that relationship was left upon us in many ways, in institutions, in language and literature, and many other ways which are rather basic, not superficial, and which, as one sees, have survived even a radical change in that relationship and are likely to survive. But, above all, the chief thing which I think strikes people not only in India, and the United Kingdom, but in other parts of the world, is the manner the change that was brought about, which was not

only rather unique, but, as I said, strangely dramatic and which after these long years of conflict rather suddenly, almost as if by a magic wand, put an end to that spirit of conflict, and in its place there came a desire to cooperate and a wish to cooperate in spite of very considerable differences in opinion or in our reaction to events. I think that was not only remarkable in itself, but, in some measure, if I may say so, it has set a pattern from which perhaps others might profit because in this world today opinions differ as they always have differed. The main thing is how to be friendly even though one differs, how to cooperate in the large field where cooperation is always possible, even though in some matters there are strong differences of opinion, because I do believe that--l am not talking for the moment England and India but of the world at large--while we talk so much about peace, the ground, the area of common thinking or common objectives is much larger than people imagine, but it is overshadowed often by the differences, with the result that, instead of that feeling of amity and cooperation, which should be encouraged, other feelings take their place. We welcome you also at this particular juncture, Mr. Prime Minister, because of the deep crisis in human affairs and the urgent necessity for resolving it. And in this crisis, you, Sir, have played and can play a very important part indeed. A few days back, just before you came to India, you said something in a broadcast about a non-aggression pact between what are today called rival powers or rival group of powers. You will have noticed what a warm reception that suggestion of yours received in a great part of the world; certainly in India, certainly, I think, in every country of Asia, and, I think, elsewhere too, in Europe and America. That warm reception came because people all over the world hanker after some lessening of tension, hankering to be rid of this everpresent fear of dangers, possibility of wars, and terrible disaster.

I earnestly hope that your suggestion in some form or other will find it possible to give effect to it or take some steps in that direction because the past few years have shown many good things and many bad things. But broadly speaking, they might be said to have been barren of any substantial results in so far as this tension in the world is concerned. All that can be said is that we have carried on, and avoided the ultimate danger. That is true, but we have had the possibility of this ultimate danger shadowing us and embittering the lives of people because fear is a bad companion and always to have to shape our actions and policies because of the fear of some country or something happening cannot be good for those actions or those policies. It is true that sometimes there are basic differences. These are so, and yet I believe firmly that given the chance, there is an enormous fund of goodwill in the world, there is a very great degree of commonness of purpose certainly in regard to the avoidance of war and also I believe in regard to the lessening of these great tensions. And I believe also that owing to various factors, partly the tremendous development in technology and in weapons of

mass destruction, this question has become much too urgent a one to be postponed. Now more specially, a psychological moment seems to have come when people expect things to happen, people expect a big step towards a peaceful solution. The result may not come suddenly but moves in that direction would certainly fit in with the temper of the age and if, unhappily, they are delayed, there might well be tremendous disappointment and frustration. And again that continuance and perhaps an aggravation of that fear that has shadowed the world. So I may say so, Mr. Prime Minister, we in India in this matter,--I think I speak for large numbers of people outside India too,--warmly welcome what you said the other day, and we earnestly hope that this will lead to results, so that this shadow of war may at last disappear from the face of the earth. I mentioned to you just now about the peculiar history of our relationship, the relationship of our two countries. We have learnt much from you, perhaps you may have learnt something from us, and yet it was odd, that England and India should come together in this way, or in the sense, that, in many ways they differed so much from each other and the oddness of it also came out, when we chose for leader a man the like of him probably would not be a leader in any other country in the world. He was not to be called a political leader, although he was a great politician. Essentially, he was something else and we chose a person who went about half clad, with no positions, no power behind him of money or arms, and yet a great power over the hearts and minds of people. And in that sense, he represented India, not only the long past of India, but the present and even the future much more than any of us gathered around this table now or later or likely to do or can do. That shows something which people are likely to forget in regard to India, something about the standards India puts, and the values she attaches to people. We, like others, naturally value the material things of life. We labour

to raise our standards, we are working hard to that end, and we will continue to work hard, determined to achieve our objectives. That is true. We naturally realise in the world today strength counts, armed strengths makes a difference. All countries keep their armies and navies, some small, some very big and yet, in the final analysis, India has paid homage, and still I believe pays homage, to the man of spirit, neither to the man of arms nor to the man of money. Whether that is good or bad I do not say, but that is, I venture to submit, largely true and therefore, if I may so, in this world today, we in all humility want to appeal to the spirit of man, neither to the money nor to the arms, but I do believe that the spirit of man will triumph in the world if approached properly and not through fear and threats and armed might which unfortunately has been the case for many years now chiefly because of fears and apprehensions. We are a big country in size but we don't presume to tell others what they should do and we don't presume to think that we can influence the larger policies of the world. But even small voices count if they are earnestly felt and we do feel earnestly and if I may say so, passionately in regard to these problems. And I repeat that we hope with all our heart that what is in the minds of so many millions of people all over the world today, that is, the assurance of peace and goodwill and how to lessen tensions and move away from this

atmosphere of fear and hatred, how this thing that is in the minds of millions and millions should be given shape by the activities of those great statesmen who are in a position to do so. And because you, Sir, are among those who are in a position to do so, I would make this earnest appeal to you.

FRANCE INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jan 23, 1958

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Mr. Macmillan's Speech

It is a great privilege for me to be the first Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to visit independent India during his term of Office. I am deeply grateful to you, Sir, for the opportunity which this visit has given me of sensing the spirit which is abroad in India today, of glimpsing something of India's historical and spiritual heritage and of seeing something of the life of this great Indian democracy and of the tremendous efforts towards economic development and people.

My visit has also given me the opportunity of renewing old friendships and I hope of making new ones and informal discussions with your great leader, Mr. Nehru, and with other distinguished members of

<Pg-11>

the Indian Government. Above all I bring with me the good wishes of the British people.

The history of our two countries has been inextricably bound up for more than two centuries and our relations have seen many vicissitudes. I believe it was a momentous event in world history that when the time came for independent India to choose her own institutions, she chose not only to maintain many of the traditions in the administration of Government and justice that we share today, but also freely to associate with us on terms of complete equality and unfettered liberty of action in the Commonwealth of Nations. There we are both members.

Indeed, it was this historic decision which first gave the Commonwealth its present character of a family group of nations of

many races and paved the way for the Commonwealth to become a great practical working example of inter-racial co-existence. This Commonwealth, founded on the noblest ideals of international fellowship, will I believe prove both enduring and flexible. Today you find its membership in all great nations in all quarters of the earth. This year, the membership has been increased by a new African member, Ghana, as well as the new independent kingdom of Malaya. This growth and this development could I think not have taken place but for the lead given by India. Indeed, the future influence of the Commonwealth for good in the world will depend very largely not on what we as members of the Commonwealth can get out of it, but on what we as members of the Commonwealth are able to put into it.

There must always be difference of emphasis as well as of approach between us over day to day events. But I do not think that should obscure the agreement on fundamental aims and ideals which exists between you in India and ourselves in Britain.

We both believe in the freedom of the individual--of the liberty of everyone without any fear to do what he likes and to say what he likes within the law. This by itself is, I think, the most important area of agreement that can exist between two nations that agree on principles. It is a common ground from which other sympathies grow. In simple terms it means the same things when they use the same words.

We both believe in parliamentary democracy and in allowing people to decide how they will be governed by free and secret vote. The results may sometimes be very embarrassing but we believe in allowing those who do not agree with us to voice their criticism freely by constitutional means. We like to think that the first seeds of parliamentary Government were sown in a small Island, Britain, many centuries ago. If that is so, it is in India that Parliamentary democracy has come into its full power on a scale that could hardly have been dreamed of by the first parliamentarians of Britain a century ago. Of every nine people in the world who are enjoying the privilege and freedom of living under conditions which you and ourselves would describe as democratic, four are Indians.

Our people, therefore, share the universal desire, and you made a moving reference to this, Mr. Prime Minister, for peace and tolerance between nations and respect for the independence of small states as well as large. We will use our energies to the best of our ability towards removing from the world the fear of international conflict which in today's conditions could only result in destruction and devastation.

It is in accordance with these principles, which you have made well-known under the name of "Panchshila", that nations must learn to live. But I would remind you that we in the Commonwealth stand for and cherish something that is equally important—the freedom of the individual and the Parliamentary democracy of which I have spoken. With so much in common, the scope for co-operation between our two

countries is wide and the opportunity great. I look forward to a long and continuing friendship between India and Britain which will, I hope, not only bring comfort and advantage to us both but which will make the Commonwealth of Nations an ever stronger force for peace.

<Pg-12>

FRANCE INDIA USA GHANA

Date: Jan 23, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid to India

The Government of India issued the following communique in New Delhi on Jan 16, 1958 on the subject of U.S. aid to India:--

The United States Government desires to assist the Government of India in meeting its current economic problems. It has, accordingly, informed the Government of India of its willingness to discuss a loan programme of approximately \$225 million from the currently available resources of the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the Development Loan Fund. In addition, the United States Government is considering, on an urgent basis, further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage.

The U.S. Government has invited the Government of India to send representatives to discuss these matters further. The Government of India has accepted this invitation; a delegation will leave India for Washington shortly.

<Pg-13>

USA INDIA

Date: Jan 16, 1958

February

Volume No

1995

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record	1958		
VOL. IV.	February No. 2		
CONTENTS			
AFGHANISTAN King of Afghanistan's Visit President Prasad's Speech Nehru-Zahir Shah Joint Communic	15	5	
CEYLON India's Help to Meet Flood Situatio	on	16	
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VII President Ho Chi Minh's Visit President Ho Chi Minh's Speech Nehru-Ho Chi Minh Joint Statemen		17	NAM)
FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS President's Address to Parliament		20	
PAKISTAN Canal Water Talks Prime Minister's Comment on Mr.			26
UNITED KINGDOM Advance Return of Instalments		26	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Joint Statement on Indo-U.S. Econo	omic Relations		27
WEST GERMANY Agreement on Deferred Payments		. 28	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

AFGHANISTAN INDIA VIETNAM PAKISTAN USA GERMANY

Date: Feb 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Nehru-Zahir Shah Joint Communique

[illegible text]

should take place as speedily as possible to consider international tensions and the problems of war and peace, in which the great powers of the world, more particularly the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would participate. They expressed view, that appropriate preparatory steps for such a conference would help to bring about such a meeting.

His Majesty the King and the Prime Minister looked with hope to the powers concerned to help to create a favourable atmosphere for such a meeting. A decision to end with immediate effect nuclear and thermonuclear tests and to reserve outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes would serve as an imaginative and constructive beginning.

His Majesty the King and the Prime minister have welcomed the formation of the United Arab Republic. It is their belief that the Republic will pursue with vigour a policy of peace.

His Majesty the King and the Prime Minister reaffirmed the well-known views and policies of their Governments in regard to colonialism. They expressed their deep regret in regard to the present situation in Algeria which has caused suffering to millions of people and continues to be a menace to freedom and peace. They expressed their hope that an early solution would be found which would ensure independence to the Algerian people and pay due regard to legitimate interests of all the concerned parties.

His Majesty the King and the Prime Minister affirmed the common resolve of their Governments to strengthen the close and friendly relations which already exist between the two countries.

Date: Feb 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

India's Help to Meet Flood Situation

Indian Government for help to relieve flood distress in Ceylon in th later parts of December.

Asked about the details and extent of

<Pg-14>

INDIA

Date: Feb 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

King of Afghanistan's Visit

At the invitation of the President of India, His Majesty the King of Afghanistan, visited India in February. President Prasad gave a banquet in honour of the distinguished visitor on Feb 13, 1958. Speaking on the occasion the King of Afghanistan said:

I express my gratitude to your Excellency and the other distinguished guests who have given us the pleasure of attending this friendly gathering.

During my stay in Delhi I have enjoyed a warm hospitality and should like to take advantage of this occasion to offer my heart-felt thanks and those of my companions. We have observed with great pleasure the progress of India and the developments in various fields; they are truly worthy of praise.

The people of Afghanistan who are themselves engaged with the building of their country can well appreciate the real value of the results of the toil of the people of India. The needs of the nations of Asia are often similar in nature and their satisfaction requires similar efforts.

The people of Afghanistan together with their aspirations for removal of their own needs wish sincerely the success of all other nations, especially the Asian peoples in their endeavours. I can, therefore, state that the most pleasant aspect of my good-will visit here is observing the success of the people of India.

While expressing the good wishes of my people, and my personal good wishes for greater achievements of the people of India in an atmosphere of world peace and tranquility I entertain the hope that the new spirit of life and work in the countries of Asia shall gain greater strength and bring forth happiness and well-being to the peoples and nations of this part of the world.

I am happy to convey through your Excellency this message of goodwill and friendship of the people of Afghanistan to the people of India.

I thank once again your Excellency and the other distinguished guests whose participation in this gathering has caused us great pleasure.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Feb 13, 1958

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

President Prasad's Speech

President Prasad in his speech said:

I am thankful to Your Majesty for your expression of goodwill and friendly consideration towards the people of India and your appreciation of whatever we have been able to do here in the field of economic reconstruction. There is no doubt, as Your Majesty has pointed out, Asian countries have somehow lagged behind in respect of material development and have to make up the leeway. We do not desire to build up our prosperity at the cost of any other country. We wish god speed to every nation and want to develop our own resources with the help of scientific knowledge and technology.

The countries of Asia have, therefore, great stake in the prevalence of peaceful conditions in the world. Economic development in the interest of the people is not compatible with war. This idea and our aforesaid need have further strengthened our conviction in peace, good-neighbourliness and international amity. Asia, from which has flowed, time and again, the benign light of faith and holiness, is, by nature, inclined towards peace. Let us hope resurgent Asia will make its weight felt and its contribution will prove to be a stabilizing factor in the present-day world policy. Who knows that may be the fulfilment of Asia's own mission voiced through the sacred teachings of the Prophets who trampled upon the soil of this continent.

While reciprocating Your Majesty's kind sentiments and good wishes for this country and our people, may I convey on behalf of my Government and people and on my own behalf our sincere good wishes to the people of Afghanistan for their happiness and well being. Once again I would like to thank Your Majesty for visiting this country in response to our invitation and for the friendly observations you have been pleased to make in your speeches.

<Pg-15>

aid sought and given, she said; The Government of Ceylon appealed to the Government of India for the loan of helicopters for rescue and relief work and for assistance in the shape of food supplies, clothing, medical supplies, etc.

The Government of India sent six Dakotas, three Fairchild Packets and two Bell Helicopters along with a unit of Army engineers equipped with collapsible assault boats for rescue work and para medical units equipped with medical supplies for relief operations. The I.A.F. aircraft flew over 150 sorties on a round-the-clock schedule and airdropped a total of over 6 lakhs Ibs. of food and medical supplies. They rescued 300 stranded persons from various places and conveyed medical teams to the affected areas. They also carried out a number of reconnaissance flights with Ministers and officials of the Ceylon Government on board the aircraft.

The army rescue teams were dropped near Pooneryn in Jaffna and at Amparai in the Gal Oya Valley. They ferried supplies to inaccessible regions and transported people back to safety. They also repaired roads and bridges.

The Government of India has given a gift of textiles worth Rs. 50,000/-. The Indian Red Cross Society, the Textile and Pharmaceutical Industry and Trade have altogether sent donations of cloth, blankets and medicines etc. to the value of Rs. 1,90,000/-.

A further gift in kind of Rs. 10 lakhs will be given by the Government of India in the shape of goods and supplies which the Government of Ceylon may require from time to time.

Date: Feb 13, 1958

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM (NORTH VIETNAM)

President Ho Chi Minh's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Dr. Ho Chi Minh, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, visited India from Feb 05, 1958 13 Fabruary 1958. On 6 February President Prasad held a State Banquet in honour of the distinguished visitor. Speaking on the occasion President Prasad said:

I have great pleasure in welcoming in our midst tonight His Excellency Dr. Ho Chi Minh, President of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. We are very glad that His Excellency found it possible to visit this country in response to our invitation. In him we welcome a distinguished leader of men and a great fighter for freedom.

India is a young Republic; we celebrated the 8th anniversary of our Republic only two weeks ago. Having remained under foreign domination for long years we know what a boon political emancipation is, and so our sympathies have always been on the side of the countries struggling for freedom from foreign rule. We have followed with great interest and sympathy post-war events in Viet-Nam, which culminated in the Armistice Agreement at the Geneva Conference in 1954. Let us hope that the present phase will yield place in course of time to the formation of unified Viet-Nam by peaceful means and on the basis of democratic principles.

India is an ancient country whose past goes beyond the dawn of history stretching into the period known as the pre-historic era. Many centuries ago we had close ties, cultural, social and religious, with many countries in South-East Asia, including Viet-Nam. It gives us great pleasure to recollect those times when our two countries were bound by close ties of friendship; more so because we are looking forward to projecting the friendly relations of the past into the future so that our common ties and the desire for economic reconstruction at home and the consolidation of peace in the world forge new links for us making the friendly ties already subsisting between our peoples still stronger.

Like Viet-Nam, India is also a predominently agricultural country.

Since the transfer of power into our hands we have been

<Pg-17>

busy with planning in order to develop our material resources. We are in the midst of a varied programme of development which includes the establishment of heavy industries, implementation of big and small hydroelectric projects, improving our agriculture and putting the village industries and arts and crafts on a modern and a better footing. I hope during your stay in this country Your Excellency will be able to see at least a few of these projects.

Once again I extend a hearty welcome to Your Excellency on behalf of the people and the Government of India and hope that Your Excellency's sojourn in this country will be enjoyable and that it will bring still closer in fruitful collaboration the peoples of India and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

VIETNAM INDIA SWITZERLAND USA

Date: Feb 05, 1958

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM (NORTH VIETNAM)

President Ho Chi Minh's Speech

President Ho Chi Minh in his speech said:

I wish to sincerely thank H.E. the President for his kind and friendly greetings. This is an honour not only for me personally, but also for the whole people of Vietnam.

We are very happy and deeply moved to come to great India, the cradle of one of the oldest civilizations in the world. Indian culture, philosophy and art have had a glorious development and made great contributions to mankind. The basis and tradition of Indian philosophy is the ideal of peace and fraternity. For many centuries, Buddhist thought and Indian art and science have been expanding all over the world.

But, colonialism imposed its rule over India for hundreds of years and hindered the Indian people's development. To recover their independence and freedom, the Indian people had been heroically and perseveringly struggling against colonialism. Now, India is a great power with an increasingly important role on the world stage. The

Indian government and people have greatly contributed to the preservation of world peace, to the development of friendly relations and cooperation among nations, on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence. Faithful to the Bandung spirit, the Indian government has made important contributions to the building of the great unity between Asian and African countries. In the economic field, the Indian Government and people have fulfilled the first Five-Year Plan and are striving to carry out the second Five-Year Plan. In the cultural field, your scientists, and intellectuals have promoted the glorious traditions of Mahatma Gandhi and of the great poet Tagore and are contributing all their strength to the building of the country. We sincerely wish the brotherly Indian people greater and greater successes and wish increasing prosperity to India.

At present, the forces of aggression in the world are plotting to push mankind into a most disastrous war, but the peoples the world over loathe and are fed up with war. The people have uneasingly struggled to preserve and consolidate peace. In this struggle for peace. India has made valuable contributions. The forces of peace are now stronger than ever and are capable of preventing war. But the warmongers have not given up their plans of aggression. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam warmly welcomes all initiatives, all efforts aimed at lessening international tension. We fully agree with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in supporting the Soviet proposals for a conference of leaders of various countries, with a view strengthening international cooperation and mutual confidence to preserve world peace. We are also opposed to all military aggressive blocs. We stand for general disarmament, for the prohibition of the tests and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The policy of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is to make all possible contributions to the cause of world peace.

At present, in Vietnam, on account of colonialist interference, national reunification by free general elections as provided for in the Geneva. Agreements has not yet been realized. That is hurting the feelings of the Vietnamese people and is an infringement on our national sovereignty.

For thousands of years, Vietnam has been one, the Vietnamese people have been one, no force can divide it. We are determined to struggle for the reunification of our country by peaceful means and on the basis of independence and democracy. Having a just cause and with the unity of the whole people and the sympathy and support of the world, we are confident that Vietnam will be reunified.

<Pg-18>

On behalf of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and of the Vietnamese people, I wish to thank the International Commission with India as its chairman for the efforts in the supervision and control of the implementation of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam. In its struggle for the consolidation of peace and for national reunification, the Government of the Democratic

Republic of Vietnam and the people of Vietnam are always grateful for the sympathy and support of the Government and people of brotherly India. The Vietnamese people will always remember that Mahatma Gandhi lent the support to their resistance in its early stage, and that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has many times raised his voice in protest against the war of aggression in Vietnam.

The visits of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and of Vice President S. Radhakrishnan to Vietnam have further promoted friendship between our two countries. We are convinced that our present visit to India will further strengthen these friendly relations and at the same time contribute to the consolidations and promotion of solidarity among Asian and African countries.

In conclusion, may I propose a toast to the health of H.E. President Rajendra Prasad and H.E. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, to the health of all the ladies and gentlemen present, to the prosperity of the Great Republic of India, to the unshakable friendship of the Indian people and the Vietnamese people, to the continual strengthening of solidarity among Asian and African countries, to the consolidation of peace in Asia and in the world, and Panch Sheel.

VIETNAM INDIA USA INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND

Date: Feb 05, 1958

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM (NORTH VIETNAM)

Nehru-Ho Chi Minh Joint Statement

At the conclusion of the visit the following Joint Statement was issued by the Prime Minister of India and His Excellency the President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam:

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Dr Ho-Chi-Minh, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, visited India from 5 to 13 February 1958. During his stay, the President visited places of historical and cultural interest, hydro-electric projects, industrial centres and community development projects.

The President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam met the President of India, the Prime Minister of India and other members of the Government of India, and took the opportunity of his visit to have a friendly and informal exchange of views with the Prime Minister on the international situation, and matters of mutual interest to their

two countries.

The President expressed his deep appreciation of the warm welcome given to him and of the friendship of the Indian people for the people of Vietnam. The President was glad to have the opportunity to see, himself, the Indian people's love for peace and their Government's achievements in the building of a modern country while at the same time retaining and developing their ancient and traditional culture.

The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed their faith in Panchsheel, the five principles of peaceful co-existence. They affirmed their belief that the application of these principles in international relations will help to relax international tensions and provide a basis for peace and understanding among nations.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that, with the developments in the fields of space travel and atomic and thermonuclear warfare, maintenance of peace has, more than ever before, become imperative. They agreed that a high level meeting for the consideration of ways and means to end nuclear and thermonuclear tests and for achieving progressive disarmament and the lessening of world tensions is eminently desirable and expressed the hope that it will take place early.

The President and the Prime Minister were of the opinion that military blocs only result in increasing international tensions and expressed their resolve to continue and intensify, in their respective spheres, their efforts towards the maintenance of peace in the

$$< Pg-19 >$$

necessity, would have the effect of making our industry less dependent on outside sources.

The production of coal during 1957 reached a new limit of 43 million tons as against 39 million tons in 1956. Drilling and prospecting have been almost completed in many important new areas and it is expected that several new collieries will be working within a few months.

An agreement has recently been concluded with the Assam Oil Company for the formation of a Rupee Company in which Government will participate to the extent of 33-1/3 per cent. for the production of oil from the Naharkatiya oil fields and for transportation of oil therefrom. Two refineries, one in Assam and the other in Bihar, are also to be set up. Prospecting and drilling for oil are taking place in other parts of the country also.

A non-lapsable Shipping Development Fund, with a view to finding an assured source of rupee finance for the rapid growth of Indian shipping has been established.

The multi-purpose river valley projects have made considerable progress. Maithon Dam in the Damodar Valley was inaugurated in September last. In the Bhakra project work is proceeding ahead of schedule. In Nagarjunasagar construction of the dam began in July last. Progress in regard to the other multi-purpose projects has also been generally satisfactory.

In the field of heavy industry, much progress has been made. In the public sector, a heavy machine building plant and a number of other projects will be financed out of a special credit offered by the Government of the U.S.S.R. A heavy foundry and forge will be set up with Czechoslovak collaboration. A fertiliser factory at Nangal is being built with the help of credit terms from the United Kingdom, France and Italy. It is proposed to build another fertiliser plant at Neyveli. The heavy electrical plant at Bhopal is being taken in hand with British collaboration. Good progress has been made in the construction of these major steel plants at Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur.

The Malaria Control Programme, which was inaugurated in 1953, made considerable progress and reduced greatly the incidence of malaria. From control, our efforts are now being directed to a complete eradication of malaria. In regard to filaria control also, good progress has been made. Provision has been made for slum clearance and development programmes.

Marked progress continues to be made in the field of science and technology, and our National Laboratories are directing their efforts to the solution of scientific problems related to industrial and national development plans. In particular, efforts are being made for the rapid increase of technical manpower.

The work of the Department of Atomic Energy has expanded greatly during the last year. Two more reactors and several new plants are under construction. Uranium metal of atomic purity and fuel element for the reactors will be in production before the end of the current year. My Government have under consideration the construction of one or more Atomic Power Stations during the current Five Year Plan period.

The State Bank of India, which was nationalised a little more than two and a half years ago, has made considerable progress. Measures are under consideration to integrate more closely with the State Bank of India certain other State associated banks of intermediate size, which will be managed as subsidiaries of the State Bank.

The Planning Commission is engaged in working out the annual plans for the States and the centre and the necessary adjustments in the Plan as a whole, having regard to the available resources and, at the same time, to the imperative consideration of not permitting any impairment to the growth of our economy. My Government will place before you in the current session the results of these studies in

regard to what is spoken of as the "Core of the Plan".

The Community Development and National Extension Service Projects have made significant progress. There are now 2,152 Blocks which comprise 2,76,000 villages and cover 15 crores of population. The National Development Council having decided that the Block should be the unit for planning and development and the common agency of all development departments, steps have been taken to integrate Departmental Development

<Pg-22>

Budgets in the Block Budget. The Block Development Officer is being placed in operational control of this budget. The Development Council have also decided on greater decentralisation in regard to administration and the transfer of greater authority to people's organisations at the village block and district levels. The pattern of such devolution will be worked out by the States according to local circumstances. A scheme for training village farm leaders has been initiated to encourage the adoption of improved agricultural methods.

The recommendations of the Official Language Commission which are being studied by a Committee of 30 Members of Parliament are under examination. Members of Parliament, you will have an early opportunity of discussing this Report and the opinions of your Committee before any directives are issued.

Requisite action in pursuance of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act of 1957 to establish a Corporation in the beginning of the next financial year has been taken.

Tripartite Wage Boards have been set up in the textile and sugar industries. My Government have under consideration the setting up of similar wage boards for other major industries in due course. With a view to securing the progressive participation of workers in industrial management, schemes to this end are being introduced initially in a few selected undertakings. The Employees' State Insurance Scheme is being extended and the Employees' Provident Fund Act of 1952 has been extended now to cover 19 industries. 6,215 factories and establishments are now covered under the Act. The total amount of contributions collected are about 100 crores of rupees.

The situation in the Naga Hills area has improved considerably. Government accepted the demands of the leaders of the Naga People's Convention held at Kohima in August 1957 and, as a result, a new unit comprising the Naga Hills and the Tuensang Frontier Division was created by Act of Parliament in November last.

Sixty-eight Bills were passed by Parliament during 1957 and eight Bills are pending before you. My Government propose to introduce legislation in the current session in regard to Merchant Shipping and Trade Mark and Merchandise Marks. Certain other amending legislation

in regard to various matters will also be submitted to you.

A statement of the estimated receipts and the expenditure of the Government of India for the ensuing financial year will be laid before you.

Our relations with foreign countries continued to be friendly. Since I addressed Parliament last, we have had the privilege of receiving as guests of the Republic, the Presidents of Indonesia, the Republic of Vietnam, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Vice-President of the Yugoslav Federal Executive Council, the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, Czecoslovakia, Japan and the United Kingdom, the Foreign Ministers of France and Morocco, the Finance Minister of Ghana, the Education Ministers of Ghana and Mauritius, and cultural delegations from several countries.

My Prime Minister attended the meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London at the end of June. He also visited Syria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Egypt, Sudan, Japan, Burma and Ceylon. The Vice-President was also able to pay goodwill visits to China, Mangolia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Ceylon.

The world situation, while it presents no aspects of an immediate crisis, is ominous with the ever present danger of deterioration into conflict which might become world wide, unless the present deadlocks and world tensions are eased and the way is found for peaceful coexistence of nations, more particularly between the Great Powers.

The launching of the earth satellites by the Soviet Union and the United States of America marks an epochal advance by Man in the conquest of Time and Space. They are great scientific advances, but in the context of world tensions and the presence of intercontinental ballistic missiles and other weapons, every such scientific advance can well become another threat to world peace.

The efforts towards achieving progress in disarmament stand deadlocked. Any effective solution requires the joint participation of the two Great Powers--the United States of America and the Soviet Union--

$$<$$
Pg-23>

and their agreement in regard to any solutions. At the last General Assembly of the United Nations, some progress was made in this direction, but the deadlock continues. That General Assembly, however, passed a unanimous resolution on peaceful co-existence which, following as it did the deadlock over disarmament, gives some hope that a fresh approach may still be made.

My Government holds the opinion that a meeting at high level of the great States with any others, on whom they might agree, would help to ease tensions, would bring about an atmosphere of peaceful tolerance, as provided in the United Nations Resolution of 14 December 1957, and

open the way towards the easing of tensions and some progress in the field of disarmament.

My Government have engaged themselves at the United Nations in continued efforts to help to ease tensions and to advance the view that on co-existence and respect of each other alone can solutions be found.

India has been elected as a member of the Disarmament Commission. The Commission can, however, meet effectively only if all countries concerned are willing to participate. My Government intend to do their utmost to help to bring about a solution.

My Government continue to press in the United Nations and elsewhere for the suspension of nuclear explosions, the dangers of which are becoming more and more the concern of scientists and indeed of peoples all over the world. My Prime Minister made an appeal to the heads of the United States of

America and the Soviet Union in regard to suspension of these tests as a first step towards disarmament. My Government will continue their efforts in these fields.

The International Supervisory Commissions in Indo-China, of which India is Chairman, have continued to function effectively despite difficulties and peace in that area has been maintained. A welcome development has been an agreement reached in Laos between the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao leaders and a political settlement there is within sight.

My Government have heard with regret and surprise reports that some countries had sought at a recent meeting of the Baghdad Pact to be equipped with atomic weapons. We profoundly believe that none of the Great Powers will give encouragement to these desires and the outlook that persists.

For ourselves, my Government desire to make it clear beyond all doubt, that while we could, if we so decided, unwisely, produce atomic weapons, with the resources and skills that we have and can develop, we have no intention whatsoever of acquiring, manufacturing or using such weapons or candoning their use by any State. Our endeavours in the atomic field will remain confined to the peaceful use of atomic energy.

Members of the Parliament, I wish you success in your labours, and trust that they may help to bring greater prosperity and contentment to our people and peace and co-operation in the world.

VIETNAM USA INDIA NORWAY FRANCE INDONESIA BURMA JAPAN SLOVAKIA MOROCCO GHANA MAURITIUS SYRIA UNITED KINGDOM DENMARK EGYPT FINLAND SUDAN SWEDEN CAMBODIA CHINA LAOS IRAQ RUSSIA

Date: Feb 05, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Talks

The following statement was made by Shri S. K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and Power, in the Lok Sabha on Feb II, 1958, in response to a question on the "talks held with Mr. W. A. B. Iliff, Vice-President of the World Bank, in regard to the Indo-Pakistan Canal Water dispute."

Mr. W. A. B. Iliff, Vice-President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, was in New Delhi from 28 January to 1 February 1958. On his way here from Washington, he had stopped for about four days in Karachi for discussions with the Government of Pakistan.

During his stay in New Delhi, Mr. Iliff met the Prime Minister. He also met me and

<Pg-24>

held informal discussions ++++ officers of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power.

These discussions ++++ ++ exploring the possibilities of various appr+++ces towards a settlement of the Canal Waters question. No concrete proposals have so far emerged from these discussions. The house will appreciate that, until various aspects of the suggestions, which were mentioned in the talks by Mr. Iliff, have been examined and further discussions regarding any concrete suggestions that may be made are held with the Bank, Government are not in a position to make a detailed statement on these exploratory discussions.

Shri S.K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and Power, informed the Lok Sabha on 12 February 1958 that the last agreement between the Governments of India and Pakistan for ad hoc transitional arrangements regarding the supply of canal waters expired on 31 March, 1957. No further agreement had been reached between the two Governments for any period subsequent to 31 March, 1957.

The arrangements for co-operative work between India, Pakistan and the Bank which had formally been extended up to 31 December 1957 had also expired. It was understood, however, that the Bank would informally continue to lend its good offices towards finding a

solution acceptable to both sides.

The Minister said that during this recent visit to India and Pakistan, Mr Iliff discussed with the two Governments possibilities of various approaches towards a settlement of the canal water dispute. These discussions had not yet led to any concrete result. Government had seen press reports of a statement in which the Pakistan Minister of Industries and Commerce was reported to have said that Pakistan was willing to submit disputed questions to arbitration.

He further added that the Government of India had not received any communication on the subject directly from the Government of Pakistan. The Bank proposal of February, 1954, clearly states that where two sovereign authorities were concerned, problems relating to the development of water resources must be solved by negotiation and agreement rather than by decision. However in case the Government of Pakistan agreed to a settlement on the basis of the Bank Proposal of February, 1954, the Government of India had already indicated their willingness to establish, if necessary, an appropriate procedure for arbitrating disputes concerning the allocation of costs in accordance with the Bank Proposal.

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA

Date: Feb 11, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Comment on Mr. Noon's Statement

Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on Feb 10, 1958 commenting on the statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan on visaless Indians in Pakistan:

Newspapers of 12 January 1958, in India and Pakistan, carried reports of a statement made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan at a press conference in Karachi the previous day wherein he referred to arresting Indian citizens in East pakistan and putting them in concentration camps. The following appeared in the "Dawn" of Karachi dated 12 january:

There was no doubt in his mind that "a very large number of Bharati citizens are roaming about the province without passports and visas." The Prime Minister declared that "we are going to arrest the whole

damn lot of them, and going to put them in concentration camps to build mud roads."

The statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan naturally caused concern amongst the Indian public. Our High Commissioner in Karachi was therefore telegraphically asked to request the Government of Pakistan for an authentic version of their Prime Minister's statement. The Prime Minister of Pakistan was on a foreign tour and the Pakistan Ministry of foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations informed our High Commissioner that no authentic version of Prime Minister Noon's statement was available. They added that what he said to some pressmen was off the record and that he did not intend to refer to changing any law or to vary any agreements existing between India and Pakistan.

<pg-25>

In view of the unsatisfactory nature of the clarification and the threat of putting Indian citizens in concentration camps and using them as forced labour to build mud roads made in the statement, Government of India protested against this statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan which was in violation of normal international practice in these matters and also violated the terms of the Indo-Pakistan Passport and Visa Agreement.

Since his return to Karachi, the Pakistan Prime Minister has clarified his earlier statement in an interview given to the press. The following report of the clarification appeared in the "DAWN" of Karachi dated 3 February:

Malik Firoz Khan Noon pointed out that it was stated by an Opposition member one Parliament during the last session in Dacca that there were 2,00,000 Bharati citizens roaming about in East Pakistan without passports or visas of any kind.

"I stated in an answer to him," the Prime Minister recalled, "that if there were any foreigners without passports or permits they would be arrested and put into concentration camps--since they would be too many for our few jails, and made to build roads, since it would be difficult to provide other labour for them."

"Since there have been no arrests of such persons, it is clear that either there were no such unauthorised persons or if there were any, they must have cleared out of East Pakistan as a salutary result of my statement," he said, and remarked: "Both conclusions are to be welcomed."

I do not wish to add any comments to the various statements made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

Movement of persons from India into East Pakistan and from East Pakistan into India is not barred provided the persons concerned carry appropriate travel documents. The so-called operation "Closed Door" conducted on East Pakistan--Indian border is an intensive antismuggling drive conducted by the Pakistan authorities and is not meant to be a sealing of borders between India and East Pakistan.

The Government of India have received reports that the Pakistan Border Police and the Pakistan Army who are operating on the India-East Pakistan border in connection with this anti-smuggling drive have, in some cases, been responsible for border incidents involving trespass into Indian territory, kidnapping and harassment of Indian nationals, forcible removal of property belonging to Indians and to some extent disorganising the border trade arrangements between East Pakistan and India. These incidents have been taken up with the Pakistan authorities both at the level of the State and Central Governments. We have also lodged a general protest about these incidents and asked the Pakistan Government to apprehend and punish those responsible for the incidents and to issue clear instructions to the Pakistan Police and Pakistan Army personnel operating on the border not to harass those engaged in border trade in pursuance of the Indo-Pakistan Agreement in this matter.

PAKISTAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA MALI

Date: Feb 10, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Advance Return of Instalments

The Government of India issued the following Press Note on Feb 17, 1958

In view of the country's present needs for foreign exchange, the Government of the United Kingdom have offered to pay on the 1 April 1958 in addition to the annual instalment of & 4 million payable by them under Sterling Pension arrangements of 1955 three more instalments in advance. This offer, which is greatly appreciated, has been accepted by the Government of India. Letters setting out the arrangement are being exchanged

<Pg-26>

between the Finance Minister and the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in India.

In accordance with the 1955 Sterling Balance Agreements, the

Government of the United Kingdom have to repay to India a certain sum on Capital Account representing the probable excess of the balance lying with them out of the Sterling transferred to the U.K. Government in 1948 for the purchase of Annuities for Sterling Pensions over the Actuarial value of these pensions as now estimated. This sum is roughly of the order approximately of œ40 million. The U.K.Government are refunding it to India in ten annual instalment of œ4 million each to help India to meet her foreign exchange requirements in 1958-59. The U. K. Government have offered to pay four instalments in 1959 instead of the annual instalments. India will thus receive œ16 million, i.e. œ12 million more as advance payment of the sums otherwise due.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date: Feb 17, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Joint Statement on India-U.S.A. Economic Relations.

A Joint Statement on the economic relations between India and the United States of America was issued in Washington on Feb 27, 1958 1958. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:--

The following Joint Statement was signed in Washington today, 27 February 1958:

Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, and Mr. Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, have jointly reviewed in a friendly and cordial atmosphere, commercial and economic problems of interest to their respective Governments. As a result of this review, they reached the following conclusions:

The two representatives recognised that closer commercial relations between their two countries would prove mutually beneficial. To this end on behalf of their respective Governments, they expressed their desire to facilitate, develop and expand private trade between their two countries by every appropriate means.

They agreed that there exists a potential for a significant increase in value and volume of trade between the two countries. They resolved to encourage such measures as might be undertaken by the businessmen of their respective countries and by their Governments which would

promote trade between India and the United States.

Shri Lall discussed the specific commodities which he hoped might be sold in larger quantities in the U.S. He gave to Mr. Kearns a list of these commodities, the principal items being jute goods, tea, manganese ore, mica, cashew-nuts, pepper and spices, frozen and preserved foods, carpets and rugs, coir products, hides and skins, leather manufactures, essential oils, handloom fabrics and other handicrafts including silk shawls jewellery and artworks. Mr. Kearns observed that the United States is a principal supplier of commodities required for India's economic development programme including food grains, industrial machinery, vehicles, iron and steel products, non ferrous metal, fertilisers and chemicals.

Mr. Kearns and Shri Lall noted that India and the U.S. are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and are members of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). They agree that effective efforts to promote trade should be made within framework of the GATT and IMF and that it was in the interest of both countries to further to the greatest possible degree non-discriminatory trade and currency convertibility.

The two representatives agreed that every possible step should be taken to encourage greater contact between businessmen of the two countries, the continued exchange of trade missions between India and the U.S., and increased participation by businessmen in trade fairs and exhibitions of the other country. Mr. Kearns, on behalf of the U.S. Department of Commerce, described the trade development facilities offered to

<Pg-27>

businessmen by the Department and its field offices: Shri Lall, on behalf of the Indian Ministry of Commerce and Industry, explained the steps that are being taken in India by the Directorate of Export Promotion to promote trade. Both representatives shared the hope that businessmen of the two countries would make increasingly greater use of the trade promotion facilities provided by the two Governments.

The two representatives recognised that adequate and economic shipping facilities are necessary for expansion of trade between the two countries and expressed the intention of their Governments to use their best endeavours to encourage the development of such shipping services.

They noted that private capital investment aids in the promotion of economic development and trade. Since U.S. private investment in India, although increasing, is still relatively small, they considered it desirable to encourage an increasing flow of American private capital to India in appropriate fields. In this connection, they agreed that every appropriate support should be given to efforts designed to promote technical collaboration between Indian and U.S. enterprises. They further agreed that a greater interchange of

scientific and technological knowledge between Indian and U.S. enterprises. They further agreed that a greater interchange of scientific and technological knowledge between their two countries would be desirable.

The two representatives indicated their awareness of the interest of businessmen in the conclusion of a convention between India and the U.S. for the avoidance of double taxation. They agreed that it would be desirable to explore the possibilities of concluding such a convention.

Mr. Kearns and Shri Lall recognised that private travel between India and the United States has a beneficial effect on commercial and cultural relations between the two countries. They expressed on behalf of their Governments their desire to promote this travel to the fullest extent practicable. Shri Lall noted that in recent years the number of American tourists visiting India has increased appreciably and that the Travel Bureaus in India and the United States are playing a dominant role in promoting the growth of travel between both countries.

Sd/- K. B. Lall, S/- Henry Kearns,

Director General of Assistant Secretary, Foreign Trade and International Affairs, Joint Secretary, Ministry U.S. Department of of Commerce Commerce. and Industry, Govment of India. New Delhi. February 27, 1958.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date: Feb 27, 1958

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Agreement on Deferred Payments

The Government of India issued the following Press Note on Feb 26, 1958 February 1958 on the subject of negotiations with West Germany for deferred payment.

During the visit of the Minister of Finance to the Federal Republic

of Germany in October, 1957, to enlist the cooperation of the Federal Government and the German industrial and financial interests in the economic development of India, the Federal Government had expressed their willingness to help in regard to postponement of payments for the Rourkela Steel Plant as also their readiness to co-operate as far as possible in respect of projects included in India's Second Five Year Plan. Subsequent negotiations led to the signing of an agreement in Bonn on 26 February 1958, by the Indian Ambassador, Shri A. C. N. Nambiar, and the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Von Brentano. This agreement enables the Indian Government, with the cooperation of German firms and banks concerned, to postpone payments for the Rourkela Steel Plant by three years upto a total amount of D. M. six hundred sixty million (Rs. 75 crores roundly). The two Governments hope that the assistance thus given will make it possible for India to proceed with the many projects included in the Second Five Year Plan to which special importance is attached.

<Pg-28>

GERMANY INDIA USA **Date**: Feb 26, 1958

March

	Volume No	
1995		
CONTENTS		

Foreign Affairs Record

1958

March

VOL. IV

No. 3

CONTENTS

ATOMIC ENERGY

Development of Atomic Energy 29
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri Arthur Lall's Speech on Tanganyika 30 Shri Arthur Lall's Speech Welcoming Admission of United Arab Republic 41 Shri A. K. Mitra's Speech on the French Cameroons UNICEF Director's Apology 47
LEBANON IndiaLebanon Air Agreement 48
NEPAL Indian Help for University at Kathmandu 48
NEW ZEALAND Mr. Walter Nash's Visit 49 Shri Nehru's Speech 49 New Zealand Prime Minister's Reply 50
PAKISTAN Canal Water Dispute 51 Statement on Border Disputes 52
RUMANIA Rumanian Prime Minister's Visit 53 Mr. Stoica's Speech 55 NehruStoica Joint Statement 55
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Payment Arrangements between India and Egyptian Region of U. A. R 56
<pg-i></pg-i>
UNITED KINGDOM U. K. Investments in India 57
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Utilization of U.S. Credit to India 57
WEST GERMANY Outstanding Payment for Rourkela Steel Plant 58
<pg-ii></pg-ii>

INDIA CAMEROON LEBANON NEPAL NEW ZEALAND PAKISTAN EGYPT USA GERMANY

Date: Mar 01, 1958

Volume No

ATOMIC ENERGY

Development of Atomic Energy

A Press Note issued by the Government of India on Mar 15, 1958 1958 on the proposal to set up an Atomic Energy Commission stated:

The Government of India have decided to establish an Atomic energy Commission with full executive and financial powers, modelled, more or less, on the lines of the Railway Board, says a resolution published in the Gazette of India on 15 March 1958.

Since the establishment of the Department of Atomic Energy in August 1954, research and development in the peaceful uses of atomic energy have made important and rapid strides. A greatly expanded programme is envisaged for the future, in the course of which India should be able to produce all the basic materials required for the utilisation of atomic energy and build a series of atomic power stations, which will contribute increasingly to the production of electric power in the country. These developments call for an organisation 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.

The special requirements of atomic energy, the newness of the field, the strategic nature of its activities and its international and political significance have been taken into consideration in setting up the Atomic Energy Commission which will replace the one set up in 1948.

The Commission will consist of full-time and part-time members. The total number of members will not be less than three but not more than seven. The Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy will be the ex-officio Chairman of the Commission. Another full-time member of the Commission will be the Member of Finance and Administration, who will also be ex-officio Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy in financial matters. The Director of the Atomic Energy Establishment will be third ex-officio full-time member in charge of research and development.

The Atomic Energy Commission will be responsible for formulating the policy of the Department of Atomic Energy for the consideration and approval of the Prime Minister and for preparing the budget of the Department of Atomic Energy for each financial year and getting it approved by Government. The Commission will also be responsible for the implementation of Government's policy in all matters concerning atomic energy.

Within the limits of the budget provision, approved by Parliament, the Commission will have the powers of the Government of India, both administrative and financial, for carrying out the work of the Department, of Atomic Energy.

The Chairman, in his capacity as Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy, will be responsible under the Prime Minister for arriving at decisions on technical questions and advising Government on matters of atomic policy. All recommendations of the Commission on policy and allied matters will be put up to the Prime Minister through the Chairman.

The Chairman will have the power to override the other members of the Commission, except that the Member for Finance and Administration will have the right to ask that any financial matter, in which he does not agree with the Chairman, be referred to the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister.

The Member for Finance and Administration will exercise the powers of the Government of India in all financial matters concerning the Department of Atomic Energy. No proposal with financial implications will be sanctioned without his prior concurrence.

The Commission will frame its own rules of procedure and shall meet at such times and places as may be fixed by the Chairman.

<Pg-29>

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Mar 15, 1958

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Speech on Tanganyika

Shri Arthur Lall, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement during the debate on examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika in the United Nations Trusteeship Committee on Mar 10, 1958.

In addressing ourselves to this general debate, after many meetings of fruitful and useful discussion on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, I wish to start with matters of great importance, but perhaps not of great substance so far as the Territory of Tanganyika

is concerned.

For one thing, I wish to pay a tribute, on behalf of the delegation of India to the visiting Mission which produced this comprehensive and extremely useful report on conditions in Tanganyika. This report has, of course, as we are all aware, made it possible for us to discuss the conditions in this Trust Territory with a degree of realism and freshness of information which has added, I think, to the value of this year's consideration of Tanganyika by the Council.

I also wish to refer very briefly to the helpful collaboration of the various specialized agencies, some of whose representatives do us the honour of sitting here in this Council Chamber. I shall say more about their work--or at least I shall hope to make a suggestion about their work--later in this statement, but it is heartening that they are very much aware of the requirements of Tanganyika. In this connection may I say how glad we were to learn that Mr. Black, the President of the International Bank, proposes to pay a visit to this important Trust Territory.

Then, the delegation of India feels, in all sincerity, that it would like to refer to the work of Sir Edward Twining, who is just completing his long term as Governor of Tanganyika. During his period there, Tanganyika has undoubtedly progressed politically, constitutionally and economically, and it has progressed in peace and, I think, in increasing co-operation between the various racial groups; and there is no doubt of it that Sir Edward Twining's leadership has been of great value to the Trust Territory. Upon his successor will devolve the delicate task of building from the foundations which have been laid, and we wish him well in this most important and difficult mission.

The Trust Territory of Tanganyika is the largest of the Trust Territories with which this Council deals. It has a population of almost 10 million. It can become--a model State in Africa. If that is to be the case, no time must be lost.

This takes me straight to the political and constitutional position in Tanganyika. At the very outset of the remarks which I wish to make on this point, I would say that the delegation and the Government of India find themselves in the fortunate position of having no difference whatsoever with the Administering Authority as regards the constitutional and political objectives for the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. In his speech of 17 September 1957, to which I have already referred, Sir Edward Twining pointed out that Secretaries of State of both the major political parties in the United Kingdom had solemnly stated that the aim of the Administering Authority was to grant Tanganyika, self-government. Indeed, Sir Edward Twining pointed out that this aim was written into the Trusteeship Agreement. He reassured us all--as he did, mainly, the members of the Legislative Council themselves--that the Administering Authority had every intention of fulfilling the aim of the Trusteeship Agreement. He then went on to make the following remark, of which we take particular

note: "It is therefore our duty to prepare the territory as quickly and as thoroughly as possible for self-government."

But that is not all. At the close of his speech of 17 September, the Governor reverted to the overall matter of progress in Tanganyika, political and otherwise. He said that conditions were changing, and changing rapidly. He hoped that the members of the Legislative Council and the people of Tanganyika would do all they could to speed progress. He closed with the thought which I have already attributed to him--namely, that he was confident that Tanganyika could look forward to the achievement of nationhood

<Pg-30>

and could emerge with pride and dignity as a model State in Africa.

As I have already said, we are fully satisfied--and we make no secret of this--that the objectives of the Trusteeship System, enshrined in the Charter and reiterated in the Trusteeship Agreement, will be fully implemented by the Administering Authority. We are full of confidence about that basic position. We have no reason to doubt it. Indeed, if we were in doubt about the matter, we should not be sitting here. If this was not the position, the history of the past twenty-five years in the world would be rather different from what it is today. Thus, we have this full confidence that the objectives of the Trusteeship System are going to be achieved. We take particular note of the fact that the Governor of Tanganyika has stated that the Administering Authority must do all it can, and do it rapidly, to prepare the Territory for self-government.

An important remark made by Sir Andrew Cohen in his statement to the Trusteeship Council on 28 February 1958 bears on this matter. In referring to the Visiting Mission's report, Sir Andrew thanked the Mission "because the report is a challenge to the Administering Authority to pursue with the utmost vigour our efforts towards the objectives of the Trusteeship System" (T/PV.872, page 3-5). When so distinguished a representative as Sir Andrew Cohen, a representative so given to the understatement which is in the best tradition of his country, speaks of pursuing with the utmost vigour the Administering Authority's efforts towards the objectives of the Trusteeship System, the Trusteeship Council has no reason to feel that the Administering Authority will in any sense be laggard in leading Tanganyika quickly--and "quickly" is a word which has been used by the Governor himself--to self-government or independence. Here, I might just say that I am sure that the Administering Authority has no objection to the use of the word "independence," because I think I am right in saying that it is explicit in the thought of Article 76 (b) of the Charter that self-government or independence, as may be the desire of the people, should be achieved. I do not have to quote Article 76(b) because all members of the Trusteeship Council are familiar with it.

We therefore come here to make some detailed remarks about developments in Tanganyika with the basic position that we are satisfied that progress in Tanganyika is going in the right direction and that there is every intention that Tanganyika should become an independent or a self-governing State, in accordance with the desire of the people.

In considering in a more detailed way the political and constitutional position in Tanganyika, I think it is right to direct our attention for a moment to what would appear to be future steps. I, for one, freely admit--as I am sure all members of the Council will admit--that no Government and no administration likes to reconsider decisions already taken, especially when those decisions have been taken with the best of intentions and have received broadly, as Sir Andrew Cohen pointed out in his remarks on 28 February, the blessing of this Council. We said for example, I believe, that the parity system of elections was a very interesting system and that we would await with interest the results of the elections. And there is no doubt that the system of elections to the Legislative Council is a step forward. It must have meant a good deal of thought and very careful consideration on the part of the Administering Authority before that step was devised and before the arrangements were made to implement it.

But I would like particularly to draw to the attention of the Administering Authority itself that, in its wisdom, pondering the question of political development and constitutional development in Tanganyika, it has, in searching its own heart on this matter, come to the conclusion that parity in the political and constitutional development of Tanganyika, while it was a necessary stage in the thought processes, may I say, of the Administering Authority, is already a stage in those processes which the Administering Authority itself has left far behind. As I will demonstrate to the Administering Authority—though this should obviously be unnecessary—in this matter of constitutional and political development, parity is something the Administering Authority has already reached far beyond.

Therefore, for the Administering Authority today to have to implement a decision regarding parity in terms of the election to the Legislative Council is something which I

< Pg-31 >

can well understand. It arises out of the inexorable character of a governmental machine--and I am not using the word "machine" in any derogatory sense. It is used purely in a figurative sense. There is an inexorable character in these matters, and a decision has been taken, but the Administering Authority itself has taken many decisions which go beyond this parity rule. Therefore while, during the questioning period, we and other delegations have suggested to the Administering Authority alternatives to this parity rule which it seeks to implement in the elections to be held later this year and next year, I should like, more than all those specific suggestions, to suggest to the Administering Authority that, difficult though it

is normally for a Government to reconsider decisions, sometimes a Government goes beyond those decisions itself, and that stage in fact has come in Tanganyika.

I shall say precisely what I mean. The Tanganyika Government is introducing a ministerial system. There was a question of appointing, as a first step, certain Assistant Ministers. Now did they appoint Africans and Europeans and Asians on a parity basis as Assistant Ministers? No, they did not. They appointed four Africans out of the six--no parity at all. Why did they do that? They did it because, in pondering over this matter, they have already reached beyond the parity stage. It is perfectly obvious to them, if I may say this, that parity is not the appropriate arrangement for Tanganyika, where 98 per cent of the population is African. Therefore, very wisely and very properly, they have gone beyond and have appointed four Africans out of six as Assistant Ministers. Now they have appointed a full member of the Executive Council. He is the Chief of Lugusha, and he is an African.

Where is the parity in that, I ask? Far be it from me to suggest that there should be parity, and I am quite certain that the Administering Authority and the representative of the United Kingdom do not understand me in those terms and that they are not going to announce here, after my speech, that they are appointing an Asian and a European--and in fact four Assistant Ministers from each of those communities. Of course not. Their thought has passed beyond that phase.

I turn now to the District Councils. A law has just been passed about District Councils. Provision has been made for these Councils to be elected. We questioned the special representative on this law and on what the composition of the District Councils would be, and I am quite certain--as, I am sure, is the Council--that there was no mention of parity. None at all. In fact, we were told I believe that these Councils will be overwhelmingly African in composition, and that only here and there may be a non-African representative, depending on the population of the particular district concerned.

This being the case, I suggest to the Administering Authority that the undoubted step forward that it took with regard to the system of elections to the Legislative Council stands out already as glaringly anachronistic. There is no other field in the Administration, either in the Executive or in the local government field or in the services—and I shall come to them in a moment—where there is any suggestion of parity. So I would be most grateful if the Administering Authority would further ponder over this matter.

I do not wish to repeat the specific suggestions which we made during question time. We suggested, for example, that instead of a return of 1-1-1 it might be 2-1-1--two Africans and 1-1 of the others--in each of these ten constituencies. We suggested that, following the precedent of the Lake District constituency, constituencies might be split and that additional single-member constituencies might be

created without any qualifications as to race, and that members of the Legislative Council might be elected also from those singlemember constituencies. It was my impression that the Administering Authority put down these suggestions for future consideration.

In this statement, however, I am bringing to bear a much more basic consideration in this issue. It is not a question now of tinkering with the present decisions. The plain fact of the matter is that the basis of that decision does not stand logically with any of the decisions being taken by the Administering Authority itself in the Territory of Tanganyika. That is the point, and it is that basic factor which undoubtedly will appear to the Administering Authority just as it appears to us. We have no doubt of it, and we have little doubt that there will be movement in this matter.

<Pg-32>

I shall now proceed to one or two other aspects of the Central picture in the constitutional and political field. I have before me the Governor's speech of 17 September, 1957 and I am looking at the part of it which deals with the appointment of a committee of the Legislative Council to examine further constitutional progress. Purely illustratively, the Governor mentioned four or five matters which would be included within the terms of reference of this committee. We are very glad indeed to see that the Governor mentions that the parity representation matter will be re-examined. He also mentions the existing constituency boundaries, by which I take him to mean the number of constituencies and so on. There will also be study of the implications of the development of the ministerial system and ways and means of improving the Executive Council, and perhaps replacing it by a Council of Ministers. There may also be a case, states the Governor, for establishing a Council of States, which in the conditions of Tanganyika--while I am not attempting now to make any theoretical or academic justification for councils of state as part of democratic constitutions; we of course have one ourselves, so I am not speaking against a council of state--where there are grounds for giving special interests a measure of representation in the legislative organs of the central Government, I think it is easy to see that a council of state may be a very good way of doing this.

If there is any fear that those who have invested some money and who are part of the indigenous population now having settled in Tanganyika but are outnumbered, but whose interests are important, well there are ways of giving such groups special representation in a council of state. The central Government has before it the experience, the knowledge and the special expertise of persons with these unusual qualifications and background.

There are several points I would like to make about this proposed committee for constitutional reform. One is that since the Governor has said that the terms of reference will include the matters which I have mentioned, I take this list to be illustrative and I take it that the intention is that this committee will have wide functions,

and we would suggest to the Administering Authority that, broadly speaking, the wider the functions the better. We hope that this body will be able to make recommendations on all aspects of the constitutional and political structure of the administration of Tanganyika.

Secondly, regarding this body we hope very much that it will be predominantly an African body, and that it will in that way seek to be representative of the wishes of the African people. I am not even going to mention parity in this connexion. I have no doubt whatsoever that the Administering Authority will not think in terms of parity in reference to this committee. Therefore, I shall not even mention that matter except in that oblique way.

Before I go on to another point in the constitutional field, may I say again with understanding of the difficulties and with respect for the position of the Administering Authority and of any Government which prepares its programme, if this committee can be appointed earlier rather than late in 1959, I think it would be a good thing. Far too often in the history of colonial administration, there has been this sad chorus of "too little, too late". This is something which has happened only too often, and a good idea can sometimes lose its value by being untimely in the sense that it comes too late. If one thing breathes through the pages of this report of the Visiting Mission, it is the fact that the people of this Territory--not only the Africans, but even the members of the United Tanganyika Party who are Africans, Asians and Europeans--want a dynamic programme of political development. What breathes through the pages of this report is the strong political wind in Tanganyika. That is the major impression that I get in reading this document.

Now feelings like these are important not only because one wants to set a timetable, not only because when there have been so many lunar months or sidereal months it is necessary--there is no periodicity of that kind involved--but there is a human importance involved. There are several races in Tanganyika. The impression I get from this report is that these races are anxious to come to terms with each other, are anxious to live together peacefully. This again is something which comes through very clearly in this report. There is a real desire to evolve a society in which people can respect each other no matter what their background and

<Pg-33>

the colour of their skin or their religious persuasions. That is something in which Tanganyika can play a most important role, and these are the feeling which come through in this report.

It is in that context that I do express the hope of our delegation that the appointment of this legislative committee on reform can be expedited as far as possible. I know that the second half of the elections are planned for September 1959. Since the first half are taking place in September 1958, perhaps the second half could take

place in December 1958. After all, the number of voters involved in either half of these elections will be of the magnitude of 30,000. The administrative arrangements, no doubt they are difficult and no doubt they require careful consideration, do not appear to be of a magnitude which would make it really impossible for the Administering Authority to move those elections forward somewhat, and thereby to accelerate the appointment of the committee which will look into these important constitutional matters. If that can be done, then the delegation of India will feel very much happier, for this reason: while there are things we feel that the Administering Authority might agree to do before then, there is undoubtedly a great deal of wisdom in waiting for the views of the elected members of the Council. If that committee is composed as I have suggested and hope that it might be composed, then those views, I shall freely say here, even though the electorate is a small one, expressed by the people of Tanganyika on their own development, are much more valuable than anything I can express in this Council. Therefore, I think it is very important that the Administering Authority should be good enough to pay some attention to this suggestion by bringing this committee into being as quickly as possible and taking the necessary steps to expedite somewhat the election to some of the seats in the Council.

There is the interesting picture in Tanganyika of its local Government affairs. If every one had the impression that the people or the institutions of a Trust Territory are simple or primitive, my advice to him is to study carefully the local government administration of Tanganyika and he will be forced to the conclusion that there is nothing simple or primitive about them, that there is a real basic complexity and, in my view, a complexity of the right kind. The problem of the Administering Authority, if I might be permitted to try and interpret it, in this matter of local Government in Tanganyika is this: that there is a basic indigenous tribal system and that connected with this tribal system, or rather the incidence of it, there is a form of local Government, there is undoubtedly some form of tribal authorities, of chiefs and so on, and consultation among the people with a view to taking decisions. I think that is why, incidentally, it is so easy in Tanganyika to establish cooperative societies much more easily than it is in many other parts of the world: because of the strong tribal co-operative feeling. I have been struck, in reading the Visiting Mission's report and in the Administrative Authority's reports, by the strength of the cooperative movement in Tanganyika, and I think it is related to this basic community structure in the Territory.

The Administering Authority comes from a country where there has been a long development of local government of a particular type--not of the tribal type--and it is quite natural--and, mind you, I should say here the development has been highly successful--and it had been an excellent development. It is quite obvious that in terms of the best experience of the British personnel in the Administering Authority, the sensible thing to do is to introduce district councils of an elective character, etc., and town councils into Tanganyika; I am not going to quarrel with that decision; I think, broadly, that it is the

correct decision. Mind you, I am not a Tanganyikan and many Tanganyikans might differ, might hold a different view and say, "No, this Indian representative does not know what he is talking about, Tanganyika is a different kettle of fish." But the fact of the matter is that I can sympathize with the Administering Authority's decisions; they appear to me to be in the right direction. In fact, I only wish they went a little farther in that direction.

With due respect to the Administering Authority, I do not quite understand this dependence on the good feeling of the nominated members District Councils to proceed to the stage of election. But, however, human nature in Tanganyika seems to me to be extraordinarily generous, seems to be highly

<Pg-34>

developed in this respect, much more highly developed than, I think, any of us could claim to be and, apparently, the Administering Authority can hope with some degree of certainty that they will proceed to elections and that many of these District Councils will in fact be constituted by elections. Well, excellent, that seems to me to be the right thing. But I would request the Administering Authority to help this Council by making, if possible, a special study of the local administration picture of Tanganyika. I have a suspicion that it is even more complicated than the Administering Authority knows at this point. I have a suspicion further and a hope--perhaps one can be suspicious and hopeful at the same time; I hope one can--that in this tribal organization in Tanganyika will be found the roots of a real system of indigenous democracy, and that a kind of village democracy will assert itself in Tanganyika which will be the best basis that there can exist in any country for a fully democratic self-respecting Government at the centre.

That is why I attach considerable importance to this. With the indulgence of the President, I should like to tell you how important this really is. A great British Administrator in India records that, after having been in India thirty years and having reached the verge of retirement, someone told him that in the district which he had been administering, there was such a thing as the Panchayat. The Panchayat is the village council in India. Then this gentleman got on to his horse and rode out and really tried to find out about the Panchayat. He said, "To my surprise, I found that, while I had thought I was administering law and order in this district and settling all the disputes of a civil and criminal nature in the civil and criminal courts or seeing that they were settled"--he did not literally settle them himself--"in the civil and criminal courts with the evidence, acts and Civil Procedure Code and Criminal Procedure Code in the Indian Penal Code, a great deal of this work was being done without my knowledge, behind my back, by the village Panchayat and I have never heard of them. I have been here thirty years, and here they are settling village disputes, opening water courses, taking action to improve village conditions, setting up a rest house and so on."

Those village Panchayats today are the basis of our whole Community Development Programme. They are the basis of our democracy, they are the basis of this modern State of India, these village Panchayats which have endured for thousands of years and of which one can find reference in a much more sophisticated form if one reads the policy texts of the Sixth Century before Christ of North-eastern India.

However, I really think that there is the shell in Tanganyika of that kind of basic village organization which is going to be of extreme value to this Territory, and I think that if there were a systematic study made of this matter it would be of value to us.

There is a gentleman who visited Tanganyika last year whose name is Mr. R. S. Hudson and there is some mention of him in the Governors' speech. He came and sat with the Provincial Commissioners, and I think he looked into the matter of decentralization from Dar es Salam and may be he also knows something about this matter. I wonder whether I might specifically ask the Administering Authority, though this is not really the question period, whether they could not let us into the secret of what Mr. R. S. Hudson did in this Territory and what his interesting findings were--at some stage perhaps, not now, we might be enlightened about this matter. I am sure it will be of value to us when we give more consideration to the development of local Government institutions in the Territory of Tanganyika.

We welcome these developments of district councils and of town councils. I gather that there are about nine or ten or twelve town councils in which election will soon have taken place and which will have been set up. We hope that they will progress, and we hope at the same time that this indigenous basis village or rural structure, tribal or whatever it is, will also continue to play its part in the life of Tanganyika.

I am not going to say very much about the Territorial Convention of Chiefs because my impression is that the Administering Authority itself was not able to tell us anything very specific about it because apparently the Chiefs are rather exclusive, even the Administering Authority does not really get a look in. We do not quite know what the Chiefs did, but I gather that they did excellent work. I would just put it forward that

<Pg-35>

territorial conventions of chiefs might perhaps be encouraged, though I say this with hesitation as I am not a Tanganyikan and I do not want to say anything which the Tanganyikan themselves would not wish to do. But perhaps they might be encouraged to take along to the next Territorial Convention of Chiefs some of the elected representatives from District Councils just to give it a flavour which was not entirely at the apex, as it were, of life in Tanganyika.

I should like to say that I am not trying to cover all aspects of the

central and political and constitutional life of Tanganyika. I feel, for example--as I am sure all of us feel, and I believe the Visiting Mission felt--that the present franchise is too restrictive. I do not want to say this, because I do not want to embarrass the Administering Authority and to have have my friend Sir Andrew Cohen and Mr. Fletcher-Cooke blush with shame or anything like it, but it is a sad fact, if I may say this in a whisper almost that in the matter of franchise, Tanganyika--the biggest of the Trust Territories and the most important perhaps, and the Trust Territory which the Governor hopes will become a model State in Africa, and so on--is behind every other Trust Territory in Africa.

I am sure that Sir Andrew Cohen can realize now why I said that I hoped that he would not blush with shame. I am advised that in the matter of the franchise Tanganyika is not as developed as any of the other Trust Territories. Supposing it is not as developed as one of the others, that is not a matter for satisfaction. Tanganyika ought to be right up in front in this matter. I am sure that Sir Andrew Cohen will agree with that. I am sure he would not wish me to say that the delegation of India is entirely satisfied and happy to note that in the matter of the franchise Tanganyika is well behind most other Trust Territories in Africa. Would he wish me to say that? I am sure he would not.

Therefore, there are all these other issues relating to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika at the centre which I am not going to touch upon because there are many members of this Council and I have no desire to monopolize the various issues which should be raised. I have the feeling that the Administering Authority--to return to the point which I made at the opening of these remarks on the political and constitutional development in Tanganyika--is progressing more rapidly than it itself acknowledges. All this talk of parity, as I pointed out, is so out of date, even on the basis of the actions being taken by the Administering Authority in almost every field, that I am sure I am right in saying that the Administering Authority is progressing faster perhaps than it would wish to acknowledge at this meeting of the Council, and I do not want to press them to come out and say, "Yes, we agree with the representative of India."

Why should they agree with the representative of India? But their actions are what are important and certainly there are certain aspects of those actions with which the delegation of India is very pleased, and we are very pleased that the logic of parity has completely broken down.

With those remarks, I will proceed, if I might, to a few words on the economic situation in Tanganyika. The Administering Authority, through its representatives here, has, very properly, from time to time expressed some concern about the fact that the Administration of Tanganyika costs money, and that when people ask for more primary schools, and so on, all that costs money and where is the money to come from; the revenues of Tanganyika are falling. This is a very basic factor. We sympathise with the Government of Tanganyika. We

have problems like this ourselves and they are problems which no Government can overlook.

I have been looking at the remarks made by the Governor on 17 September and there are some extraordinarily hopeful statistics which he gives us. I am not going to quote them, but I would suggest to members of the Council that they look at the figures of the production of sisal, coffee, cotton, tea, tobacco, cashew nuts, sugar, copra and coconut oil, and so on, for the year 1947 and the year 1956, and they will see a picture which by any standards is magnificent. There has been an annual increase in production of 7% per cent for the last ten years. This is excellent; there is no doubt about it. This is an excellent figure and I for one take note, very happily, of the Governor's confidence that during the next ten years there will be a steady increase of not less than 7% per cent per annum. This is truly something I think, which speaks very well of the Administration

<Pg-36>

and of the people of Tanganyika, whatever be their race. They are mostly Africans, of course.

It seems to me that when one remembers that this progress has been achieved at a time when the Administering Authority and the peoples of Tanganyika have deployed the resources of only one-third of the Territory, I think they give us great hope for the future and I think they are all the more magnificent. I believe I am right in saying that only one-third of the Territory is deployed. I think it was the very able special representative, Mr. Fletcher-Cooke, who himself told us in his statement that two-thirds of the Territory of Tanganyika has not yet been put under use because of the fly. I must say that it is a magnificent record if in one-third of the Territory this can be done. That being the case, I am going to go straight to the problem of the fly.

I think it is a distressing and awful fact that two-third of Tanganyika is occupied by the fly and one-third by the Administering Authority and other human beings. Here is where I would like to turn to the participation of the specialized agencies. Some of them, as I say, are represented here in the Council chamber, but some of them have not come. The fact of the matter is this. It appears to me that there can be no better nor more appropriate field of activity for both FAO and WHO than an engagement with this wretched fly. Why is it that FAO and WHO have not been busily engaged in pushing away this fly? I have not understood this. I did ask some questions about it, but one does not want to ask too blunt questions from important organizations like FAO and WHO. But I really am nonplussed by this state of affairs.

Why is the fly being allowed to continue to reign over two-third of Tanganyika, with WHO and FAO normally sitting here--they seem to have left--and listening to us talking about Tanganyika? I do not

understand this state of affairs. I think I have the answer to it though. The Administering Authority in Tanganyika has waited for the stouthearted entreprenuer to come along and say: Give me a hundred thousand acres of land and I will clear it of the fly. But let me settle down there and grow this, that and the other, and so on. And the Administering Authority has said: Well, the fly is a very wicked insect and we want to get the fly out of here, so right you are, here is a hundred thousand acres and go ahead and get the fly out of the place. Of course that is no business of FAO and WHO because a private individual has taken it upon himself to clear the fly out of this hundred thousand acres.

Here is my suggestion, both to the Administering Authority and to the absent representatives of WHO and FAO: Could not the co-operative societies of Tanganyika, which are indigenous and so vigorous, be encouraged to apply to FAO and WHO, through the Administering Authority, of course, for assistance in this battle with the fly. That is what I should like to see done.

One would like to see the indigenous co-operative societies look upon a fair prospect such as 100,000 acres, and say, "How wonderful it would be if we could only put that under for the cultivation of cashew nuts, coffee, cotton and wheat. We cannot do this because of this fly. We cannot do this individually because we do not have the resources individually. And even as a co-operative society we do not have the resources to clear this area of the fly. Therefore, we will apply to Mr. Fletcher-Cooke or the Administering Authority to get WHO to send us people, machines and guns--or whatever is used in these engagements with the fly."

That is what should happen. That is the role that FAO and WHO should play. They should help these African co-operative societies with the machines, with the money etc. required to clear away the fly. Then we will have more prosperity in Tanganyika and we will not have to deploy only one-third of the Territory. That is what we would suggest to the Administering Authority and to the absent specialized agencies concerned.

With your permission, I should like to say a few more words, if I may, on economic matters. I think it is right, to say that our friends from the United Kingdom, and the Governor also in his speech, have spoken of the fact that a very large proportion of the revenues of the Territory are derived from non-African sources. Now, I should like to enter a very small objection to this phrase, which, I know will not be misunderstood. A

<Pg-37>

statement like that gives the impression that a great deal of wealth is pouring into Tanganyika. That is not the case. There is some, I do not gainsay that at all. But I think what is meant is that non-African people in Tanganyika are producing this wealth. But why I am bringing out this point is that these are not non-African sources,

these are the sources of the soil of Africa: the minerals, the land, the sisal of Africa.

I am saying this for the very important reason that these are Tanganyika resources. These are resources which are happily Tanganyikan, and then the Administering Authority and this Council can look upon them as available for the development of Tanganyika to her full statehood. That is the point I wanted to bring out.

Now the delegation of India is very happy to see in this connexion that Sir Edward Twining said, "that the Government is anxious to redress this ill balance by increasing as far as possible the wealth of the African people." We welcome this statement by Sir Edward Twining. And we take note in this connexion of the forty African productivity schemes. We regret a little bit that the 140 suddenly became forty. We hope that they might again expand from forty and become 140 or something like that, but forty is a good beginning. The schemes are of the value of something like \$2 million--\alpha750,000--if my mathematics is roughly correct.

In addition to that, the Government mentions that there is a capital programme of $\infty 25\%$ million plus another $\infty 4\%$ million from other resources. He said this all in connexion with redressing the ill-balance, in increasing the wealth of the African population. This is very heartening.

We are very glad to note and we welcome the fact that in the matter of sugar there is to be a new inter-racial mill, or something, of which there will be directors of all three races. And I think, perhaps as a result of this development that Tanganyika is going to be self-sufficient in the matter of sugar.

Now, since the Governor and the representatives of the Administering Authority here, and Sir Andrew Cohen, have all told us that it is their endeavour--and Sir Andrew Cohen always likes to use these mild words such as, "utmost vigour", it is going to be their endeavour to promote with the utmost vigour the economic development of the African people in Tanganyika. He did not say that, but he does not mind my saying that for him, I hope.

Since that is the case, it seems to us logical and we hope acceptable for us to make certain suggestions in this connexion to the Administering Authority. As I said, we welcome their general position. Perhaps in this connexion they would be good enough to consider when it comes to the matter of licensing industrial ventures or commercial ventures in the Territory, to stipulate that the licensees will include arrangements for training of Africans in the branches of industry and commerce in which the licensee is engaged. And, of course, if the licensee is unwilling, then the Administering Authority could be a little coy and someone else will probably turn up and make a proposal which does include such possibility. In other words, this need not perhaps be done by regulation. It could be done by very careful handling. We think there is scope for doing it that

way. When it comes particularly to the mineral resources of Tanganyika, we very much hope that that will be done--the training of Africans in those fields, so that they know what the resources of their Territory are--and that is extremely important. It is something which will help the African and the indigenous population generally to realize the value of the Territory, to feel that this Territory is capable of delivering them by diversified economy and in due course a high standard of living.

In that connexion, I would remind the Administering Authority's representatives here, if I may, of my suggestions regarding the geological survey. We realize that there are a number of Africans in the geological survey, but I gather not any whom one would in professional circles call a geologist. Those are the kind of men whom we would like to see as soon as possible in the geological survey of Africa. We would request the Administering Authority to see that that happens and to see that these training schemes and association of indigenous population are matters which the Western Rift Company and another concern which is resorting to aerial photo geology etc., will not leave out of account.

<Pg-38>

I must comment on the question of land because it is connected with economic advancement to some extent. We were most grateful to the special representative for the statistics and the statement he made about land. These have given us a very full picture of the land alienation situation in Tanganyika.

Mr. Fletcher-Cooke was good enough to give us certain supplementary statistics. I believe he also gave them to the Council. Unfortunately I was absent, but I was later privileged to see them. My impression is--and he can correct me if I am wrong--that of the land at present being cultivated in Tanganyika about 5 per cent is being cultivated by people to whom land has been alienated. I will tell you how I arrived at this calculation because I think it is a little unfair to the representatives of the United Kingdom to face them with the result, which might even be inaccurate.

Arable land in use today is 20 million acres. The total alienated land amounts to about 2.35 million acres. Out of the 2.35 million acres, my calculation is that about 1.25 million acres are used for cultivation. I am willing to take a quarter of a million away from that figure and to arrive at the very round and approximate figure of 1 million. One million is 5 per cent of 20 million, which is the acreage of the arable land in use today. That is how I arrived at my figure, which I think is a conservative estimate. It might be 6.5 per cent. There is other land, of course, which is cultivable and which we hope will be cultivated once the specialized agencies get going with the cooperative societies in Africa and others, but that is the picture today. I have mentioned this fact because the figure 5 per cent is not inconsiderable, taking into account the dimensions of the population involved.

That being so, we feel in all earnestness that we should appeal to the Administering Authority to give the most serious consideration to the suggestion that all land alienations now be brought under some such regulation as the following:

First, alienations in favour of public and semi-public bodies--of course, after consultation with and due compensation to the people-to go forward.

Secondly, alienations of land for plantation purposes to be offered first to African co-operative societies; then to indigenous farmers; and then to outsiders if there is no objection.

Thirdly, land for ranching to be offered on a similar basis;

Fourthly, land for agricultural operation no longer to be alienated except to the indigenous population.

These are our suggestions to the Administering Authority with regard to land alienations.

I now proceed to education. The problem of education in Tanganyika is very unusual in terms of my experience, and I say this for the following reason: facilities already exist in the Territory for elementary education for 40 per cent of the population of schoolgoing age--not the adult population. In another fifteen to twenty years--that, I think, was the period mentioned by the Governor, and I am sure it was accurately stated by him--there will be facilities for elementary education for all the school-going population. At the same time, we are constantly being told by the representatives of the Administering Authority--and undoubtedly correctly--that one of the obstacles to a more rapid development of constitutional, political and administrative reforms in Tanganyika is that there are not enough educated people.

When the British Government left India, there were school facilities for not more than 20 per cent of the school-going population. Of course, there was a fairly large number of people--many millions--who had the advantage not just in British times--if the British gentlemen sitting here will not mind my saying so--but for many thousands of years of higher education. Therefore, there was a lot of intellectual material lying around which one could use. Apparently that is not so in Tanganyika. Or is it not? I am not so sure. I wonder whether that is really the case. I have not had the privilege of meeting many Tanganyikans, but I met two who were petitioners here last year; and in terms of character and intellectual ability, I have not come across a better couple of men. Any country would be proud to have these men among its citizens. I am sure of

<Pg-39>

that. Now, how many Tanganyikans like these are there--scores,

hundreds, hundreds of thousands? I wonder. If there are, then I am not sure that the over-all picture of education really is an obstacle to any degree of political development in Tanganyika right up to statehood. There are facilities for more school children than there were in most of the countries from which Britain itself has retired, and there are men from Tanganyika that we have met who are of the highest calibre. Then what is the problem of education and politics? I do not understand it. So far as I can see there is no real difficulty on this ground.

Maybe I am overlooking some of the facts. If that is the case, I would be most grateful if the representatives of the Administering Authority would inform me of them. Because so far as I can see educationally Tanganyika is not backward compared with many parts of the world which are independent.

There are obvious gaps. One would like to see a situation in the services particularly where there were more Africans at the higher levels. One would like the day--and we hope that literally it will dawn tomorrow--when there will be an African District Commissioner, for example. I have been informed by Mr. Fletcher-Cooke that there will be about nine African District Officers by the end of 1959 out of a total of about 150. One would like to see a little less disparity between those two sets of figures. As I ventured to suggest to our colleagues from the United Kingdom, recruitment on a fifty-fifty basis would seem very desirable. That would be a sort of parity. I am sure that suggestion will be accepted. It has an authentic ring about it.

So, there are these gaps; and there are too few doctors. I think that there are nine African doctors in Tanganyika. That is far too few. But I gather that now one can get a very respectable degree at Makerere, and one does hope that this university--and perhaps in these rather scattered thoughts on education it will not be objected to if I go straight on to the question of the university--which is going to be set up, considering the fact that there is Makerere around the corner, should concentrate first of all on a medical college, on an engineering college, and so on. Let it start as a technical university. There is Makerere, and I gather that there not enough Tanganyikans to fill the ordinary liberal arts college courses in Makerere. Would it not be an excellent innovation if what Uganda has done for Tanganyika in the liberal arts field by providing Makerere, Tanganyika would do for Uganda by providing university education in those branches where it is badly needed in East Africa. That is to say, let these two university colleges, to begin with at any rate, express the requirements of the territory of East Africa by giving priority to those fields of study and training which are lacking or which are not adequately available, perhaps because there are not enough seats at Makerere. That would be a wonderful way of starting this university, and I am sure that the Tanganyikans would not object to this sort of development. I am sure that Tanganyika scholars who are abroad in the world--I do not know how many there are, and I am glad to see that out of approximately 1,500 foreign

students whom we have in India, 16 come from Tanganyika--are studying, many of them, technical courses, and I am sure that this kind of university is something which would be of real benefit to the Tanganyikans.

I do not think that they want elementary education; and, judging from Mr. Julian Nyerere and Chief Marealle, they do not need any education in elocution or anything like that--they are past masters of these arts. They probably need technical education, and this is what I would suggest that the university might turn its attention to. And if this is what the university would turn its attention to it could be expedited. It need not be planned on a broad basis by preparing people with the history of England, or of India, which are valuable subjects--and, of course the history of Guatemala--but they can begin by going into these technical subjects straightway, and the nucleus of a university as a technical university can be set up, we hope, without delay.

I do not thing that it is desirable for me to go on speaking because I do not know when I would stop unless I bring myself to a halt. But before I do so, I should like to say this about education. Having regard to the strong desire of the people of this Territory to live at peace and in cooperation with each other--the various racial groups--

<Pg-40>

I would earnestly commend to the Administering Authority the suggestion which I have already made that, in the future, the Administering Authority should not establish any schools on a separate isolation basis; all schools in the future to be established by the Government should be schools for all citizens of the Territory. Indeed, I am not at all sure that a good lawyer--such as I am not--could not make out a case--and I am not trying to prompt anyone in this room to do so--that, in terms of the Trusteeship System, all government schools ought to be for all races. And, of course, in terms of article 12 of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority does have a special responsibility in the field of education. And I am very much hoping that, apart from the legalities of this matter, but in view of their own objectives in Tanganyika--the objectives of a democratic, self-governing State--the day is over when the Administering Authority will set up segregated schools.

I have kept to the last a part of my statement which gives me, personally, very great pleasure, and I want most sincerely to thank Sir Andrew Cohen and Mr. FletcherCooke for having made this series of meetings on Tanganyika a real search with a common purpose, a common endeavour. I have not for a moment had the impression that the Administering Authority was holding back on us or that it did not join with the most respectable and radical of us--to use Sir Andrew Cohen's words--in looking for those avenues of development which are most fruitful and which will be most fruitful for Tanganyika. I have

truly been impressed by the way in which both our British colleagues have joined in these discussions, and I think that they have made these discussions on Tanganyika a model for discussions in the Trusteeship Council. I am most grateful to them. I know that they will take the suggestions which the delegation of India has made in the spirit in which they have been made. We have no intention of trying to embarrass the Administering Authority. Far be it from us to have that sort of view--we do not look at life that way. We want Tanganyika to develop as rapidly as possible to independent statehood--statehood within the Commonwealth, or without, if it prefers to be outside, but within if that is its wish. We want that development to take place in a manner in which there will be no lack of security for any of the peoples who have made their homes in Tanganyika, and we are fully convinced that it is the endeavour of the Administering Authority to obtain this objective. If we have different views from them regarding the speed at which events should go in Tanganyika, it is not because we have any quarrel with their intentions, but it is because our experience is different from theirs. They were at one end of a certain experience; we at the other end of that experience. And we feel that we can give them advice based on our experience which they do not have, which we have. They can say things from a point of view which we do not share--I do not mean do not share in the sense that we depart from their view, but which we have just not had--and between these two sets of views there is no reason why there should not be common ground, and why there should not be the sort of common endeavour which is developed around this table, and why Tanganvika should not become the model State which the Governor of Tanganyika has promised, and why the Administering Authority should not, to quote Sir Andrew Cohen's words, pursue with the utmost vigour its efforts in this direction. And I know that the utmost vigour of the United Kingdom Government is no mean thing. And we expect to see Tanganyika a State and a member of the United Nations in the near future.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UGANDA GUATEMALA

Date: Mar 10, 1958

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Speech. Welcoming Admission of United Arab Republic

India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, Mr. Arthur Lall, made the following statement on Mar 07, 1958 welcoming the representation of the United Arab Republic at the U.N. Trusteeship

Council:--

We are extremely happy to see that the arrangements which you foreshadowed, Mr. President, at the end of our morning meeting have been made and that we now have in our midst the United Arab Republic which consists precisely of what were two Member States of the United Nations. Accordingly, the appearance here of the United Arab

<Pg-41>

Republic poses no problem for us at all. We have in the past worked closely in co-operation with what were the two component States of the new Republic, and we have appreciated the opportunities of working with them. We recall the work which we have done together with the Egyptian delegation in the Fourth Committee and the work there and in this Council with the Syrian delegation.

It is interesting that part of the new Arab Republic was for some time a mandated territory and that now they sit here as part of that Republic and as a member of the Trusteeship Council. It is also interesting that this event happens to have occurred on what is the anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Ghana, which also contains what was a Trust Territory. We are very happy indeed to have amongst us old friends as a new Republic, as a member of this Council now, and we look forward to the strengthening of the Council as an augury which will lead to more effectiveness in its work.

I should like to felicitate the Government of the new Arab Republic and its representatives who are now sitting in our amidst.

INDIA USA EGYPT SYRIA GHANA

Date: Mar 07, 1958

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri A. K. Mitra's Speech on the French Cameroons

Mr. A. K. Mitra, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations made the following statement while taking part in the debate on French Cameroons in the United Nations Trusteeship Committee on Mar 01, 1958

Mr. Mitra (India): To begin with, I would like to express our very sincere gratitude to the special representative for the clarity with

which he has replied to the many questions which have been addressed to him. We are equally grateful to the representative of France for many of the clarifications which he personally gave with regard to various matters. I would also like to take this opportunity of thanking the representatives of the specialised agencies for their contribution to our consideration of the annual report regarding the Territory of the Cameroons under French administration. I may also add that, to a large measure, it is the co-operation and the efficiency of the numerous, and sometimes nameless workers in the Secretariat that has contributed greatly to what I hope is our proper understanding of the nature of the problem facing us.

To begin with, and in considering the political situation in the Trust Territory, my delegation has noted with interest the Statute that has been promulgated in the area, and which is now in operation with an elected Cameroonian Government to carry out its provisions. I must, however, add that it is the firm conviction of my delegation that it is not possible for a Trust Territory to progress towards independence unless many of the powers which are still retained by the central organs of the French Republic are, in the near future, transferred to the organs of administration in the Territory. On a number of occasions, in reply to question, the special representative as well as the representative of France had stressed that such and such a matter was in the exclusive competence of the Cameroonian Government. This, I note, has been particularly the case when questions have been asked about, for example, the Cameroonization of the administrative services, the rate of progress of education, etc.--matters in which some members of the Council have perhaps felt that progress has not been as rapid as might be desirable. Whereas my delegation is happy to see an increasing measure of responsibility being given to the Cameroons Government for the administration of the Territory we cannot feel confident that the Government is so independent that little, if any, responsibility attaches to the Administering authority in those matters which are enumerated in article 11 of the Statute. Further--and I will deal with this again when I speak of economic matters--the Government of the Territory does not have sufficient financial power to be considered entirely responsible for internal administration. He who controls the purse strings very often controls the Government. By virtue of the exclusive control over foreign exchange mineral rights, credits, customs duties and foreign trade, a great deal of economic control is exercised by the Administering Authorities.

<Pg-42>

For example, the High Commissioner of the French Republic has not only definite powers at his disposal in accordance with article 44 of the Statute but also presides over all meetings of the Council of Ministers; in all these ways he does exercise, to put it mildly, a great deal of influence, if not control, over the Government of the Territory. Take, for example, the recent events in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration--I am referring to the question of the resignation of the Mbida Government

and its replacement by the new Government in the last few days.

Though I am perfectly well aware of the reasons which led to the resignation of the Government of Mbida, I must point out that the High Commissioner did act in a manner which shows that his influence on the Cameroons is much greater than that demonstrated by the terms of the Statute. I wish to emphasise that my information on this matter is based on a careful reading of the best known French newspaper Le Monde and the statements of the special representative and the representative of France. As I understand it, the situation was that Mr. Mbida had designated some new Ministers at a time when the High Commissioner felt that these new Ministers would not enable Dr. Mbida to obtain a vote of confidence in the Assembly. However, according to article 28 of the Statute the Prime Minister can be removed from office only by a motion of censure in the Legislative Assembly, such a motion of censure can, again, according to the same article, only be passed by a two third majority.

In quoting this article of the statute, I do not wish to indicate that my delegation necessarily approves of a procedure where even though a majority of the members of the Assembly may oppose the continuance of a certain Prime Minister, the mere fact that he has more than a third of the members with him should enable him to continue in office. But this is what the Statute lays down. I, however, note from Le Monde of 14 February 1958 that when Mr. Mbida named certain Ministers, the High Commissioner did not consider it possible to accept the nominations and this led to the resignation of the Prime Ministerú I have gone into this matter only to show that sometimes when the Administering Authority considers it necessary, decisions are taken by the Authority itself, which may not be entirely in agreement with the letter of the Statute.

My delegation has also noted that the draft Statute places an important limitation on the rights of the Cameroons Administration in article 15 of the Statute. In that article it is specifically stated that all legislation and regulations made by the Cameroons authorities must be consistent with the preamble to the Constitution of the French Republic. The preamble to the Constitution of the French Republic specifically states--and I now quote from a copy of the Constitution as provided by the French Mission here:

"France shall form with the people of her overseas territories a Union based upon equality of rights and duties, without distinction as to race or religion.

"The French Union shall be composed of nations and peoples who shall place in common or co-ordinate their resources and their efforts in order to develop their respective civilizations, further their well-being and ensure their security."

Now whether as a result of this Title 8 of the Constitution of the French Republic --which is headed "The French Union"--is automatically applicable to the Trust Territory of the Cameroons is a

moot point and one for legal experts. The intention appears to be that legislation pertaining to the Union would also be applicable to the Cameroons. Here I wish to draw a distinction which I attempted to draw yesterday when the one and only petitioner we had was being questioned.

My country is also proud to belong to an association of independent and sovereign States which is known as the Commonwealth of Nations. But there is no legislation regarding the Commonwealth of Nations, and no independent member of the Commonwealth in any way abdicates any legislative functions to any other member. When I asked the petitioner yesterday whether, in his opinion, an association such as the one we have in the Commonwealth of Nations is the one that he would prefer for his country, he answered affirmatively. I am sure the representative of France will agree with me

<Pg-43>

that the petitioner did not betray at any time anything less than complete faith and loyalty to France--he himself used the term "loyalty" on a number of occasions. As such I feel that perhaps it will be desirable if this question of membership in the French Union could be left to a future decision by a fully competent and fully sovereign Cameroons Government, instead of being decided by a Statute which has been laid down from outside.

I wish to make it clear that the only reason for making these remarks is that my delegation feels that a partnership of equals decided upon independently and individually by each equal in conditions of absolute sovereignty is a much more lasting and enduring partnership than any which is, to however small a degree, imposed by exterior means.

Turning now to the political situation in the Cameroons, my delegation is happy to see that normal democratic processes are now appearing to be practised in the Cameroon legislature. The change of Government such as has taken place is not a bad thing in itself as it shows the vitality of the Assembly. One of the most hopeful signs has been the fact that the new Government has been formed by a cooperation of elements from the North and South of the Territory. My delegation always regards with concern any state of affairs where a division appears to have been caused between the people of any territory or colony.

But my delegation still feels that in view of the fact that a certain measure of political equilibrium seems to have been reached, it is all the more necessary to establish such conditions as would be conducive to the peaceful and democratic growth of the country towards the ideal of independence or full self-government, which is the ideal laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. In this connexion, my delegation is happy that an Amnesty Law has at least been promulgated in the Territory. We only regret that two and a half years had to elapse between the events that took place and the

Amnesty Law that applied to them. We regret this because we feel that perhaps earlier action in this matter would have probably resulted in a more favourable political situation. Though I understand the difficulty of the Administering Authority in this matter, yet I must point out that according to article 14 of the Statute, the system of public liberties is exclusively in the competence of the central organs of the French Republic and therefore this matter could perhaps have been dealt with a little more expeditiously by the central organs of the French Republic and not by the Government of Cameroons.

In this connection my delegation has in the past deplored the recourse to violence by some members of political parties in the Cameroons, a matter which has been referred to just now. We deplore this again and we feel that all political parties in the Cameroons should realize at an early date that the rapid evolution towards independence depends entirely on their own ability to work in peaceful conditions without violence. My delegation has been very pained to read in the news papers, as well as to hear from the Administering Authority in reply to questions, that violence has once again flared up in the Cameroons. Without condoning this violence in any way, my delegation would like to say that while those who commit crimes should be punished some steps should also be taken of a political nature to stop this general violence in the Territory. In this connexion, I repeat once again that my delegation is strongly opposed to the employment of violence for the achievement of political ends. However, I can do no better that to quote part of an article in the original French which appeared in the newspaper Le monde on 18 February 1958.

With regard to the Union des populations du Cameroon, a nationalist extremist organisation, a minority which had recourse to terrorism, two methods were available: one was the method of political overtures; giving opportunity to the leaders of the organisation to show whether they accept or reject democratic measures and simultaneously taking away their principal reason for fighting to hasten the process of accession to independence of the Cameroons, since everyone in Paris knows that the final attainment of independence cannot be avoided....

It is then for the Administering Authority to consider, in accordance with its responsibilities regarding law and order and system of public liberties--responsibilities

<Pg-44>

which are exclusively those of the Administering Authority--to take such steps as will reduce the climate of tension and of violence that has existed in the Territory for a long time. If I appear to insist on this question, it is probably because my delegation naturally feels unhappy that for the first time in the history of either the Mandated Territories or one the Trust Territories, troops have had to be brought in from the administering country in order to suppress political movements and violence. This does not, again I say, in any

way, detract from our earlier statement that we condemn the use of violence by political parties. In this connexion, we would like to make a suggestion for the consideration of the Administering Authority. There appears to be continuous violence in certain areas of the Territory and also a large number of arrests and imprisonments. In such a situation it might perhaps be desirable for the Administering Authority to order a judicial enquiry by respected judges to examine what methods are necessary to improve the situation. This is only a suggestion for consideration by the Administering Authority. In any event, my delegation feels that it would be highly desirable for the visiting Mission which is due to go to this Territory in the near future to examine the situation and to recommend such means as will remove not only the unrest but the causes of the unrest. The problem is not simply one of violence; it is a problem of violence caused by political factors. Its cure is perhaps not only in counter-violence but also in political settlement and political stability.

I would now like to refer briefly to the question of the Cameroonization of the services. I apologize for this word, but as it was first used in my presence by the representative of Her Britanic Majesty, I feel that it is perfectly in order for me to use it in the English language. I already had occasion, during the period of questions put to the Administering Authority, to draw its attention to what I am afraid my delegation still considers rather a slow rate of Cameroonization of the essential services. It appears that there are 80 senior Cameroonians in administrative posts.... I do not include the senior technical posts--as against 60 in senior administrative posts last year. There is not a single Chief of Region who is a Cameroonian --there are 19 regions in the Territory. It is my understanding that there are, at least 1,200 senior administrative posts in the country. If every year the increase is by geometrical progression as the representative of France hoped for in his kind reply to my question, even then it will take many years before the services are half Cameroonised. I am fully aware of the preoccupation of the Administering Authority in this matter, but I wonder if it would be possible for the Administering Authority to draw up some sort of a time-table regarding the rate at which the indigenous inhabitants of the Cameroons would be able to take over responsibility from French officials This would of course involve a great deal of effort in the field of education and I propose to return to this matter later. The reason I have specifically asked for a time-table is because resolutions 1207 of the 12th Session of the General Assembly as well as earlier resolutions, have all requested the Administering Authority to indicate successive target dates. In this field it would be desirable to have some target dates from the Administering Authority regarding the date of cameroonization of the public services.

I would now like to return to the economic conditions in the Territory. Here again, I feel that the Administering Authority should be congratulated for the effort it has made to improve the economic conditions of the Cameroonian people. In particular the Ten-Year plan

for development appears to be bold and far-sighted measure to increase economic production in the country and in general improve the lot of the people. It is a matter of regret to my delegation that more adequate statistics showing the actual increase in production on a percentage basis crease in production on a percentage basis for various domains of economic production are not readily available. But from such evidence as we have both in the report and in the working paper, it is obvious that there have been advances in the economic field. Here, again my delegation feels that perhaps it would be desirable to give some more powers to the local government of the Cameroons to enable that Government really to interest itself in matters pertaining to the economic field. I would particularly refer to that part of article 14 of the statute which specifically reserves to the competence of the Administering Authority all matters, relating to currency and foreign exchange system, foreign trade, credit, customs matters and mineral resources. I am fully aware that this

<Pg-45>

is also a matter which is receiving attention from the Administering Authority. However, my delegation must reiterate that we feel that a Government can really not be called in any way independent unless it has at at least control over its own economy. For example, we feel that it is necessary for the Government of the Cameroons to be in a position to control the outflow of foreign exchange from its Territory. We were informed last year by the representative of France that no control of any sort was exercised on transfers of funds from the Cameroons to any other area of the France zone; this would undoubtedly mean that citizens of metropolitan France operating in the Cameroons could transfer any amount of funds back to the metropolitan territory without the Cameroons Government being in any position to control this traffic. Similarly, though we are aware that in accordance with the Trust Agreement, customs duties are not applied yet I note that in paragraphs 36 on page 73 of the report, there is considerable reference to Droits d'importation at droits d'exportation. This is perhaps not called customs duty; but it appears to be very much the same thing. For example, there is a reference on page 74 to something called "Production Tax" which applies ad volorem to some exported products. I notice that whereas figures are given for the taxes on cocoa, on cattle, etc., no figures are given for rubber and tin. As both these products are produced and presumably exported by non-indigenous firms, we feel that the right of taxation in this matter should be with the Government of the Cameroons so that the economy of the Cameroons would be returned to the maximum benefit of the indigenous people. In the same fashion, we feel that it would perhaps be desirable to give the indigenous population some measure of control over the mineral resources in their country, which are not inconsiderable.

In the same connexion, I would also like specifically to refer to the question of aluminium production which has been referred to by other representatives. I have already had occasion to express the sincere

congratulations of my delegation to the Administering Authority for setting up this industry in the Cameroons. This industry is a very valuable one and can bring enormous benefits to the population of the Cameroons. Production of aluminium would undoubtedly be fairly inexpensive in a country where electricity is so cheap and where minimum wages of labour, according to some of the statistics given yesterday by the special representative, are sometimes as low as (US) 9 cents per hour. My delegation would be grateful if in the future the Administering Authority would indicate in its report the extent of the economic benefits enjoyed by the people of the Territory from this major industry in which 90 per cent of the capital is owned by non-indigenous organisations or individuals.

My delegation is very happy to observe the successful working of the Cocoa Stabilization Fund. We sincerely hope that this Fund, as well as the Coffee Stabilization Fund, will enable the African producer to enjoy a better standard of living than in the past My delegation is equally happy to see the expansion of the Cameroons Credit Organisation as well as of its activities in improving the housing conditions of the indigenous population.

Turning now to the social problems in the Territory, my delegation would like once again to stress the fact that alcoholism is a major disease in areas where the level of education, the level of political advancement and the level of economic well-being are all rather low. We would suggest to the Administering Authority that it should take such steps as are feasible including the imposition of high taxes on imports, high excise taxes on local production, and popular education on the subject towards discouraging excessive consumption of alcohol by the inhabitants. We should be grateful if special attention could be paid to this matter and some indications given in future reports about the actual situation.

In the same field, my delegation is much concerned about the rather drastic reduction in medical personnel, already referred to by another representative on the Council. We hope that there is some error in the statistics given and that the drop has not been as drastic as it appears to be at first sight. In any event, my delegation is quite concerned about the shortage of indigenous medical personnel and would suggest to the Administering Authority that a greater effort be made to send qualified Cameroonians in much larger numbers than at present for education in the medical field. From-the statistics given in the

<Pg-46>

report, it appears that even by 1961 only 27 indigenous doctors are expected to have completed their studies. In a country where the number of doctors is already very low, we feel that it would be desirable to increase the rate at which-doctors are being trained, particularly as we are dealing here with a population of 3 1/2 million. Twenty-seven doctors a year will not make up the gap which already exists, and we hope that the Administering Authority will pay

particular attention to this matter.

In the field of education, I must begin by saying that the over-all figure of school attendance throughout the Territory is commendable. I have noted that there appears to be a very unfortunate reduction in the number of teachers who are being trained in private and public schools at this time. We would recommend to the Administering Authority special measures, such as increased financial incentives for teachers, in order to remedy this situation. I wish to add that this shortage of teachers is a universal phenomenon, but in a Territory like the Cameroons it is doubly dangerous since the Territory is in a very early stage of educational development. In the same manner, my delegation would like to draw the Administering Authority's attention to the great shortage of inspectors of schools and to suggest that special measures be taken to remedy the situation before next year.

Finally, my delegation would again stress the need for planning for a university in the Territory of the Cameroons under French administration. I have already had occasion to refer to this. My delegation feels, and has felt for some time, that in view of the very large number of Cameroonians who wish to enjoy the advantage of higher education, it would be most desirable now to think of starting a university in the Territory. I was informed that the Cameroons Government felt that it was essential to develop primary education before any steps were taken to establish a university in the Territory.

It seems to me that primary education in the Territory is already sufficiently advanced to permit consideration of the problem of higher education. Even from the financial point of view, the burden of sending hundreds of students to France every year is considerable. To bring to the Cameroons the facilities available in France, such as professors and teachers, would perhaps, in the long run, be more economical. My delegation feels strongly that the Administering Authority should, at this stage, lay the foundations of a university. Universities are not built in a day or a year, and if at this time a plan does not even exist for the starting of such a university, it will be difficult indeed to find a sufficient number of educated Cameroonians to take over the administration of the country in the not too distant future. I have already referred to the shortage of doctors, teachers, school inspectors and administrators. All these shortages would be greatly reduced, if not removed, if there existed in the Territory itself facilities which would enable suitable Cameroonians to be trained. For this reason, I would again request the Administering Authority--as has been done on previous occasions by this Council--to take immediate steps to set up a university in the Cameroons.

It has been a matter of some pleasure to my delegation to observe that steps are being taken in the Territory which, we hope, will enable it to enjoy the benefits of independence very soon. If on certain matters we disagree with the interpretations given by the Administering Authority, it is only because of our natural concern for the inhabitants of the Territory, as well as because of our responsibility as a member of this body. However, I should like to assure the representative of France, as well as the special representative, that my delegation is not by any means unappreciative. On the other hand, it is very appreciative indeed of many of the steps which have been taken by the Administering Authority in the political, economic and other fields.

INDIA CAMEROON USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

Date: Mar 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

UNICEF Director's Apology

In a written reply to a question whether it was a fact that the UNICEF's Asian Regional Director in his recent report to the Executive Board of the UNICEF had made certain objectionable and incorrect statements in regard to India's Second Five Year

<Pg-47>

Plan, and if so, what action had been taken by the Government of India in regard thereto, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said in the Lok Sabha on 26 March 1958:

The UNICEF Asian Regional Director in his statement on UNICEF 1957 Programmes in Asia, inter alia, stated that many of the countries such as India had been over-optimistic about their five-year plans and had spent in the early years more money than they could raise by taxes or borrow at home or abroad.

The Indian Representative objected to these remarks being made by an employee of the United Nations about matters which fell clearly within the domestic jurisdiction of India and he requested that these remarks be expunged from the records. After his protest the Asian Regional Directors apologised. And it was decided that his offending remarks, our protest and his apology would not appear in the records.

INDIA

Date: Mar 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

LEBANON

India-Lebanon Air Agreement

An agreement between India and Lebanon for air services, the final draft of which was initialled by the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of Lebanon on Mar 22, 1957 was signed on 13 March 1958 in Delhi.

Shri M. M. Philip, Secretary, Ministry of Transport and Communications (Departments of Communications and Civil Aviation) signed on behalf of the Government of India and His Excellency Halim Abu-Izzeddin, Minister of Lebanon in India, signed on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Lebanon.

Under this Agreement, the airline, designated by the Government of India, will be entitled to touch Lebanon at Beirut, and, if desired, beyond, except points in Egypt. Similarly, the airline designated by the Government of the Republic of Lebanon is entitled to touch India at Bombay and proceed, if desired, beyond.

The agreement is expected to facilitate and promote closer contacts between the peoples of India and of Lebanon and thereby contribute to the furtherance of friendly relations between the two countries.

LEBANON INDIA EGYPT

Date: Mar 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indian Help for University At Kathmandu

The Government of Nepal have so far requested the Government of India for the services of two persons under the Technical Cooperation Scheme of the Colombo Plan. One person asked for is an architect to

advise the Nepal Government on technical points regarding the layout plan and architectural designs for buildings of the proposed University campus. The other is an experienced person, preferably a retired Vice-Chancellor, to advise them on University administration.

Giving this information in reply to a question by Shri Rameshwar Tantia in the Lok Sabha on Mar 20, 1958, the Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri B. R. Bhagat, said that arrangements had been finalised to provide the services of an architect and he was expected to visit Nepal shortly. The Government were taking action to find a suitable person to advice the Nepal Government on University administration, the Deputy Minister added.

<Pg-48>

NEPAL INDIA SRI LANKA USA

Date: Mar 20, 1958

Volume No

1995

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. Walter Nash's Visit

His Excellency the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Walter Nash, paid a visit to India at the invitation of the Government of India in March. Prime Minister Nehru gave a State Banquet in honour of the visiting Prime Minister on Mar 19, 1958. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:

The basic problem today which governs everything else is the problem of peace and security in the world, said Prime Minister Nehru today. The Prime Minister who was speaking at a Banquet given by him in honour of Mr. Walter Nash, Prime Minister of New Zealand, said that today fear was "almost the governing emotion in the world as a whole, fear of one nation of another nation, and because of this fear, armaments pile up and the new discoveries of science are used for the purpose of more and more dangerous armaments".

The Prime Minister of New Zealand said that in the last decade, no country or continent or people had made a greater contribution than India, to the conditions that might make peace possible through the world.

NEW ZEALAND INDIA USA

Date: Mar 19, 1958

Volume No

1995

NEW ZEALAND

Shri Nehru's Speech

Shri Nehru said: We have met here, Sir, to welcome you. You came her yesterday and this welcome banquet is also a farewell bonquet. It is unfortunate because we would hence liked to have you here for a longer period chiefly to benefit from your presence here, and your very friendly and gracious personality and also perhaps for you to see our country a little more and meet our people. However, we are happy to have you here for a variety of reasons, because we are fellow members of the Commonwealth, and have co-operated in many ways and hope to co-operate in the future; because also you come from a country which has achieved much that we wish to achieve. We talk in this country of having a Welfare State. We are very far from that objective and ideal of ours, but you in New Zealand have got a Welfare State where there is no poverty, where every person has amenities, not only the necessities of life, but many other things, and above all, opportunity. I wish every child of India had anywhere near the opportunities that every child in New Zealand has. I hope in time we shall achieve it but it will take hard work and a fairly considerable period of time.

We welcome you also because you are a peaceful, freedom loving community seeking peace not only for yourselves but for the rest of the world. Long ago your forebears went from the old quarrelling world to a new world taking no doubt much of the culture of the old world, but leaving the guarrels behind. And so, you built up in this far off land, far off to us, a new land, a community of free men living in peace and cooperation and developed into a prosperous. welfare state of today. So, we look at your country not only with admiration but perhaps with a little envy also sometimes, I hope you will not mind. We have and you have tremendous problems to face in the world today because even though you might be far off in the southern hemisphere, you are as much tied up to these world problems as we, who live more in this congested central part of the continent. And because we have these common problems we have the opportunities and the urges to cooperate and work together, to help somewhat in their solution. The problems are many and appear to be very difficult, and it would be presumptuous on my part to say that we in India can do very much towards the solution of those problems, but all of us can do a little and perhaps all the little steps that we and your country and other countries can take, may together mount up

to a good deal in the end, and actually influence the course of events. Among all these problems the basic problem today which governs everything else is the problem of peace and security in the world. Today we find fear as almost the governing emotion in the world as a whole, fear of one nation of another nation, and because of this fear, armaments pile up and the new discoveries of science are used for the purpose of more

<Pg-49>

and more dangerous armaments.

It is a curious world we live in when the mind of man has discovered, invented all manner of things and those things have undoubtedly brought great benefits to humanity, but they have also brought great dangers and it is a choice for all of us whether we shall go on getting more and more benefits advancing the human race, or we are unable to control our very discoveries and inventions, and the forces that man has realised and thus suffer destruction. Put boldly, there is only one answer to that question. Who can say that we want destruction? Everybody wants peace and prosperity and the possibility of utilising these great forces for the advantage and progress of humanity. Everybody agrees with that, I have no doubt. And yet here we are caught in this terrible tangle and cannot easily get out of it. But looking at things in a longer perspective, one sees other moments of great crisis in the world's history when people at that time thought that perhaps the end of the world's civilisation had come, and yet man, or humanity, managed to overcome those crises and difficulties and survived and progressed. So I believe, I hope and believe that the present age will also survive and get over the difficulties. But in order to do so, we have to apply ourselves to this task and not wait for some automatic development of destiny and this heavy burden falls on all of us in whatever country we may live. So we work for peace but I have always thought that working for peace means adopting the methods of peace because it seems to me rather odd that we should work for peace thinking of war, preparing for war, ever fearful of war; the two do not fit in.

I am sure that your country, Sir, is devoted to the works of peace, it is a friendly country, and your influence is not counted by the numbers of your population, just as our influence is not counted by the vast numbers of our population. It is the quality of one's thought and action that counts, not the quantity or the numbers.

And so I welcome you. You come from a nation of quality, a people of quality who have advanced in the works of peace, not so much of war and I hope that your country's influence will help in solving these problems together with other countries' influence. And I welcome you also, Sir, in your personal capacity because even in these two days, while you have been with us, we have felt your charm and your wisdom. We would have liked to have you here much more to learn from you and to be charmed even more by you.

I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

NEW ZEALAND USA INDIA

Date: Mar 19, 1958

Volume No

1995

NEW ZEALAND

New Zealand Prime Minister's Reply

Mr. Walter Nash replying said: From the knowledge that I have of the people that belong to this amazing continent, or subcontinent, called India, there is every potential here equal to that which, we have in our part of the world to build a welfare State, were it not for the fact you have 400 millions and we are only 2 1/4 millions--perhaps it is not 200 times as many. But that was not all, Sir. You said you could speak rather lightly of your contribution to the making of peace or to the creation of conditions that make peace more possible. I think I will be speaking my own mind and that of the major number of the people that I represent in New Zealand, If I said that in the last decade, there was no country or continent or people that has made a greater contribution to the conditions that might make peace possible through the world. You mentioned the question of fear; and some lines came to my mind when you said: "Though puny minds may introduce a sectarian strife to play upon man's fetters--fear and hatred. You are marching on, we are marching on." I believe we can eliminate them and again no man in the present century or in the one immediately before made a greater contribution to the evolution of fear and hate and I think that the evolution of these two factors will have more to do with the creation of the conditions of peace than any other factor or two factors. So I come to your country and I have had days and nights like this, tours; If I want, I could not stand any more. I certainly had the privilege to go to the places where you are working, your people are working--the Medical Institute, the magnificent work you do to get the supply of milk to your people in Delhi. I have been to one of your Com-

<Pg-50>

munity Centres, I have been to one of your villages. The enthusiasm and feeling are the factors outside those two points that I mentioned and your country not only has to go a long way, it has gone a long way. I met Your Planning Commission. I found something that was more inspiring to me than most other things that we do. I found that you

have improved not only the quantity of foodstuffs available, but there are more foodstuffs available per capita now than there was seven years ago. I think your major problem is food. It is first, it is second, it is third. You cannot very well, except by men of the type and women of the type that followed Mahatma Gandhi, do without food. We have twice as much as you. Twice as much food does not make twice as good men or women. We have met some of your people down in our country. They are coming out to see the way we live and they have been an inspiration to us, helpful to us by their quiet manner and intellectual outlook and the general willingness to participate in our form of life and to bring some of it insofar as that is constructive back here.

I bring back you a memory of one of our great men, named, Peter Frazer. I don't think you realise what great contribution you made to him and his way of thinking. I believe, I recognised and you recognise that he helped India when the change came in connection with the Commonwealth. I was quoting it tonight at the Institute of World Affairs when he talked of "independence plus"; we don't have only that independence inside the Commonwealth. We have independence that flows; we have independence with a number of others with the same goal and that "independence plus" is probably a great contribution that any individual nation can get by linking out with others of the same mind. I shall say a few words. I must not speak any longer. I have been proud to have been here for a little more than two days. I am going back home. I shall be glad to tell them of your great achievements here, I shall be able to tell them of the spirit of the people that is here, I shall be able to tell about your Parliament, one like our own. Two hours delightful, nobody knows except the Speaker because he had to intervene once or twice. I am sure that with you in the Commonwealth with others in the Commonwealth, we can make this Commonwealth of ours a factor of peace in this world, strong and powerful.

I thank you very much for your reference to my country, I thank you for the kind words you used about myself. I cannot live up to that which you have already achieved, but I have got much from you. I shall try and use that which I have from you beneficially I hope for our Commonwealth.

Last, I want you to accept an invitation to come down our way early. You will be helped by it, but the help you will get will be nothing to correspond with the help you will give. It is much more blessed to give than to receive. I hope you will come soon. Thanks for what you said, thanks for the way you received what the Prime Minister said tonight. I will take your goodwill and your good wishes back to my own country, and the 2 1/4 millions down there, and tell them 400 millions are thinking in the way you spoke tonight.

NEW ZEALAND INDIA USA

Date: Mar 19, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pak Canal Waters Dispute

The Government of India had seen some vague press reports emanating from Karachi regarding rejection by Pakistan of the latest suggestions made by Mr. W. A. B. lliff, Vice President of the World Bank, in connection with the distribution of waters of the Indus System. Government had no other information.

Shri S. K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and Power, made this statement in the Lok Sabha on Mar 23, 1958 in reply to a short-notice question.

<Pg-51>

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA

Date: Mar 23, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Statement on Border Incidents

The following statement on border incidents was made by Prime Minister Nehru in the Lok Sabha on Mar 31, 1958:

A number of Calling Attention notices and Short Notice questions have been tabled in the last few days in connection with the Indo-Pakistan border incident along the Surma river between Cacher district of Assam and Sylhet district of East Pakistan. There was also a motion for Adjournment in regard to this incident on 27th to which you, Sir, after some discussion, declined to give your consent. I fully appreciate the concern felt by the House and I am glad to have this opportunity to make a statement on the nature of the border problem involved, the recent firing and the action taken by the Indian

authorities.

The Indo-Pakistan boundary, according to the Radcliffe Award, runs along the left high bank of the river Surma for a length of about 13 miles between Cacher district of Assam and Sylhet district of East Pakistan. The entire breadth of the river in this region has been under our control since partition. It was in January 1950 that the Government of Pakistan, while dealing with the request from the Government of India to give necessary facilities to the Assam survey and settlement staff to go across to the left bank of the river in connection with settlement operations in the Cacher district, raised the question that the mid-stream of the river should be the Indo-Pakistan boundary. There have been exchanges of notes in this connection and there has been no reply from the Government of Pakistan to our last note dated 3rd March 1956, which established beyond doubt that, under the Radcliffe award, the Indo-Pakistan boundary in this region runs along the left high bank of the river Surma.

Throughout the last few years, Pakistani citizens, encouraged and, in some cases, assisted by Pakistani local authorities in the area, have been attempting to contest Government of India's sovereignty over the entire breadth of the river up to the left bank, particularly by attempting cultivation of Char lands alongside the left bank of the river. Indian authorities have in each case protested against these attempted violations of Indian territory and, when necessary, fired in self-defence. Incidents similar to the recent one occurred in November-December 1954, February 1956, November 1956 and October 1957. In all these incidents, Indian authorities acted promptly to protect our sovereign rights in the area. Pakistani cultivators encouraged or supported by local Pakistani authorities take advantage of the continuous land connection with Pakistani territory and attempt to raise crops on the char lands in the river bed. Our local authorities, therefore, have to take necessary remedial action by protests and, when necessary, by firing in self-defence to contain these attempted violations of our territory.

The recent incident started on 11th March when Pakistani nationals supported by Pakistani armed forces personnel attempted to harvest crops planted illegally by them in the Char lands in the Surma river. When the Indian police patrol protested, they were fired upon and had to return the fire in self-defence. The unprovoked firing later spread from the Rangpur-Leverputa area to Harinagar, Bhanga, Mahisasan, Barpunji, Latu and Madanpur areas between 11th and 27th March despite a cease-fire agreement arrived at on 21st March. Throughout this period, the District Magistrate of Cacher who had kept in constant touch with his Pakistani counter-part, the District Magistrate of Sylhet, sent several protests against the firing and gave strict instructions to our police personnel not to fire except strictly in self-defence. The Assam Government also sent five protests to the East Pakistan Government at Dacca on 12th, 19th, 20th, 21st and 26th March. Our latest information is that a second cease-fire has been arrived at on 27th and firing has completely

stopped in this region since the afternoon of 27th March.

Demarcation of the Indo-East Pakistan boundary of 2480 miles has been going on since 1950. 1017 miles out of a total of 1350 miles of the West Bengal--East Pakistan border have been demarcated. 200 miles out of a total of 609 miles of the boundary between Assam and East Pakistan have been demarcated. Little progress has been made on the demarcation of the boundary between East Pakistan and Tripura. The House will appreciate that demarcation of land boundaries

<Pg-52>

is a complex and laborious process involving agreement on each yard of the boundary, which is determined from revenue records, maps and ground surveys. This process is difficult even in normal disputes between villages regarding their land boundaries. It is more difficult when inter-state boundaries even within Indian territory are involved. It is still more complicated by the nature of the terrain between Assam and East Pakistan, particularly when it is realised that this is a joint operation between the two sovereign Governments of India and Pakistan, relations between whom, for various reasons, have, throughout the last 11 years, been extremely difficult. We are going ahead with the demarcation of the boundary as best as we can but the pace of demarcation is not a matter entirely within our control.

Incidents of this type are unavoidable while the frontier remains undemarcated. We have always been anxious to settle all differences, including differences regarding boundary between India and Pakistan, by negotiation but we cannot surrender rightful territorial claims merely because the other side makes a show of force. At the same time, we are averse to taking any hasty or ill-considered action which would unnecessarily worsen Indo-Pakistan relations further and give rise to graver problems. Our local authorities have acted with firmness and circumspection and there has been no loss of life despite repeated firing between the llth and 27th of March.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date**: Mar 31, 1958

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Rumanian Prime Minister's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency the Prime Minister of Rumania, Mr. Chivu Stoica, paid a visit to India in March. Prime Minister Nehru gave a State Banquet in honour of the visiting Prime Minister on Mar 08, 1958. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:

Speaking at a State Banquet given tonight in honour of Mr. Chivu Stoica, Prime Minister of the Rumanian People's Republic, the Prime Minister stated that in spite of the great difficulties and dangers that confronted people in the international sphere, the world is slowly moving towards peace. The people realised that there was no alternative. The Prime Minister emphasised that merely to try to drift towards a lessening of tensions was not enough. "We have to help the process in many ways, above all in the minds of men."

The Rumanian Prime Minister expressed his appreciation of India's struggle to promote peaceful coexistence among States and secure lasting peace.

Prime Minister Nehru said: Nearly two years ago, our Vice-President visited Rumania and received a warm welcome there and now you, Sir, have come here as our welcome guest with your colleagues who are all welcome and thus we have in the present age put a seal to our cooperation and friendship. I do not know very much about past contacts between India and Rumania. I believe that in fairly ancient times there were contacts of trade and the like and I am told that the main routes from Asia, from India across Western Asia led through Rumania and to other parts of Europe. Anyhow, for a long period there were no marked contacts because many barriers came in their way. For hundreds of years we were rather cut off and presumably you also suffered some kind of barriers. Anyhow, in the new age, we are developing these contacts and not only reviving old friendships but making new friends, and we are happy to count you among our friends with whom we can cooperate in so many matters. During this long period of the past we have had a different course; we have been conditioned in different ways and inevitably we have done many things in a different way. Even now we may differ in some matters, but I believe there are far more things in common between us and in other countries than differences. We are engaged and you are engaged in building up our countries, and our old countries have become new in a way. Ours is a new Republic although an ancient country, and we are engrossed in the task of building

<Pg-53>

up this new India and of serving our people and trying to raise their standards. You have been engaged in that task also in your country. I believe that there are many profitable ways in which we can cooperate to our mutual advantage. I am grateful to you and your Government for the cooperation they have given us in the exploration and exploitation of oil in this country. I am sure this will lead to other avenues of cooperation. But apart from these contacts, economic and cultural, there is one matter which affects you and us, and I

believe people in every country in the world, and that is the question of peace. In this world of ours it seems to hover always on the verge of conflict. In that matter I am quite sure that our passionate desire for peace is reflected in your minds too. I believe also that in spite of the great difficulties and dangers that confront us in the international sphere, the world is moving slowly towards peace. The people of the world are realising that there is no alternative and merely to remain on the verge of war is not a state of affairs which any reasonable person can like. But still it is not enough for us merely to drift or try to drift towards a lessening of tensions. We have to try to do our best to help that process, to help it in many ways, above all in the minds of men. Even today the great urge for peace in the world comes no doubt from Governments too but in the main it comes from the people and sometimes Governments lag behind their peoples' urges. Problems are very difficult and we can hardly expect to solve them in some magic way because they are rooted in peoples' fear, distrust and apprehensions. It will not be easy to remove these fears, but I believe that every step taken helps in the process and makes the next step easier. There is the tremendous danger today of atomic warfare. We have been long of opinion that one of the first steps should be in restricting this finally putting an end to it, and putting an end to what are called test explosions, nuclear explosions

and leading up to the abandonment of the manufacture of these nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Also perhaps step by step we may go in enlarging the area in the world which is supposed to be uncommitted in the military sense and sometimes it is called, rather wrongly, a neutral area--an area which is armed to the teeth preparing for war but which wants to discard war as a policy to be pursued. There have been various proposals and suggestions in recent times to enlarge this area. It is true that a mere enlargement of that area does not solve the problems that confront us but every progressive step makes that problem a little easier of solution. If, on the other hand, there is no such area and all the nations of the world stood in serried armed ranks facing each other, the position would be terrible indeed. Therefore, if we cannot do very much positively we in India because we have no strength of arms nor have we any other way of influencing other countries by our wealth or might, but we have at least this negative way of avoiding military commitments, keeping out of military pacts and trying in all humility to serve the cause of peace. We believe that at any time, and more particularly today, an attempt by force to impress one's will over another country is bad and indeed is bound to fail. We cannot ultimately change the minds of men by force and so we believe in peaceful coexistence of countries even though they differ in their political or economic structure. You will remember, Sir, those five principles that are sometimes known as the Panch Sheel principles of peaceful co-existence when no country commits aggression on another or even interferes in its internal affairs and each country and each people evolve according to their own genius in friendship for others, thus influencing each other not through military might or ways of coercion and compulsion but by friendship and cooperation. We do not know what success we can have in this task but we do know that if large numbers of people all over

the world think

that way, the path of all of us will become easier and we pledge ourselves to cooperate with every country which seeks peace and strives for peace and strives for peace, if I may say so with all respect through peaceful ways and peaceful words and peaceful actions.

And so we welcome you here today both as firmly establishing our cooperation in many fields and also as fellow travellers on the way to peace. I hope that when you go back from here you and your colleagues will carry with you the goodwill of our Government and people for the people of Rumania.

Excellencies may I request you to drink to the good health of the Prime Minister of Rumania.

<Pg-54>

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Mar 08, 1958

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Mr. Stoica's Speech

Replying Mr. Stoica said: Being here with you, foremost leaders of India and representatives of public life, may we be allowed to express heartiest thanks for the cordial welcome extended to us in the beautiful capital of your country.

The friendly words addressed to us, the talks we have had with representatives of the Indian people, the courteous attention lavished on us all the time, express the feelings of warm friendship of the Indian people towards the Rumanian people. I can assure you that these feelings are reciprocal and that the great Indian people has, and will have, in our people a steadfast friend.

The progress that is being achieved by India in its economic and cultural development is followed with the utmost interest and sympathy in the Rumanian People's Republic. In our country we also well know and highly appreciate the consistent struggle carried on by India to bring about a peaceful settlement of litigious international problems, to promote peaceful coexistence among States, to secure a lasting peace so much longed for by all the peoples.

I propose a toast to His Excellency the Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, to the Government of the Republic of India, to the industrious and gifted Indian people, to the friendship between Rumania and India, to understanding, friendship and peace among peoples.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Mar 08, 1958

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Nehru-Stoica Joint Statement

At the conclusion of the Rumanian Prime Minister's visit the following Joint Statement was issued:

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. Chivu Stoica, the Prime Minister of the Rumanian People's Republic, accompanied by the Vice-President of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Emil Bodnaras, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Avram Bunaciu, paid a visit to India. They had frank and friendly discussions with the Prime Minister of india in regard to the present world situation, as well as on matters of mutual interest, to further promote and strengthen co-operation between the two countries in economic and cultural matters.

The Prime Ministers agreed that the present international situation is still full of danger to peace and to the progress of mankind. While it is essential, therefore, that a practical approach should be made to important international problems, such as Disarmament, it is equally essential that the unfortunate lack of trust among nations, which comes in the way of peaceful co-existence among them, should be removed. A reduction in international tension would release energies and resources for fruitful endeavours in the service of mankind. The resolution passed unanimously by the United Nations on Dec 14, 1957 namely "Declaration concerning the Peaceful Co-existence of States" provides a basis for a fresh approach to the solution of international problems.

The Prime Ministers welcome the proposals for a high level meeting which have already met with a large measure of support all over the world. They trust that effective steps will be taken in preparation for such a meeting. Any progress towards disarmament and the

lessening of world tensions will help other steps and further progress in disarmament.

The Prime Minister reviewed the more important international problems in difficult regions of the world. They agreed that these problems can only be satisfactorily solved by a peaceful approach and negotiations and without interference with the independence and sovereignty of nations.

The Prime Ministers express their firm conviction that the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions can be a first and specific step that should be taken immediately. Such a cessation is in any case essential to prevent further dangers to present and future generations of mankind. This would also lead to further steps for the elimination of the possibilities of the destructive use of nuclear energy and to disarmament.

The Prime Ministers express the hope that in their activities and statements, political leaders will keep in view the aim of creating an atmosphere of peace and trust.

The Prime Ministers reaffirm their

<Pg-55>

sympathy with and support of peoples in their struggle against colonialism and to win or consolidate their independence. They recognise the great importance of assistance for economic development to under-developed countries through the United Nations, and also by bilateral relations between countries for the same purpose.

The Prime Ministers reiterate their faith in the importance of the development of economic co-operation among States on the basis of equality, mutual advantage and respect for each other's economic and political independence.

The Prime Ministers reaffirm their determination to pursue their endeavours to ensure that the People's Republic of China takes its rightful place in the United Nations. They welcome the withdrawal of the Chinese volunteers from North Korea.

The Prime Ministers welcome the growing co-operation between their countries in economic and cultural matters. The Prime Minister of India expressed his Government's appreciation of the assistance given by the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic, more particularly in regard to the development of the oil industry in India.

The Prime Minister of the Rumanian People's Republic, on behalf of the Rumanian Government, expressed his gratification at the friendly reception given to him and his colleagues in India, and stated that his Government and the people of Rumania would welcome a visit to their country by the Prime Minister of India. The Prime Ministers expressed their satisfaction at the opportunity of personal discussion of various problems of common interest, provided by the present visit of the Prime Minister of the Rumanian People's Republic and his colleagues to India. This has helped to promote and strengthen the friendly relations that exist between their countries and also to serve the cause of world peace and cooperation.

USA INDIA CHINA KOREA NORTH KOREA

Date: Dec 14, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Payment Arrangements Between India and Egyptian Region of U.A.R.

Matters of common interest concerning trade and commercial payments between the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic and India were reviewed in friendly discussions which took place between the officials of the Government of India led by Shri K. B. Lall and the Egyptian Trade Delegation led by Dr. M. B. Chiati on Mar 25, 1958 at Delhi.

This review has been made in the context of the foreign exchange difficulties of the two countries and in the light of the latest foreign exchange regulations promulgated by the Egyptian Government.

It has been agreed that so long as the current foreign exchange regulations remain in force in Egypt, contracts for import of tea and jute goods from India and export of cotton to India, will, as an exception to the rupee payment arrangements stipulated in the agreement of 8 March 1957, be made in terms of Egyptian pounds.

The State Bank of India will open with the National Bank of Egypt an export account in Egyptian pounds to provide banking facilities to Indian exporters of tea and jute goods and to Indian importers of Egyptian cotton.

Export and import of goods, other than tea, jute goods and cotton, will continue to be paid for in Indian rupees.

<Pg-56>

Date: Mar 25, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

U. K. Investments In India

Foreign business investments in India from the United Kingdom were o the order of Rs. 391.99 crores on Mar 31, 1955 compared to Rs. 347.28 crores on 31 December 1953 and Rs. 209.95 crores on 30 June 1948.

This information was given in the Lok Sabha on 25 March 1958 by Shri B. R. Bhagat, Deputy Minister for Finance, in a written reply to Shri D.C. Sharma.

The Deputy Minister added that figures relating to such investments were collected only periodically and not annually. Hence figures for each year or for later years were not available.

INDIA USA

Date: Mar 31, 1955

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Utilization of U.S. Credit to India

The following communique was issued by the Government of India on Mar 04, 1958 on U.S. credit to India:

A Delegation from the Government of India led by Shri B. K. Nehru has had discussions during the last four weeks with the authorities of the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Development Loan Fund in Washington. As a result, letters of commitment were exchanged on Tuesday, the 4 March 1958, at Washington, between Shri B. K. Nehru

and Mr. Samuel Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank and Mr. Dempster Macintosh representing the Development Loan Fund.

A credit of 150 million dollars from the Export-Import Bank will be utilised for the procurement in the United States of capital equipment machinery and services needed by India in the next 12 months for the following programmes: Irrigation and Reclamation, Power, Transport and Communications, Mining and certain selected industries like textiles, chemical industries, the fabrication of heavy structurals and electrical equipment and machine tools. Payments made in the United States after the 28 February for goods under these programmes will be eligible to be paid from this credit. The credit will bear interest at 5-1|4 and the term will be 15 years; repayment of principal will, however, start only on 15 January 1964.

A credit of 75 million dollars from the Development Loan Fund will be utilised for the purchase of components for the manufacture of trucks, buses and jeeps needed for India's road transport development, purchase of structural steel and other steel products required by Indian railways and for the purchase of machinery for India's jute and cement industries. Repayment will start on 15 March 1959 and can be in rupees. The credit in respect of railway purchases will bear interest at 3-1|2 per cent and will be repaid in 40 semi-annual instalments, the other credits will bear interest at 5-1/4 per cent and will be discharged in 30 semi-annual instalments.

Both the credits will be from the respective institutions to the Government of India; hence purchasers in India both in the public and in the private sectors will have to follow the normal procedure for negotiation of purchases etc. It is intended that the Government of India should later reimburse itself from these two institutions for the foreign exchange expenditure involved in such purchases.

To study the details of administrative arrangements in India for import licensing and for payments of foreign exchange and to acquaint themselves with various aspects of Indian economy, a five-man Mission led by Mr. Hawthorne Arey, Director of the Export-Import Bank is arriving in India on Friday the 7 March 1958. Other members of the Mission are--

(a) from Export-Import Bank--Mr.

<Pg-57>

Raymond L. Jones, Mr. Charles E. Houston, Mr. Robert L. Moorman, and

(b) from Development Loan Fund--Mr. Edward S. Lynch. They are expected to be in india for three weeks during which time they will hold discussions with the officials concerned in New Delhi and will later tour areas of the country.

Date: Mar 04, 1958

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Outstanding Payment For Rourkela Plant

Shri K. D. Malaviya, Minister for Mines and Oil, made the following statement in clarification of answers which he had given in reply to certain supplementaries to a question No. 764 on Mar 08, 1958 about the postponement of outstanding payments for the Rourkela Steel Plant:--

The agreement is in respect of the payments outstanding to West German firms, for the supply of plant and equipment to the Rourkela steel plant. It is between Government of India and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. Under this agreement, the Government of India have to deliver to the German firms concerned, in lieu of payments in actual Deutsche Marks, promissory notes expressed in Deutsche Marks and maturing three years after the date the payments fall due. The German firms will be entitled to negotiate the promissory notes in the Federal Republic of Germany. In other words, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will ensure that the firms are able to get paid by negotiating the promissory notes. On the dates when the promissory notes mature, they will be handed over to the Government of India and in return the Government of India will pay the face value, in Deutsche Marks.

<Pg-58>

GERMANY INDIA

Date: Mar 08, 1958

April

Volume No

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record	
1958	
April	
Volume IV No. 4	
CONTENTS	
AID FROM INDIA TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES Loans due from Foreign Countries 59	
ATOMIC ENERGY Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha 59 Prime Minister's Reply 63	
ETHIOPIA First Trade Agreement Signed 65	
FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN INDIA Statement in Parliament	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Arthur Lall's Letter to the Security Council 65	
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha 66	
Prime Minister's Reply 75	
PAKISTAN Canal Water Dispute Talks 79 Movable Property Agreement 79 Nehru's Statement on Pakistan's Letter to Security Council 80 Nehru's Statement on Border Incidents 81 Pakistan Government's Reply 82	
RUMANIA Offer to Set Up Oil Refinery 82	
SAUDI ARABIA Joint Communique on Trade and Economic Relations 82	
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC U.A.R. Admitted to Asian Legal Consultative Committee 83	

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid for Health Projects 83 Technical Assistance 84

YUGOSLAVIA

Trade Agreement Extended 85

<Pg-i>

INDIA ETHIOPIA PAKISTAN SAUDI ARABIA USA YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Apr 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

AID FROM INDIA TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Loans Due From Foreign Countries

The Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, told in the Lok Sabha on Apr 01, 1958 April 1958 during Question Hour, that India had advanced to Burma and Indonesia loans amounting to Rs. 150,000,000 and-Rs 50,000 respectively. The loan to Burma was repayable in 24 equal half-yearly instalments starting from 1 April 1960. The terms of repayment of loan by Indonesia, Shri Morarji Desai said, had not yet been settled.

The Finance Minister added that the Government of India had also loaned 3,100 tons of rice to Nepal to be repaid in kind.

INDIA BURMA INDONESIA NEPAL

Date: Apr 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

ATOMIC ENERGY

Nehru's Speech in Parliament

Initiating a debate on the demands for grants for the Department of Atomic Energy in the Lok Sabha, Prime Minister Nehru said on Apr 10, 1958

I have been the Minister in charge of this Department of Atomic Energy for some years and I have tried to understand and follow its development. But as a layman, I cannot pretend to know much about the scientific side of it or about the highly complicated and intricate work that is being done in connection with it. I see from the numerous cut motions that some Hon. Members have tabled numerous proposals and suggestions which presumably flow from some intimate knowledge of atomic energy and how it should be worked. I confess I cannot meet them at this particular level of personal knowledge and have to rely, therefore, on scientific colleagues and advisers.

Fortunately, we have some very eminent scientists connected with our atomic energy establishment, and they have done good work and shown good results which have attracted attention in other parts of the world. Anyhow, I welcome the great interest taken by the Hon. Members in this development of atomic energy in this country.

It is many years ago when we first formed the Atomic Energy Department. Before that it was called something else--because we realised even at that early stage the importance of this. Normally speaking, the development of atomic energy has taken place in the countries which are industrially advanced. They have the resources for it. It is somewhat unusual for a country like India which is on the threshold of industrial advance, and is struggling to bring about what might be called the industrial revolution here, which took place a hundred or more years ago elsewhere--it is rather unusual for a country in this position to launch out into an atomic energy programme. We did so not because we wanted to show off--that we have got something big, but because of the definite realisation that this was of the highest importance, looking at the future. We were on the threshold of the atomic age in the world. For us, this had overlapped, if I may say so, with our being on the threshold of the industrial age in India. But it is impossible for us to go through the slow processes of the industrial age, having arrived at somewhere far behind, while the other countries have gone on to the atomic age. So, we thought that we must give thought to this matter.

Fortunately, we had able nuclear scientists. Otherwise we could not have done it. It is not a question of money. Money is the least part of it. Indeed in anything worthwhile that has been done in the country, let us remember that, though money is important, it is of the least importance compared to trained men. That is the real thing. It is they who produce things and money.

But there was another aspect of this question which led us to think in terms of atomic energy development and this was the question of power supply. It is well known that you can almost judge of a country's progress by seeing how much power it produced and consumed. Our sources of power, thermal, and hydro-electric are there, of course, but the principal source of power in India still continues to be cow dung. It is well to remember this. People do not realise it. I forget the exact figure but probably 80 per cent of the power--or maybe, more--used in India comes from cow dung. That is of course the primitive state of our economy.

The other day, my colleague who was then the Minister of Irrigation and Power spoke about the untapped sources of power in India. Of course there are untapped sources, very big sources. But I think he was somewhat optimistic about those untapped sources. Not that he was not justified in being optimistic. You can take either view.

For instance, one source was the river Brahamaputra, more especially at the place where it takes the turn to India from Tibet. It is a potential source of enormous power.

But in order to reach that turn of the Brahmaputra there, it would require enormous efforts on our part. It is relatively easier perhaps for the Tibetan authorities and the Chinese Government to reach there: it is more in their territories than ours. Anyhow, it is difficult to get there and having got there, it is difficult to get out the power that you produce there.

But apart from that, the normal calculations about the coal and hydro-electric power depend upon how much we use and at what rate we consume. For instance, if we consume this power at the present rate which is of course a very low rate, it may last us 200 or 300 years or more. But if we consume at the rate of the U.S.A. today, then all the potential power will last us 30 years and not more--may be 35 or 40 years. Of course we are not going to consume at the rate at which the U.S.A. consumes because we cannot. We may arrive at some middle figure between this and that.

But the point is that we have not got inexhaustible supplies of power in India and that was one reason among many others which forced us to consider the possibility of using atomic energy in future as power for civil purposes.

This was mentioned for the first time, I think, by the Chairman of our Commission, Dr. Bhabha, who has been speaking at some length about this subject. He spoke, I think, last year at Dublin at the British Association meeting too, Working out the figures. People are somewhat doubtful and credulous about the feasibility, about the economic aspect of it. He showed even then, that in places far removed from the coal fields or the places where hydro-electric power is produced, this was a feasible proposition. It was not feasible in the economic sense right in the coal field because coal was cheap there.

But ever since he made that calculation, other developments are taking place, which indicate the probability of this power being produced from atomic energy in a cheaper way, and it seems now quite a feasible proposition in most places. I have no doubt that further advances will make it more feasible still.

In a country like India whose power sources are very limited at the present moment, it is of the highest importance to get something like that. The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is far more important for India than, let us say, for the United States of America, because they have got tremendous other sources of power, and cheap power. So, not only for the obvious reason that we are on the new source of energy which is going, probably, to transform world conditions in the future, and therefore we should know about it,--not know it by reading text books from other countries, but we ourselves, our scientists, discoverers and research workers should know about it; that is important--but, apart from this, it is important because we hunger for more power in this country. Hon. Members are making demands for electricity there and electricity here, which are completely legitimate and understandable. You can really measure the advance of any part of the country by the electric power available there. Because of that too, and looking into the future we thought it desirable to carry this work on.

What is this atomic power? This is a part of nuclear physics. Nuclear physics is and should be a part of the basic training in physics in any university. But, if we want every university in India to take up this atomic energy work in detail, well, they just

<Pg-60>

have not got the equipment or the personnel, and we will spread out our very limited resources in trained men as well as equipment, with the result that there will be no result at all--just spread out fine lectures delivered here and there. Therefore, we have to concentrate our available talent, our available equipment which is exceedingly expensive etc.,--these reactors--in this Atomic Energy Establishment that We have got, expecting that the universities will do a good job of work in teaching nuclear physics and thus supply people from there to these specialised agencies of the Atomic Energy Establishment, where they can do higher work, and that specialised agency again supplying their trained men for work in the universities, for teaching work and the rest.

I am laying stress on this because, first of all, it is very important that our universities should have up-to-date teaching and equipment for nuclear physics. That is the basis out of which every other thing will come. And, they have not got it today. They are ambitious--some of them--and want to do atomic energy work. I like their ambition, but they have not got the facilities for it. They make demands on the Atomic Energy Commission: "Give us this equipment; give us that; give us lakhs and lakhs of money". I want to make it clear that we cannot, financially or in terms of personnel,

spread ourselves all over India in regard to higher atomic energy work. But what we do is for special research projects. The Department gives money and, may be, supplies some equipment too if necessary.

So far as the study of nuclear physics is concerned, which we should like all universities in India to have in an adequate degree, that is not the function of the Atomic Energy Department as such. The University Grants Commission should look into it and do it. We must not get mixed up in the two, because that may mean lack of success at both ends.

Now, in this Atomic Energy Establishment, may I say--of course, it does not need saying, perhaps, but I should like to repeat it--that we are not in the slightest interested in atomic bombs and the like, except in so far as we wish to avoid them and not be targets for them. Anyhow all our work on atomic energy is for peaceful use.

We have drawn up some kind of a long range plan, which is not complete, in regard to the development of atomic energy. Even during the last year the programme has expanded rapidly. The scientific and technical staff of the Atomic Energy Establishment, which is the heart of the research and development activities of the Department, now exceeds 600. A year ago it was 320. These figures only include graduate scientists and engineers and those with higher qualifications. It is expected that this number will increase by another 300 during the current year—that is, it will come to 900 senior scientists.

To feed this recruitment, the Department has started a training programme from last August, admission to which was made after a very rigorous selection by interview. The total number of applicants exceeded 7,000. Of these, 1,400 were called for interview, and over 1,100 actually appeared. The number selected was about 200 of whom about 176 will finish their course. These trainees are given not only courses in basic physics, chemistry and mathematics to fit them for the more advanced courses which come later in the year, there are tutorial classes for small groups of students. This training is necessary cheifly because the training received in the universities was found not to be adequate, and it is our desire that the preliminary training should be made adequate in every university, instead of some universities having inadequate training there and wanting to do some direct atomic energy work also, which also will necessarily be inadequate.

Now, so far as the scientific work of the Trombay Establishment is concerned, this has also increased in breadth, variety and intensity. Our first reactor, the House may remember, is called Apsara--the Water Nymph.

It is a suitable name because it is called, I think, "Water Cooled Reactor". This Apsara reached criticality, as the phrase goes, for the first time on 4 August 1956. It was worked at very low power levels till the end of January, 1957, so as to cheek its operations.

Since then its utilization has increased rapidly. Demands on the use of the reactor become so great that it is worked on two shifts a day, and it is expected shortly to go into three shifts--operation. Requests for irradiation of biological specimens and radio

<Pg-61>

isotopes from various centres in India have been met to a large extent, and an Isotope Division has been established for which special facilities are under construction. This is, expected to produce radio-active iodine, radio-active phosphorus and certain other isotopes required for biological and medical investigations. When the Canada-India reactor goes into operation, the full range of radio-active isotopes including radio cobalt will be produced. A new radio chemistry laboratory has been constructed which is designed to deal with radio-active substances like plutonium and the fission products. Some of these substances like plutonium are so toxic that a maximum permissible dose for ingestion into the system is much less than ten-millionth part of a gram. More of it will be dangerous. Therefore, extremely drastic precautions have to be taken in handling such substances. Most of the work with plutonium is done in glove boxes which are now being made at Trombay. These glove boxes--the hands never touch them. The gloves are inside and manipulated by hands from outside.

This work with radio-active substances requires a constant watch to ensure that the workers are not exposed to dangerous radiation levels. All the necessary instruments for health protection are now being, made by the Health Physics Instrumentation Division. Indeed, most of the electronic instrumentation used in the Trombay Establishment or the Atomic Minerals Division is now made in the Establishment, especially in the Electronics instruments Section. This saves us good deal of foreign exchange.

The Health Physics Section has organised a Film Badge Service for the workers not only in Trombay but elsewhere in India. Each person wears a film badge and this film in the badge is processed weekly and a record kept of the radiation dose received by each worker. This service is available to hospitals in the country where radium and X-rays are used at a nominal charge and it is being availed of by a large number of hospitals and other institutions not connected with atomic energy.

Now, the construction of the Canada-India reactor made progress during the year though difficulties were encountered with the steel shell. The top of the steel shell is s hemisphere, some 150 feet in diameter, and is one of the largest containment vessels in the world. It is now expected that the Canada-India reactor will be ready towards the end of 1959. When this reactor goes into operation, India will possess one of the best isotope producers in the world, with which it will be possible to produce all neutron-induced isotopes including radio cobalt.

A storage block for the used fuel elements is being designed so that the intense radiation emitted by them can be used for studies on the effects of radiation on the preservation of food and other biological experiments. Studies are also being made on the use of radiation of killing weevils, insects and other organisms which lead to the destruction of foodgrains in storage. The construction of the uranium plant for producing uranium metal of atomic purity was undertaken during the current year, and the building is nearly complete. A laboratory plant for converting this uranium metal into fuel elements for the Canada-India reactor and other natural uranium reactors is also under construction at Trombay. This will have the necessary facilities for canning the fuel elements in aluminium cans and other minerals such as beryllium and zirconium. The Department is in close touch with, and carefully follows, all developments in this rapidly advancing field all over the world.

The scientific personnel of the Department have attended scientific conferences, visited laboratories and atomic installations and established contacts with scientists in other countries. The Department has friendly co-operation with similar organisations in all those countries which are most advanced in this field. A number of distinguished scientists and mathematicians from Canada, France, Japan, Poland, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Yugoslavia and other countries have spent varying periods at the Trombay Establishment and the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, attending seminars and giving lectures.

The House knows that we propose to produce our own heavy water to begin with, in connection with the fertiliser plant at Nangal. Sometime ago I made a statement in the House in regard to the constitution of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has been

<Pg-62>

constituted by a resolution of the Government of India. About two years and a half ago, in August, 1955, there was the first great conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Geneva. It was rather a remarkable, conference on this new subject and a very successful one. It was presided over by our own eminent scientist, Dr. Bhabha. Now, a second conference is going to take place in September this year at Geneva Meanwhile, the International Atomic Energy Agency has been established. This came into force in July 1957. There are 62 member-states in it. The first general conference of the Agency was held in Vienna in October 1957.

This, Sir, is an attempt to give an account to the House of the various activities we are indulging in. It is difficult for me, and perhaps for the House also, to go into the details of this intricate business, but I hope that what I have said and the pamphlet we have placed before the Hon. Members of the House will give them a broad idea of our activities.

Date: Apr 10, 1958

Volume No

1995

ATOMIC ENERGY

Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the debate on demands for grants for the Department of Atomic Energy, the Prime Minister said:--

Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to reply in brief to the points raised. The last speaker made a suggestion that there should be a separate Ministry for Nuclear Research, so that decisions may be taken quickly an at a higher level. Broadly speaking, I do not know any higher level here than Government and the Prime Minister and I do not know how the creation of a Ministry would expedite any decision or make working more easy. As a matter of fact, it was with this very purpose, that the work of this Atomic Energy Department should not get tied up in the normal routine of Government, that the Prime Minister here, and sometimes in other countries also, has directly taken charge of this. So, I can assure Shri Bharucha that whatever other failings may be there in this Department, it does not suffer, as other Ministries often suffer, from delay. Things are done pretty fast.

Secondly, one member laid great stress on not wasting our energy on collecting useless knowledge or on experimenting about all manner of things, but said that we should rather concentrate on special objects of enquiry which might prove useful.

To begin with, we do necessarily concentrate; we cannot help it. But, when Shri Bharucha refers to useless knowledge, I think, he is on some dangerous ground. There is always the same argument usually between scientists and non-scientists, industrialists and others as to what is useless knowledge and what is not, what is pure science and what is applied science. Everything in applied science would normally come out with some research in pure science. You cannot divide these. Anyhow the fact is that we do concentrate on specific things.

But some of the matters he referred to are research in biology or medicine or other things. That type of research is not primarily the work of the Atomic Energy Department. The Atomic Energy Department produces the isotopes, equipment etc. for it. And, this research should take place in a hundred establishments in India wherever it can be, in hospitals, in agricultural institutions etc. So, that is the place.

I entirely agree with Shri Bharucha that a tremendous field for research is oppn and should take place. The Atomic Energy Department will help in supplying the isotopes and the equipment which they are making. But, I may add that in addition to this, although it is not in a sense the primary work of the Atomic Energy Establishments, as a matter of fact, they do research work in these very fields which the member mentioned, whether it is agriculture or biology. They do it and they will continue to do the same but they cannot spread themselves out over all this. It should really be done by a host of people all over the country in other establishments. Now someone asked about the Government taking a policy decision about the construction of power station. In a sense, the Government has taken a policy decision but it is naturally subject to two or three factors: the feasibility of it and the finances. It is not that we shall do this on this particular date. We have taken this decision and we intend to do it and will certainly do it.

<Pg-63>

The exact date, the location, the feasibility have all to be considered in terms of other factors.

Another member warned us about the disposal of waste. I want to assure her that so far as Trombay is concerned, there is no waste of that type. The criteria laid down for the future are so strict that I am informed that there will not be the slightest risk. Indeed one tends rather to take extra measures of safety. I am told that the water that comes out of this after all this is so treated that it is, broadly speaking, less radio active than the normal amount of radio activity in the water we drink. The amount of precautions taken is very great indeed. It is said that the workers engaged in nuclear research work and such other industries are better protected than probably in any other industry in the world.

One of the Hon. Members said something about the scholarships. No doubt, the Atomic Energy Establishment is thinking of providing scholarships for nuclear engineering at the Roorkee University. This might be done elsewhere too later on.

We have at present in Trombay a group working on the design of a power reactor of 10-20MW with beryllium oxide as a moderator. We are also considering making a strong effort on research for fusion reaction. We have not quite started on it, but this will depend on a number of factors and if we feel that from researches on this we are likely to get fruitful results, we may take it up.

Then there were many suggestions made about consulting others. Our Atomic Energy Establishment is connected, or its chief scientists are connected, with a large number of establishments in India. There are

many liaison committees and the like. They are connected with the universities. I shall certainly be happy if this connection grows.

An Hon. Member suggested, I think, some kind of a Committee of Members of Parliament. Well, I am not myself quite sure of what a Committee of Members of Parliament as such will do in this matter. But I can assure the House that any Member of Parliament who wants to discuss this matter alone or in a group can certainly do so. We shall be very happy to arrange for this whenever an occasion offers.

Secondly, a complaint has been made that enough information has not been supplied. It is rather difficult to know what type of information might be supplied. I may inform the House that Dr. Bhabha and I were discussing this very subject as to what should be put in this pamphlet for the House. We had to draw the line somewhere, in the sense that it should not be too technical. Some Hon. Members of the House may certainly understand all the technical implications but it was not meant for an isolated Member but for every one. I told Dr. Bhabha: "Please do not make it too technical. Otherwise it will be above the knowledge of many Members." It is not because one wants to keep anything secret. There is no secret about it so far as we are concerned. But there is the difficulty about the technical aspect. Anyhow, I shall be very happy to provide any kind of information that is in our power.

Something was said about the production having gone down in the plants in Kerala. Apart from the fact that the previous production was of all the three plants, the third plant is still not functioning. There has been much difficulty because of this. A bit of the old Madras State went to Kerala and that bit of the old Madras State had one of these plants. Even now, after a year's effort, there is no full agreement between Madras Government, the Kerala Government and the Atomic Energy Establishment about the new set-up, as to who should provide the additional director and what should be the shares of each Government. I think that we are now on our way to an agreement. Dr. Bhabha visited Trivandrum for this purpose. So, this has created some difficulties in setting down I believe that sometime in the past there was also a strike which made a difference.

Previously it was in the old Travancore-Cochin State. One part having gone to Madras, that Government naturally wants its own share in this thing, in the directorate and in the finances.

There is one thing more which I may mention. The recent developments have shown the cost of producing power. I am informed that in view of these developments, it is expected that the cost of power from atomic stations would be round about 2.6 nP per unit of electricity, which, I believe, is much lower than the cost of generation of electricity from thermal stations in most

<Pg-64>

parts of India not near the coal fields. If we are to take part in

these devlopments, in future, I think it is necessary to set up at least one atomic power station, to begin with, working on natural uranium. After that we can go on to other processes. It is expected, if we start soon, that the first atomic power station might go into operation in 1962.

USA INDIA

Date: Apr 10, 1958

Volume No

1995

ETHIOPIA

First Trade Agreement Signed

The discussions between the Government of India and the Imperial Ethiopian Government on the development and strengthening of the trade between the two countries, which were initiated during the visit to India of His Imperial Majesty, Emperor Haile Selasse, have concluded. A Trade Agreement, the first ever between the two countries, was signed in New Delhi on Apr 18, 1958. The Agreement was signed by Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry and Director General of Foreign Trade, on behalf of the Government of India and the Ethiopian Ambassador to India, His Highness Ras H. S. Imru, on behalf of the Imperial Ethiopian Government.

Under the Agreement the two Governments have agreed to extend to each other the most-favoured-nation treatment in respect of customs duties, other taxes payable on imports and exports and all customs regulations and formalities.

Subject to the relevant regulations in force, the two Governments will give the maximum possible facilities for import and export of commodities of interest to either party. For this purpose lists of articles available for export from either country will be exchanged periodically.

Contacts between traders and trading organizations in the two countries would be encouraged by the two Governments.

The possibility of closer economic cooperation, particularly the sharing of technical knowledge, experience and training facilities, will be explored by the two countries.

The Agreement comes into force immediately and will be valid until

the end of May 1959. It may continue in force for a further period of one year subject to any modification.

ETHIOPIA INDIA USA MALI

Date: Apr 18, 1958

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN INDIA

Statement in Parliament

Foreign capital Investments in India at the end of Apr 30, 1955, the period for which latest information is available, was Rs. 630,000,000 crores in the public sector and Rs. 480,000,000, crores in the private sector.

This information was given in the Lok Sabha 7 April by the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, in reply to a question.

INDIA

Date: Apr 30, 1955

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Arthur Lall's Letter to the Security Council

The Government of India issued the following Press Note on Apr 25, 1958 about India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations letter to the President of the Security Council:

Letter dated 24 April 1958 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United

<Pg-65>

Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

I am instructed by the Government of India to refer to letter dated 28 March 1958 from the Representative of Pakistan addressed to the President of the Security Council, about certain administrative and audit arrangements in Jammu and Kashmir which has been circulated as Security Council document S 3981 and to say that the Government of India are surprised at this further attempt by the Government of Pakistan to mislead the Security Council.

Jammu and Kashmir has been an integral part of the Union of India since 26 October 1947 when it acceded to India. The accession took place in accordance with the procedures laid down in an Act of the British Parliament namely, the Government of India Act of 1935, as amended in 1947, which laid down the procedures to be adopted by the Government concerned, viz., the Governments of the U.K., India and Pakistan. The position that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union has been the basis of India's complaint to the Security Council and of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 and the assurances given by the Commission to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council. The Government of Pakistan are also fully aware that the Government of India did not accept the resolutions of the Security Council dated 30 March 1951 and 24 January 1957 which have been quoted in the letter from the Representative of Pakistan and that Governments of India and Pakistan have both accepted the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January, 1948 and they are engaged by the two resolutions dated 13 August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949 of United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

The Government of India have not violated any Security Council resolution that they have accepted nor have they repudiated any of their international engagements. The Government of Pakistan on the other hand have, throughout the last ten years, acted in violation of the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January 1948 which they had accepted and have failed to carry out their obligations under the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949. They have consolidated their aggression of Indian Union territory which they continue to occupy unlawfully and have been committing further aggression by promoting subversion and by numerous acts of sabotage in Indian Union territory.

The Government of India take serious exception to this deliberate misrepresentation by the Government of Pakistan of measures taken in normal course to secure administrative efficiency and proper audit control in the functioning of the Governments of the constituent States of the Indian Union. This attempt of the Government of Pakistan to seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Union of India is obviously intended to cover up their continued violations of the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan and to confuse the basic issues in the Kashmir situation.

It is requested that this communication may kindly be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

INDIA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Apr 25, 1958

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Initiating the debate in the Lok Sabha on the demands for grants for the Ministry of External Affairs, Prime Minister Nehru said on Apr 09, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. In doing so, I should like particularly to draw the attention of the House of the fact that the Ministry of External Affairs not only deals with external affairs but also with many important activities which might be called domestic. In fact, from the expenditure point of view, if we take the last year's

<Pg-66>

figures--may I say here that all this is given in the booklet that the Ministry has prepared for the Members of Parliament--the expenditure was Rs. 177,200,000 in round figures. Out of this Rs. 116,700,000 were for activities unconnected with the External Affairs proper. For instance, there were the Tribal Areas, the NEFA, the Naga Hills and Tuensang Area and there was a fairly considerable expenditure on the Assam Rifles, which really is an extension of the army, which deals directly with the External Affairs. This, naturally, is rather an expensive item. Then there is Pondicherry. Then there are contributions to numerous international organisations and International Armistice and Supervisory Commissions in Indo-China, expenditure on demarcation of boundaries etc. etc. The point I wish to make is that in effect the expenditure on External Affairs proper last year, according to the revised estimates, came to Rs. 605,000,000, a trifle over Rs. 600,000,000.

Now, I do not wish to say much about the quality and the extent of

our work abroad and our missions abroad. It is rather difficult to judge these things. But we may make comparisons to some extent with missions of other countries, from the point of view of expenditure. That is easier to compare; quality is rather difficult. If we compare it with any important country, the rate of our expenditure is far less. I do not mean to say thot whatever we spend, every rupee, is well utilized. I do not mean to say thot there is no wastage on our side and there is no need for economy. Of course, there is need for economies; there always is. There is always a tendency for wastage, if one is not vigilant. What I wish to submit is that compared to any country, our foreign affairs are conducted in a much, well, less-expensive way.

In this connection I would also say that--I am not defending high salaries or any thing--broadly speaking, the rate of payment to our staff abroad is far lower than what other countries give to their Heads of Missions and others employed in their offices. There again, I do not wish to generalise. What we may pay, may be often inadequate to keep up a certain status which our Embassies and Legations are supposed to keep up. On other occasions it has been found that the money we pay them for this purpose is not fully and properly utilised. It is not spent. Therefore it would indicate that we are paying them too much. But these are rather rare cases. I am putting both sides of the picture to the House.

Naturally I cannot say that a large number of people employed in our foreign service are all of the same high level as we like them to be, but I do say that the quality of our Heads of Missions serving abroad is a high one compared to any diplomatic service that I know of. There are also people who are not so good and who do not come up to that standard. Naturally in a large Service we have occasional difficulties. We have to take some kind of disciplinary action. But taken all in all, I would submit to the House that our Missions abroad have carried out their functions with dignity and ability and, broadly speaking, at a much less cost than the diplomatic service or the missions of the major countries.

In this connection may I also say, although it is not part of external affairs, that in the NEFA two or three years ago we constituted a special cadre of political officers, who were specially recruited for that purpose. It is very difficult to deal with that situation and very special type of officer was needed for it. It is a hard life. It is an isolate life--a life with practically no amenities of civilised existence, no people sometimes to talk to even, and hard work. Therefore we require a very special type of person who likes that kind of jungle life and who is physically and mentally tough, who could get on and be friends with the tribal people he was meant to serve. So, we chose a number of people and I am happy to inform the House that most of these people, who were chosen, have done remarkably well.

I should like to mention here in this House that not only in our foreign missions but also in a case like the NEFA it is not merely

the officer who counts but his wife also counts very much. People do not often realise that in employing an officer, we are really, in effect, employing two persons--the officer and his wife. We do not have the wife always--that is true--but in fact we expect the wife to play an important part in the social and human side. I am particularly thinking at present of these officers' wives in remote and tribal areas, NEFA and elsewhere. Only recently I had a report of

<Pg-67>

one officer and his wife. That lady in that remote area had done a very fine piece of work, apart from her husband doing well, because she had gone out of her way to deal with the tribal people, serve them, make friends with them, make friends with their children, play with their children and help them in many ways. She really created a much better impression than what any formal work by the officer would have done. So far these people, in these remote areas, I should like to put in a good word and I am sure the House will appreciate the fact that these officers in remote areas, NEFA, tribal areas, Naga Hills and Tuensang area deserve well of us because they are doing their work under very difficult conditions with marked ability.

It is about ten years now since we started building up our Foreign Service in our Missions abroad. There were a very few missions before independence. There was India House in London and there was some kind of representation in Washington and a few others mostly dealing with commercial matters or educational matters sometimes. When we started with our career after independence we had this whole wide world to deal with. We started as a country in a big way. I do not mean to say that we are not a big country, but we did not suddenly sort of creep in the international scene furtively. We came almost with a bang and people's attention was directed to our country. Many countries wanted to exchange diplomatic representatives with us. We were quite agreeable, of course, but it was no easy matter to do so, i.e., to build up the Foreign Service and to build up all the apparatus that goes with it. Foreign representation is not merely a question of good and educationally qualified men. It requires experience. Just as in the Army all the individual ability of a man is not quite enough to replace the experience of a General Staff which has inherited and accumulated experience--the experience of a General Staff cannot be produced by an individual, however brilliant he May be--so also in the Foreign Service of any country, the accumulated experience of a Foreign Office is a very useful thing, not perhaps quite so important, may be, as the General Staff in the Army, but it is important and this is regardless of the broad specific policy that you might pursue. This is a kind of background experience which helps one to judge a programme.

All Hon. Members read a newspaper and come to some conclusions about some incident. I, acting as the Foreign Minister, naturally have greater access to facts as they occur. It has often happened that I come to certain conclusions quickly but when I go deeper into it and find out the records in the Foreign Office as to how the problem

arose and what had happened previously, I have to change my opinionnot on matters of high policy, but on other matters--because there is the accumulated experience and facts. We started from scratch and gradually in the course of these ten years we have built up that experience and we are building it up.

We have now 41 embassies, seven high commissions, eleven legations-some of these are duplicated--25 consulates and vice-consulates and 16 commissions, special missions and agencies. Altogether we have 101 missions of some kind or other situated abroad, apart from a considerable number of Indian Information Units abroad. Now, this is a fairly large number. I cannot, as I said, say that every unit, every person abroad is a brilliant officer. Naturally, there are various types. But, taking it all in all, they have preserved a fairly high level and there can be no doubt about it that they have a high reputation among the diplomatic personnel of the world.

As far as our relations with other countries are concerned, they are at a remarkably friendly level. Unfortunately, we have not been able to maintain the same co-operative and friendly level of intercourse with our neighbour country, Pakistan. As the House knows, we have no relations with Portugal because of Goa. We have nd diplomatic relations with South Africa. Also the reasons are known to this House. Apart from these, our diplomatic personnel are spread out directly or indirectly all over the world.

I do not propose to discuss at the present moment the question of broad policy or world affairs. I wish to refer briefly to some matters. Our broad policy in international affairs has, I believe, the cordial approval of a very large section of this House--not all-and of the country. There are criticisms, legitimate criticisms about particular aspects, emphasis, of some minor importance as to how things are done. But, the broad policy has had approval and this approval of the House and of this country has naturally given

<Pg-68>

great strength to the Government in carrying out this policy. Because, if we went abroad, whether to the United Nations or to other Chancelleries and put forward some policy which was a matter of dispute in this country in a big way, naturally, the effect we produce would be very limited. I will not say any thing about that broad policy.

At present, taking the big world questions, obviously, the most important thing is disarmament, which is likely to affect the whole future of the world as to what steps are to be taken. In this connection, many things have happened in the course of the last few months. The outstanding event in recent months or weeks has been the proposal made on behalf of the Soviet Government--not a proposal, but the decision--not to have nuclear test explosions. This has been criticised on the ground that having indulged in a vast number of tests, they can well afford not to have them for some time. That may

be true. But, such criticisms can be advanced about any action taken. The major countries today, the United States and the Soviet Union, both probably have got a vast stock of atomic or hydrogen bombs. It is not necessary for them, from any point of view, to manufacture more probably. Nevertheless, if they decided not to manufacture any more, it would be a great thing even though they do not actively require them. Therefore, a good step is a good step, however it might have come into being. We must welcome--and indeed the country has welcomed--this step of the Soviet Government in regard to stoppage of nuclear tests. In saying so, they have added a proviso or rather a warning that if others do not stop them, we shall resume them--more or less to that effect. I trust this contingency will not arise.

There has been a further development. It has been said on behalf of the Soviet Government that they are prepared for control and supervision. That is an important factor. Because, the real thing that comes in the way is fear, and it has often been said that there can be no certain way of detecting an explosion. I am not a scientist enough to say whether that is right or wrong, because scientists differ. The obvious course seems to be for the United Nations or some, other organisation to appoint some scientist of high repute in these matters and ask him to find out how detection can be made certain if some kind of test explosion takes place.

Then, there is, on the side of the United States of America, a proposal made by President Eisenhower that fissionable material should not be produced for war purposes, which is an important proposal. Here are all these proposals which, if taken together and acted upon together, would make an enormous difference to the present atmosphere of strain and fear in the world. I do not say that accepting any of these proposals means the solution of any major problem in the world. But, I do say that accepting them and acting up to them produces conditions which help in solving these problems of the world.

There is talk, as the House knows, of what is called the summit conference or high level conference. As far as we can judge,-- I speak from no secret information, but from what is available to all members of this House--the chances are that some such high level conference will be held in the course of this year. I have said often that while every country is interested in this matter, naturally, because the whole peace of the world depends upon it, the two countries in whose hands lies the final issue of war and peace today are the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, any agreement must involve an agreement between these two, apart from other countries. Any disarmament conference which leaves out one of them is no disarmament conference. It can produce no adequate results. Sometimes, India's name has been put forward for attendance, for participation in the high level conference. The question when put to us has rather embarrassed us. Always our reply has been that we do not wish to push ourselves into any conference, but if our presence is wanted by the principal parties concerned and we feel that we can help, we want to be of help. These are world problems which affect us

tremendously as they affect the whole world.

Only one thing more I should like to say about world problems and that is this. If the, people are desirous of putting an end to this cold war, it seems to us that the approach should not be hostile, an approach of condemning your opponent. There is no doubt that countries differ in their policies, in their structures of Government, in their

<Pg-69>

economic approaches. There is that difference. You cannot put an end to that [illegible text]

is, not a racial conflict in that particular sense but something near or alike to it, in our own country when we suppress one people because they are called untouchable or depressed or this and that. Let us not imagine that our hands are clean in these matters. Of course, they are not clean, and we cannot merely condemn others without looking after our own house.

There are racial conflicts in the United States of America and elsewhere, but the thing that distinguishes the South African matter is this. In the United States of America efforts have been made, and made with growing success, to ease the racial problem. I do not say they have solved it, but the Government was to solve it, they tried to solve it, they have succeeded, public opinion is helping, there is progress in a certain direction so also elsewhere. But in South Africa it is the deliberate, acknowledged and loudly-proclaimed policy of the Government itself to maintain this segregation and racial domination. That is why the South African case is unique in the world. While there is racial trouble in many places in the world and conflict, in South Africa it is the official policy, and if that is the official policy of a Government, well, that is a policy with which obviously no country, no person who believes in, let us say, the United Nations Charter can ever compromise, because it uproots almost every thing, whether it is the United Nations Charter, whether it is your ideas of democracy or anything else.

Then there are other matters which come up in questions here, about people of Indian descent in Ceylon. I will not go into that. It is a complicated problem. These problems become difficult, and they become more difficult, because of growth of population, unemployment, economic difficulties. You will find usually at the back of it there is some economic difficulty and unemployment. That is there. And the problem is, in the main, that of the Ceylon Government because these people, according to our showing, are not Indian nationals. Whether registered or not, we feel they are or ought to be Ceylon nationals. It is their problem. We are interested in it again because of past history. We are interested in the solution of this because we are friendly with the Ceylon Government. We are interested because of cultural contacts and all that. And it is unfortunate

that it has dragged on for so long, but I would beg this House to remember that we should not be too eager to condemn any Government, or the Ceylon Government, merely because it has not solved it quickly. They have their difficulties, and they should realise our position just as we are perfectly prepared to consider their difficulties, but it is obvious that we cannot accept large numbers of people who have lived there, who have been born there, and just ask them to walk across to India, or accept them as our nationals. Fortunately, in spite of this complicated and difficult problem, it is increasingly realised in Ceylon by the Government and others, and by us of course, that we should not treat it as a political problem or dispute, but as a human problem, because, ultimately, the welfare of large numbers of human beings is involved, and I do hope that, however long it may take, it will be settled in a friendly way and to the advantage of this large number of human beings that are involved.

Now I come to this collection of problems and difficulties which represent Indo-Pakistan relations now. I do not propose to go deeply into this matter, and right at the commencement, I would say that we can make a long list of our problems. There is Kashmir, there is canal waters, there is the exodus from East Pakistan, there is this question of displaced persons and rehabilitation, there are financial issues, and there are so many other matters. All seem to drag on. Sometimes some small matter is discussed and settled, some little progress is made, but by and large, none of our major problems moves towards a settlement. It is most surprising because I think one thing that should be recognised by all of us, by every Indian present in this country, and I hope in Pakistan, is that the perpetuation of conflict or even any kind of a cold war between India and Pakistan is very bad for all of us and all of them. Whatever approach ours might be, except just the approach of an angry person which is not a good approach, whatever approach we might make, whether it is geographical, historical, cultural, past connections, present, future, it is patent that India and Pakistan should live cooperatively not interfering with each other's policies. They are independent countries; we may separate, we may become independent countries as we have done, but we cannot deny geography, we cannot deny history, we cannot deny a hundred things which exist, and so it is inevitable that we must come together, and we must live cooperatively and carry on in our own ways. We cannot force them--we have no desire to force them--to adopt any particular policy, even though, we may consider their policy wrong. Now, these are the facts of life, as I said. And because of this it is terribly distressing that we cannot make much progress in developing what is natural, and, I think, inevitable between our two countries.

And yet, there is one more hopeful factor, and that is so far as the common people are concerned, in India and Pakistan. I believe that the old feeling of bitterness and suspicion and fear is infinitely less than it was ten or eleven years ago. That trail of bitterness

which followed partition and those huge migrations and most terrible killings, has died down. It is only in the politico sphere that passion can be roused, or with the help of religion sometimes these communal feelings may be roused whether in Pakistan much more so, or to some extent, in India also. Let us remember it is no good our pretending that our hands are lily-white all the time, and our minds are lily-white, because they are not. We have made errors.

I believe that the major difference between Pakistan and India is not because we are better folk than they are--I mean the common people. We are the same lot. We have the same type of virtues and the same type of weaknesses and failings. But I believe that the major difference has been that we as a Government--and not only as Government, but I would say, as leaders of parties, all parties or nearly all parties--have deliberately aimed at avoidance of conflict, by growing better relations with the people of Pakistan, while in Pakistan the leadership has not done that. I am not criticising them. I do not wish to criticise them and have a match of mutual criticism. But circumstances in Pakistan have been such that, the very creation of Pakistan, that is, on the communal basis and all that, and the way it has continued, have been such that, unfortunately the leadership there has been driven, to lay stress on conflict with India, on hatred of India, on carrying on the old tradition of the Muslim League which they inherited. Therefore, while neither of us is free of blame as a people, as a Government we have at least tried to go the right way. That attempt

<Pg-71>

has been absent from the other side.

When you consider this unfortunate fact of the strained relations between India and Pakistan, curious strained relations--because, when a group of people from India meets a group of people from Pakistan, we are friendly, we hardly meet as strangers, as people of two countries; we speak the same language; we have common friends, common memories and a hundred and one things, and yet there is this tremendous strain which does harm to both of us--when you think of this, people tell you--some people say--'Oh, you go and settle this Kashmir issue, and all would be well.'--This is the normal criticism or advice offered to us in foreign countries--or `Settle this canal waters issue.' Well, obviously, if we settled any issue which is in conflict, it creates a good atmosphere naturally. But I do submit to this House that the strain and the feeling of conflict between India and Pakistan is not due to the Kashmir issue, is not due to the canal waters or any other issue, but that all these issues are due to another essential conflict on something else. They are the outcome of that, not the origin of the conflict; of course, they overlap, and it is rather difficult to draw a line between the two. But it does mean this, that if this type of anti-India approach, hatred of India, bitter dislike of India which is propagated in the press, in the statements of leading people in Pakistan continues, and if that is the basis of their foreign and internal policy, then it just does not

matter what you settle and what you do not settle, because that is the basis of policy. If by any chance the Kashmir issue was out of the picture as a matter of conflict, it will have, no doubt, a very good effect; I have no doubt. But unless that basic approach is changed, the thing will continue in other forms. That is our difficulty, so that I feel very unhappy about this matter, and it is no pleasure for me, no desire of mine, to say words, any words which might accentuate our difficulties. I do not like much that is happening in Pakistan. I do not wan to criticise it. It is none of my business unless it affects me.

I read only in yesterday's paper--or was it the day before--a former Prime Minister of Pakistan openly saying that `We must march Pakistan troops into Kashmir.' Now, what is this? Is this reasonable, sensible? Even if it is a reaction just in an angry defiant way, it is not good; it creates that atmosphere of bitterness and hatred and fear and cold war which we want to get rid of.

All these years, Hon. Members know that there are noted personalities in Pakistan who have made it their business--openly to commit sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir State. In fact, I forget the number, but at least a hundred bomb outrages have taken place in that State; many people have been killed, and all that. This has been deliberately done there. How can one go towards solving a problem when that is the attitude--when jehad and all that is talked about? I do not think that is the attitude of the people of Pakistan as a whole. And I would not even say this; for, who am I to go about criticising the leaders of other countries? But I would say, we have got into such a tangle that the only positive policy of theirs is a negative policy, which is a contradiction in terms, that is, a negative policy of hatred of India. And they go about repeating--some of them--that India will crush them and swallow them up, and that India is out to undo Partition. For anyone to think of that is foolish; for anyone to do it or try to do it would be criminal folly. And looking at it, apart from the larger viewpoints, from the standpoint of India and India alone, from the narrowest opportunist point of view even, it would be criminal folly.

Nobody wants to undo Partition. It will be terrible; we will go down; everything that we try, whether it is our Five Year Plan or whatever it is the whole thing will collapse; instead of doing any good to anybody, the whole structure of our economy, the political and economic structure would suffer. The only way is for each country to go its way, and I hope, come nearer to each other co-operatively in thinking and action, of its own free will. That is the way--and retaining its independence and freedom of action.

Now, there are these two major problems. One is the canal waters dispute, dragging on interminably. Some of our best engineers are practically spending their lives, sitting in Washington, discussing this matter with representatives of Pakistan and the World Bank. We have spent vast sums of money just in these discussions. I do not

know the figure, but it runs into crores, I think. We would have built a fine scheme or project or canal here or in Pakistan by the amount of money we have spent merely in talking. Talking is sometimes useful; naturally, it serves some purpose; it is better than quarrelling. Anyhow, here is this problem of canal waters which, essentially, is not a political problem and should not be considered as such. It is a human problem. We do not want to deny Pakistan any water that it can have. We do not wish to make the Pakistan peasantry suffer for lack of water. Obviously, we are not going to deny our own people what they need so badly. We are not going to deny something for which we have been preparing almost for generations, not to mention the last ten years or so, something for which people in Rajasthan, in parts of East Punjab and other areas have been preparing for generations. We are not going to wipe out all this because some people do not like it. Mind you, all these are preindependence and pre-partition schemes and you can judge them.

Anyhow, our approach--and I want this approach to be carried out--is a friendly approach to Pakistan, is a human approach to this problem. Let us do our best. It is no good Pakistan telling us 'Give us Rs. 1,000 crores.' It is fantastic--such huge figures being thrown about, as if any country can do that. But we do not want Pakistan to suffer; at the same time, it is obvious that we do not want ourselves to suffer at all.

Finally, take this problem of the Jammu and Kashmir State. Recently there has been a report by Dr. Graham. Dr. Graham had been here previously and all of us who have had the privilege of meeting him, respect him. He is a man beaming goodwill and good intentions, and it is really a pleasure to meet a man like that. He came here on this occasion and he was our honoured guest, although we had informed the Security Council when they passed that resolution, that we could not accept that resolution, nevertheless, if Dr. Graham came, he would be welcome. So he came and he had some talks with us. In his report, he himself has stated the nature of our talks. I am not at the present moment going into this Kashmir question. It is too big and too difficult, and apart from that, this House knows very well what our position in regard to this issue is--what we have said in great detail in the Security Council and in India. And in this matter, I believe there are no two opinions in this House or in the country. There might be slight variations about emphasis, but broadly speaking, there is none.

The trouble, according to us, in considering this matter has been that from the very beginning certain basic factors and basic aspects have not been considered by the Security Council, and because of that, the foundation of thinking and action has been unreal and artificial, and all this tremendous lapse of time has occurred without achieving any result.

When Dr. Jarring came here representing the Security Council--that

was before Dr. Graham came--he presented a brief report. In that report, the House may remember, there was a recognition of certain factors, certain developments, certain facts of life which could not be ignored. He merely hinted at them; he did not go into that matter; it was difficult. Anyhow, this is the first glimmering that you see of what the problem is today. You can consider this problem in terms of 1948 and 1949 or in terms of today. You cannot consider it all the time, every little phase in between. I say 1948 and 1949 because it was in those years that certain resolutions of the Security Council were passed, which we accepted. The very first thing in those resolutions was that Pakistan and India should behave in a certain way, that is, peacefully and not curse each other, not create conditions of conflict. The second thing was that Pakistan should withdraw from the occupied part of Kashmir and so on and so forth. Remember, the basis of those resolutions was the recognition of the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir State over the whole territory, that is to say, that the State was part of India and, therefore, Indian sovereignty. I am not going into that. Now, after that, much happened. A great deal has happened during these ten years, and even the papers that we have--I forget the exact number--run into 20, 25 or 30 volumes in connection with this Kashmir affair.

Now, we come to today. Keep--if you want to keep--those resolutions that we accepted, in mind; we do not want to go away from them. But remember that during all these ten years, the very first part has not been given effect to by Pakistan--neither the first, nor the second, nor the third and all

$$<$$
Pg-73 $>$

discussions begin in the Security Council ignoring all this, with something that is at the far end of the resolutions, which was only to be thought of after everything else had been done.

Now, Dr. Graham has been good enough to put forward certain suggestions. One is that we should reiterate solemnly--'we' meaning India and Pakistan--what we had said previously: we should make a new declaration in favour of maintaining an atmosphere of peace. I was perfectly prepared to make it, and I will make it once, twice, three times, a number of times more. But with all humility--I submit again that I aim prepared to make it--we drew Dr. Graham's attention to the type of declarations that were being made in Pakistan from day to day while he was there in Karachi. The declarations that were made there had no semblance of peace; there was the very opposite of it and all these bomb explosions organised from Pakistan are taking place in the Jammu and Kashmir State. So nobody can object to what Dr. Graham has said. Let us have by all means declarations about maintaining an atmosphere of peace. But let us look at the facts, what is happening, what a former Prime Minister of Pakistan has just said, which is in yesterday's papers, and so on.

Then Dr. Graham said--the second thing--let us also declare that we shall observe the integrity of the cease-fire line. I do not think

anybody has accused us during these ten years of a breach of that cease-fire line. There it is. We do not recognise Pakistan occupation on the other side as justified in any way, but we gave our word that we would not take any offensive action against it, and we have not done so. On the other hand, you see, what I have referred to several times, organised sabotage across the cease-fire line in Kashmir.

The third suggestion of Dr. Graham was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops from the occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir State. Certainly, it is not up to us to withdrawal; we have been asking for their is not a question of our agreement to their withdrawal; we have been asking for their withdrawal all this time.

The fourth proposal was about the stationing of United Nations forces on the Pakistan border of Jammu and Kashmir State following the withdrawal of the Pakistan army from the State.

Now, the proposal was or is for the stationing of UN troops, not in any part of Jammu and Kashmir territory, not in the part which is occupied by Pakistan now, but these forces should be stationed in Pakistan territory proper; obviously, Pakistan is an independent sovereign State. If it wants to have any foreign forces, we cannot say, 'NO' to it. We cannot prevent that. We, for our part, do not like the idea of foreign forces anywhere. And more especially in this connection we felt we did not see any reason why the UN Forces should sit in Pakistan on the Kashmir border. But, that is our opinion. It does not carry us anywhere because what is proposed is to be done in the territory of Pakistan. It is for Pakistan to agree or not to agree; we have expressed our opinion.

Then finally, Dr. Graham suggested that the two Prime Ministers, that is, of India and Pakistan, should meet under his auspices. Now, it has been our practice or convention always to be prepared to meet not only as Prime Ministers, but anywhere, in any conflict, to meet our opponent, to meet our adversary, to meet, of course, our friends also. So, there can be no difficulty and no objection on our part, or for me, to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan. But Dr. Graham says that we should meet under his auspices; that is to say, the three of us should meet. That Produces an entirely different type of picture.

First of all, it places us in a position of, let us say, equality in this matter with Pakistan. We have always challenged that position. Pakistan is an aggressor country in Kashmir and we are the aggrieved party. We cannot be treated on level. That has been our case right from the beginning.

Secondly, for the two Prime Ministers who meet, it would almost appear as if they have to plead with Dr. Graham, under whose auspices they meet, as advocates for certain causes which they represent. This kind of thing does not lead to problems being considered properly or solved. So, we told Dr. Graham that while we are always prepared to meet, this way of meeting with a third party present, even though the third party may be so eminent as Dr. Graham, was not a desirable way.

<Pg-74>

I have ventured to say something about Dr. Graham's report because there has been a good deal of talk about it, and a good deal of criticism rather ill-informed criticism, in the foreign Press on the subject. Anyway, it is open to our friends or those who are not our friends to criticise us. I make no complaint. But I do wish that they would realise our position in this matter and what exactly of Dr. Graham's report we rejected.

I told you the first point, broadly speaking, is to make a declaration of good neighbourliness. Nobody can oppose that and there is no question of its rejection. Our submission is that this thing has been totally lacking from October 1947 onwards and even after we had made this statement Pakistan has not. In fact, it is our primary case that the old resolution of 1948--the very first part of it--has not been given effect to by Pakistan.

The second point is about the cease-fire line. There is nothing to reject there.

The third was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops. It is none of our concern. We want that to happen. We do not reject the withdrawal of Pakistan troops.

The fourth was the placing of UN troops in Pakistan territory. Well, I have told you it is up to Pakistan to agree or not to agree. If they want our opinion we can give it.

And, lastly, this question of the two Prime Minister meeting. If my opinion is asked for, I would say that a meeting should take place. Any meeting can take place when, if I may use the word, the omens are favourable, when the atmosphere is helpful. Otherwise, it is not likely to do much good. But, apart from that I am prepared to meet whatever the omens may be. But as I said, I do not think it is the right way to approach this question, to meet in the manner suggested by Dr. Graham, that is, under his Chairmanship, discussing this matter between us. So, that is the position.

Now, I should like to say a sentence or two before finishing in regard generally to the Demands for External Affairs, in the past, during these debates and sometimes during questions, many points have been brought out and many criticisms have been made; and we have profit by these criticisms; at any rate, we have tried to profit by them and we welcome them. We are not afraid of criticisms and we welcome those criticisms; but I would say only one thing.

Sometimes an approach is made which entails, without much obvious good, a great deal of labour. For instance, after 2 or 3 years of effort, labour and concentration we formed the Indian Foreign Service B. It involved tremendous labour, all kinds of committees of

selection and consultation with Public Service Commission and all that. I do not know--I forget that now--but probably 7,000 or 8,000 persons applied. I get complaint after complaint that so and so has been improperly rejected or so and so has been improperly chosen. It is not possible for me as the Minister to consider 7,000 applications. Some impartial committee has to consider them. Most of these came from people in service; they were taken in or they remained where they were. I suppose some of the persons who did not happen to get in or who were not chosen go about from Member to Member with their complaints. Then, I get long letters, letters of 3,4 or 5 typewritten foolscap pages. I have them examined, of course; I send them answers. But, I would submit that it is impossible, when we are following these procedures greatly--I cannot guarantee that-that an absolutely 100 per cent correct decision is always made. Who can guarantee that? But we make a certain procedure where the personal element does not count or counts very little and when we go through this procedure if any obvious error takes place, one tries to correct it. But it is quite impossible for us to go after these 6,000 or 7,000 people continuously and repeatedly because they go and complain of something that might have happened to them.

USA CHINA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA RUSSIA TUNISIA

Date: Apr 09, 1958

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to the debate in Lok Sabha on the demands for grants for th Ministry of External Affairs, the Prime Minister said on Apr 09, 1958:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall deal very briefly with the few points. I am really surprised at the persistence of Shri Barua about this question of the selection of officers

<Pg-75>

[illegible text]

terms of a few thousands. But you have to think in terms of millions, scores of millions to make a difference.

Probably, among the States of India--I am not quite sure--Madhya

Pradesh is the most sparsely populated. It may well be that the member may try this to some extent in relation to his own State.

There are grave difficulties. I say this because unless there is something definite, feasible and practicable, it is not worthwhile our saying things which frighten people. There is no such intention on our part.

Then again, the population of India is a big one. It is no doubt a growing one. But tile population of China is far bigger and the rate of growth is even bigger. Whatever birth control may do in the future, it is calculated that there are about 600 millions in China. It will be a thousand millions before very long--in 20 or 25 years. Imagine a thousand millions in China. Then take Indonesia. It is also a very heavily populated country with 70, 80 or 90 millions--I think. I till told it is 85 millions. It is also growing rapidly. The whole of South-East Asia is tremendously heavily populated area.

The population of the whole of Chinese State, including Tibet, Gobi desert and all that, and Mongolia--if you spread it out, it is not so great. But the really heavily populated area is China proper. It is terribly populated, What is more as I have said, the rate if increase is two per cent per annum. This of increase is bound to go up because of health measures and the rest as in India. Actually, our rate of increase in population, in, population growth is a little less than it was before; it is actually going down. But because the death rate is going down fast, in the result, more people remain alive.

Another member referred to a number of matters. One he referred to was about an Indian doctor in London, and that diplomatic immunity had been claimed by the warden of a hostel. This matter came up before me sometime ago. I think the Hon. Member was pleased to draw my attention to it and I enquired into the details. I do not think it will be right or proper for me to say anything much here about this case, because it will be very much to the disadvantage of that Indian doctor if I say anything much here.

<Pg-76>

He was a gentleman who was sent from India with the help of advance, loans etc. from the West Bengal Government, and later he received more loans. He has not returned them. He has refused to abide by any directions. In fact, some suits are pending against him for various purposes. And, he failed, in other words, with the people who had sent him, who had given him money, and refused to come back. He has been there for a long time. The dispute arose about his insisting on treating Indian students in tile hostel which is run by the High Commission. It was stated that he was trying to induce the students to ask for him whenever they wanted a doctor. It was not considered proper for any doctor to do so, and he was asked not to do so, but if any student wanted him he could go. This is the beginning. It is not a very big matter, but since it was referred to I thought I should say something about it.

Then, Sir, he sued the lady warden of the hostel for defamation, defamation presumably because, she said he was trying to get students to engage him, which was supposed to be defamatory. And, the Commonwealth Relations Office in London, it appears, informed them that this lady had diplomatic immunity. I do not myself like anyone claiming diplomatic immunity unless in some very very special case: normally diplomatic immunity is given on a reciprocal basis between two countries. This was, finally, the action of the Commonwealth Relations Office; I do not know the details. But, having gone through much of the correspondence with this doctor, I cannot say that my sympathies went out to him at all. His record was not at all a pleasing and satisfactory one, so far as his relations with those who had sent him or those with whom he was dealing there, was concerned. And, surprisingly enough he has found a champion in England, a champion whom, well, many of us would prefer not to have--the champion is the Daily Express.

The same member made some suggestions, some of which seem to me completely beyond our power. He said something about Nagar Haveli; we should apparently take some steps to put an end to this case going on in the International Court, we should incorporate it with the Indian Union, and so on. Of course, this Parliament could incorporate it. There is no difficulty about incorporation, but you can consider the advisability of it, the advisability of such an action when a case is going on in an international plane in The Hague Court. We have deliberately—and I think rightly—ever since Nagar Haveli became a liberated area through the efforts of its own inhabitants, avoided any formal contact with it, any governmental authority. And we wanted to leave it at that and not to confuse the issue by any step that we might take.

Then, he also said something about our firmly and finally withdrawing the case, of Kashmir issue, from the Security Council. There again, it was not quite clear to me how a case is withdrawn from the Security Council. So far as I know, a case goes there, it remains there and if somebody Intends to withdraw it, suppose we want to withdraw a complaint we made, we cannot withdraw somebody else's complaint. We might withdraw our own complaint but the other complaint would remain. But there was one thing that he said. He seemed to think that because I did not mention in my earlier speech Indonesia and Algeria, we are suffering from some kind of inhibition lest I might offend somebody. That of course was not the case. I was not dealing, this morning, with the entire field of foreign affairs. So far as Algeria is concerned, it is a matter, well, of tragedy, which really can be measured only in almost elemental terms. It is a terribly bad thing, but I do not understand yet how I can serve the cause of Algeria or the Algerian people by merely shouting about it all the time. We have in our own way drawn the attention to this fact repeatedly. May be sometimes what we have stated has had some effect. We have in our own way done it. We refused to shout and we refused to go about merely condemning when all kinds of stories came to us, and facts, a year and a half ago or more, about Hungary. We did not think

it was right to do that, but we did try to draw the attention of the Governments concerned to various matters and sometimes with success. We did serve a cause we had at heart. We would not have been able to do that if we had merely per formed in public, with vigour, without an, results.

<Pg-77>

Then he referred also to the possibility of holding a Bandung Conference. It can be held; but I still think that a Bandung Conference at the present stage, of the type that was held, would not be feasible because it was a Governmental Conference. This House knows what is happening in Western Asia--separate groups of nations struggling away in different directions. There are internal troubles in Indonesia. I should have thought this is not at all a suitable time for such a conference, and this was not my view only. This was the view of most of the people concerned with the sponsoring of the first Bandung Conference, because we consulted each other some time back.

Now, this member has made a suggestion which I fear is not feasible, but I would welcome it if it was feasible. It was about a customs union, but clearly, when the position is what it is today, to talk about customs union is not to talk in terms of reality.

Only today I was told of the kind of thing that happens. Only today a newspaper quoted a speech delivered in Lahore. I shall make it clear that so far as I know it is, not delivered by any high government functionary, but still by a prominent citizen. He said, "Oh, Kashmir! The question of Kashmir is there of course. But that is not enough. We must now strive for a complete rectification of the boundary between India and Pakistan, the area in that northern boundary. The Qaid-e-Azam said so and, we must try that." This supports what I ventured to say to this House this morning that we are up against something in a sense very solid and in another sense very insubstantial. It is not Kashmir, though Kashmir, of course, is a very important issue. It is not canal waters. It is something basic derived from that intense communal attitude, bitterness, etc., anti-Indian attitude, which has been the inheritance of Pakistan unfortunately, from the old Muslim League, and then after the time of the partition. Claims grow, demands grow and nothing is satisfied. Therefore, how we are to attack their basic attitude--and convert it and make it a friendly one, is a problem very difficult for us, but there is no other way to do it.

There is one thing else. It is quite extraordinary at the present moment, what the Pakistan Radio is saying from day to day about India, about Kashmir, about individuals here, the Government and everybody, --the Pakistan Radio functioning not only from Karachi, but Lahore, Rawalpindi, Peshawar. And I am not referring to what is called the Azad Radio; that is, of course, a class by itself, and its virulence nobody can reach. The Pakistan Radio's constant attacks on India, constant preaching of hatred and violence is something

amazing. That is the attitude we have to face all the time. I said this morning that I do not claim that we are blameless, that we are guiltless, that we go with lily-white hands and all that. We have made mistakes; we have made errors. Sometimes some speech is delivered, there is some writing which is either not in good taste or is otherwise improper. But the fact is that our major effort, the effort of this Parliament, of this Government and even I say of our Press generally speaking, is towards a lessening of tensions, though individuals go sometimes astray, while there in Pakistan there is nobody to check that. In fact, all efforts are made to increase the tension, bitterness and hatred. All that we can do is not to be led away by that into wrong courses ourselves, and to remember always that the final objective between India and Pakistan can only be friendship and co-operation.

We are neighbours and our conflicts--they may appear big today--are really small compared to the innumerable points of contact that we have, and are bound to have. As a matter of fact, these conflicts have not only injured us but even in economic and financial terms, but if we had co-operated economically in trade, this, that and the other, it would have been far more advantageous to us both.

Lastly, one of my colleagues, referred to our frontier areas meaning by that not the east frontier, not NEFA or the Naga Hills or Assamthat of course is there--but rather the whole stretch of the frontier--Punjab, U.P., etc. These areas have been completely neglected in the past. There is one Hon. Member in this House--may be there are others, but there is certainly one,--who is constantly reminding us about these areas by putting questions and writing to me quite rightly, because they are important. I am not for the moment thinking in terms of strategy, etc., but they are rich areas and there are fine people living in those areas. It is difficult to do much for

<Pg-78>

them till at least communications are developed. The primary thing is communications. We are doing something towards that end and I hope more will be done.

USA INDIA CHINA INDONESIA MONGOLIA UNITED KINGDOM ALGERIA HUNGARY PAKISTAN

Date: Apr 09, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Dispute Talks

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power, Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, said in the Rajya Sabha on Apr 22, 1958 that further exploratory talks on the Indo-Pakistan dispute on the distribution of the waters of the Indus system were to be held in Rome between representatives of India, Pakistan and the World Bank towards the end of April this year.

He added that in January, 1958, Mr. W.A.B. Iliff, Vice-President of the world Bank, discussed separately with the representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan the possibilities of various approaches towards a settlement of the Canal Water Dispute. The talks in Rome would be in continuation of these discussions.

Shri Hathi gave this information in reply to a question.

PAKISTAN LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM ITALY USA INDIA

Date: Apr 22, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Movable Property Agreement

The following Joint Press Communique was issued by the Governments o India and Pakistan on Apr 21, 1958.

The fourth meeting of the Implementation Committee, set up under the Moveable Property Agreement India and Pakistan, was held at New Delhi on 16 and 17 April 1958.

The Committee reviewed the progress made in the implementation of the Agreement and discussed measures to expedite completion of the remaining work, so that relief could be afforded to the affected persons on both sides.

Both the governments would ensure immediate restoration of moveable property in respect of which lists have already been exchanged.

They would also complete, within a period of four months, enquiries into cases, in which documentary evidence has been supplied by the displaced persons in support of their claims.

Further exchange of fire arms of displaced persons will be held on 17 June 1958.

Supplementary lists of moveable property, bank drafts for sale proceeds and further lists of evacuee court deposits will be exchanged at Lahore on 18 June 1958.

The exchange of security documents, postal certificates, valuables and payment authorities, etc. relating to court deposits, whose lists have already been exchanged, will take place at Lahore on 15 May 1958.

It has been decided to fix 31 July 1958 as the final date for the filing of claims under the Transfer of Evacuee Deposits Act.

No claims will be entertained thereafter.

The Joint Committee which will look into the third party claims against moveable property and assess the compensation payable properties allotted or acquired will start functioning from 1 June 1958.

This committee would meet alternately in India and Pakistan and is expected to complete its work within a period of six months.

The date for the buried treasure operations has been extended upto 31 May 1958.

There would be no further extension after this date.

<Pg-79>

Displaced persons who had opened postal accounts or purchased certificates before 15 August 1947, but did not register their claims by the prescribed dates, will be allowed to register their claims.

For this purpose, a period of six months will be given from 15 May onwards.

Arrangements for settlement of postal life insurance claims have also been agreed upon.

The sealing of safe deposits and lockers belonging to displaced persons which has already been started by the two Governments will be completed by 15 May 1958.

Lockers and safe deposits would be handed over to the diplomatic representative of the other country at Lahore and Delhi, respectively on 5 June 1958.

It has also been agreed that funds will be transferred from India to Pakistan, to the extent necessary, in cases where sufficient liquid assets are not available in Pakistan to enable the banks to discharge the liabilities created by the transfer of Muslim bank accounts in the en bloc areas.

The other decisions cover arrangements for the exchange of revenue records, gold loan accounts and claims of joint stock companies for payment of compensation.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Apr 21, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Nehru's Statement on Pakistan's Letter To Security Council

The following statement was made by the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha on Apr 17, 1958 in response to Calling Attention Notices on the subject of a letter addressed by Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the U.N. on 11 April 1958:

According to reports in the Press, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations has sent to the President of the Security Council a letter on 11 April 1958, making certain allegations against the Government of India. Government have not received the authorised text of the letter. But from the report in the press it appears that this letter is full of false and baseless allegations and is a part of the campaign of hatred and calumny which Pakistan pursues against India.

Except for the area of Jammu and Kashmir State which is illegally occupied by Pakistan by force, the State, as a part of the Federal Union of India, enjoys autonomy which is granted under the Constitution to the States. There is a Legislature elected by adult suffrage and a Government responsible to that Legislature. This Government has been formed by the National Conference Party of the Jammu and Kashmir State who have a considerable majority in the Legislature. The Opposition Parties have freedom to criticise and comment on the activities of Government. Indian and foreign newspapers have their correspondents there who have freedom to report.

For many months past, as is well known, a deliberate campaign of sabotage in the State has been organised from Pakistan and a large number of bomb outrages have taken place. Cases have been instituted in the law courts in connection with this campaign. There was also

recently a deplorable incident at Hazratbal which involved the killing of one person and injuries to a large number as also the destruction of property. Seventy persons have been arrested in connection with this Hazratbal incident for murder, or rioting or other charges. These are in judicial custody as under-trials. It is totally untrue to say that the number of arrested persons amounts to thousands.

There are thirty-three persons in detention in Jammu & Kashmir State at present.

In view of the organised campaign of sabotage and rioting, the District Magistrates in three of the Districts have promulgated Rule 50 of the Defence Rules in order to prevent lawlessness and acts of violence and rioting. This rule requires permissions to be taken for meetings and processions. There is no bar on religious gatherings. Those committing a breach of this Rule are dealt with under the ordinary processes of the law.

The Army has nothing to do with any preventive measure or police duties. The allegation that the Army has been used against the civil population is wholly untrue.

<Pg-80>

As is well known, its function is to defend the country against external aggression.

In spite of the subversive and sabotage activities, chiefly engineered by Pakistan, life in the Jammu and Kashmir State is normal. The tourist season has started and hundreds of visitors including a large number of foreigners are going to Kashmir daily. On Sunday last, 13 April, Baisakhi was celebrated with great enthusiasm and thousands of people of all communities as also some foreign tourists, visited the Mughal gardens in Srinagar to celebrate the holiday.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Apr 17, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Nehru's Statement on Border Incidents

The following statement was made by Prime Minister Nehru on the recent repeated firing by Pakistan Forces on the border of the Khasi-Janitia Hills District of Assam:

The House will recall that in response to a number of Call Attention Notices and Short Notice Questions, the Deputy Minister made a statement on my behalf on 31 March regarding firing by Pakistani troops across the Sylhet-Cachar border. This statement dealt with the course of events up to 27 March when a cease-fire agreement--the second since the incidents began on 11 March--was arrived at. Firing, however, has continued and more Call Attention Notices and Short Notice Questions have been tabled in the last few days. I fully appreciate the concern felt by the House and I take this opportunity to make a further statement on the course of events between 27 March and 14 April.

Though detailed reports about individual incidents have not yet been received, the following general picture emerges from the preliminary reports received so far:

Sporadic firing has been going on almost daily in the Surma region from 27 March to 7 April. The affected area covers such places as Madanpur, Latu, Nijjalalpur, Mahisasan and Bhanga Bazar.

The firing spread from the Surma region to the Khasi-Janitia Hills along the Pyain river. Full details are not available, but it is clear that Pakistani armed forces opened fire on an Indian patrol on 4 April, the firing on Indian cultivators was resumed on 5 April and continued throughout the morning and the next day. As usual, protests were lodged by Assam Government. Pakistani authorities have also lodged counter-protests.

The casualties on our side as a result of firing were one killed, three seriously wounded, who may or may not survive, and five others wounded.

There was an exodus of about a hundred families from the Bhanga area caused by the intensity of firing and collecting of vegetables on both sides of the Surma had stopped but people have started returning for vegetable collection since the cease fire on 9 April.

A meeting between the Divisional Commissioners of Assam and East Pakistan took place at Karimganj and a fresh Cease-Fire Agreement to be effective from 5.30 a.m. on 9 April was reached at the meeting. Various details regarding co-operation of the authorities on both sides in the effective maintenance of the cease-fire were also settled and it was hoped that there would be no further incidents.

The latest position is that, despite the Cease-Fire Agreement, Pakistani forces opened fire in Nathanpur area on 9 April and Pakistani villagers began violating Indian territory by starting fishing en masse in Indian waters on the Surma river. It has also been reported that whereas the Cease-Fire Agreement provided for demolition of recently constructed bunkers and the filling up of trenches, Pakistani armed personnel are repairing such bunkers on their side and digging new trenches. The Assam authorities have lodged a protest against these breaches of the Cease-Fire Agreement and violation of Indian territory with the East Pakistan authorities and we have also lodged a protest with the Pakistan High Commissioner at Delhi and requested him to move the Government of Pakistan to issue immediate instructions to the local authorities concerned to implement the Cease-Fire Agreement in the spirit of good neighbourliness and to take necessary action to prevent their nationals from using the Cease-Fire Agreement as a cloak to violate Indian territory. Our High Commissioner in Karachi has also taken up

<Pg-81>

this matter with the Government of Pakistan.

It is hoped that there will be no further violations and that the Cease-Fire Agreement will be fully observed. I should like to add that the Governments of India and Pakistan have also agreed to hold a joint enquiry into the entire series of these incidents commencing 11 March. The Governments of India and Pakistan are each nominating a representative of the Central Government to carry out this joint enquiry.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Apr 17, 1958

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Pakistan Government's Reply

In answer to a question in the Lok Sabha whether the Government of India have received any reply from the Pakistan Government to their protest with regard to the abusive language used against India and threatening speeches made by Khaksar processionists in front of the office of the Indian Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca on 11 October 1957 Prime Minister Nehru said on Apr 22, 1958 in their reply the Pakistan Government have admitted that demonstrations were held but have Stated that the processionists were peaceful and had shown no signs of violence. The Pakistan Government have attributed the reason for the demonstrations to the strong feelings in Pakistan over the Kashmir issue and have expressed their inability to stop such demonstrations.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Apr 22, 1958

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Offer to Set Up Oil Refinery

The Government of India had accepted the offer from Rumania for collaboration in setting up an oil refinery at Gauhati, said Shri K. D. Malaviya, Union Minister for Mines & Oil, in the Rajya Sabha, on Apr 23, 1958.

The Minister, who was replying to Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, added that the offer had been accepted subject to consideration of the detailed terms on which the refinery had to be installed.

INDIA

Date: Apr 23, 1958

Volume No

1995

SAUDI ARABIA

Joint Communique on Trade and Economic Relations

The following is the Joint Communique on trade and economic relation between India and Saudi Arabia. This was finalised during discussions between the Indian Delegation, led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister for Industry, and the Trade Delegation from Saudi Arabia, led by His Excellency Mr. Mohamed A. Alireza. The communique was signed in New Delhi on Apr 08, 1958 by the Saudi Arabian Ambassador in India, Sheikh Yusuf Alfoza.

On the invitation of the Government of India, a Trade Delegation from Saudi Arabia led by His Excellency Mr. Mohamed A. Alireza, Minister of Commerce, Royal Saudi Arab Government, visited India from 5 March

to 26 March 1958 with the purpose of further strengthening the ancient friendly commercial relations between India and Saudi Arabia. With that end in view, the members of the Saudi Arabian Delegation visited centres of commerce, industrial establishments and some of the important development projects, and met and discussed problems of trade with representatives of commerce and industry and with the Government authorities concerned. The Delegation also met members of the Planning Commission and discussed problems of

<Pg-82>

common interest concerning economic development of the two countries. His Excellency Mr. Mohamed A. Alireza and the members of his Delegation noted with particular interest the efforts made in India for economic and industrial progress and the zeal with which the Indian people worked for the economic progress of their country. The Saudi Arabian Delegation was particularly impressed by the keen desire of the Indian people to foster commercial ties and economic cooperation with Saudi Arabia.

Recognising that closer commercial and economic relation between the two countries would be of mutual benefit, the Delegation of India led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister for Industry, and the Delegation of Saudi Arabia, led by His Excellency Mr. Mohamed A. Alireza, Ministry of Commerce, exchanged views on the obstacles in the way of smoother flow of trade between the two countries and the importance of finding suitable remedies therefor, and on the importance of reviving, maintaining and developing traditional trade between the two countries, particularly in food-stuffs and textiles and of extending that trade to new commodities which they are able to exchange as a result of the rapid economic development taking place in both countries.

It was agreed that the two Governments would cooperate with each other to provide maximum possible facilities for the development and expansion of trade between the two countries and the promotion of joint industrial enterprises. It was also agreed that it would be useful to promote shipping facilities between the two countries to the maximum extent possible.

Finally, it was agreed that having regard to the progress attained in this visit, it would be useful if the further progress in fostering trade relations and developing economic cooperation between the two countries could be reviewed from time to time.

SAUDI ARABIA INDIA USA

Date: Apr 08, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

U.A.R. Admitted to Asian Legal Consultative Committee

The following Press Note was issued by the Government of India on th subject of admission of the United Arab Republic to the Asian Legal Consultative Committee:

The United Arab Republic has been admitted to participate in the Asian Legal Consultative Committee from Apr 19, 1958. It shall be deemed to be an "original participant" being the successor to the rights and liabilities of the State of Syria in respect of its membership of the Committee.

The Statutes of the Committee have also as from 19 April 1958 been altered to include participation of the countries of the African Continent within the Committee and it shall henceforth be known as Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee. The decision to enlarge the scope of the Committee has been unanimously taken by the Governments of all the member countries. The proposal for inclusion of African countries was taken up following the suggestion of the Prime Minister of India made during his inaugural address at the First Session of Committee held in April 1957 at New Delhi.

INDIA SYRIA USA

Date: Apr 19, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid for Health Projects

Assistance amounting to 1,18,80,596.22 U.S. dollars was received fro the Government of U.S.A. for health projects in India.

The assistance was in respect of medical colleges and allied institutions in India, the orientation training projects, the national water supply and sanitation programme, the national malaria control programme and the national filaria control programme.

This information was given by Shri D. P. Karmarkar, Minister for Health, in a written answer to a question in Lok Sabha on 26 April 1958.

USA INDIA

Date: Apr 19, 1958

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Technical Assistance

The Governments of India and the United States on Apr 29, 1958 signed nine project agreements under the Indo-American Technical Assistance Programme. The agreements provide a total of \$1,287,000 to assist India in the fields of Health, Education, Industrial Research, Agriculture and Industrial Productivity. They initiate the United States Fiscal Year 1958 programme of technical assistance in India which total \$6.3 million.

The agreements were signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, for the Government of India and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the United States Technical Cooperation Mission to India.

Under the agreements signed today, specific assistance is rendered to Agricultural Education and Research by furnishing \$658,000 to continue contracts with the five U.S. Land Grant Colleges providing assistance to Indian agricultural and veterinary institutions. The U.S. cooperating institutions are Illinois, Ohio, Missouri and Tennessee Universities and Kansas State College. A total of \$5,388,413 has been allotted for this programme in prior fiscal years, since the Indo-American Technical Cooperation Programme started in 1952.

A total of \$319,000 is provided for Assistance to Home Science Education and Research. This agreement continues for three years the services of U.S. technicians and the procurement of demonstrational equipment for four Indian home science colleges. They are the Lady Irwin College at New Delhi, the Viharilal Mitra Institute at Calcutta, the South India Education Trust at Madras and the Shrimati Natibai Damodar Thackersey University at Bombay.

The sum of \$210,000 is provided for developing the Central Institute

of Education into a national centre with a view to promoting leadership training in the field of professional education. In addition to the U.S. educational specialists who will come to India under this project, provision is made for sending 17 Indians to the United States for training in the fields of educational administration, educational guidance and educational material.

The other six agreements provide for \$26,730 for assistance to Indian medical colleges and institutions, \$2,000 for assistance to the National Institute of Basic Education, \$15,820 for technical assistance in nursing at three medical college nursing schools, \$25,400 to provide additional technical assistance to the fuel Research Institute at Jealgora, Bihar, \$10,530 to supply hybrid maize seeds to the Tarai and Chandigarh areas, and \$19,591 to aid in the establishment of a National Productivity Council.

Assistance under the agricultural education and research project is restricted to 33 public and 7 private sector colleges and two central research institutes where post-graduate research is conducted. Technicians will be stationed at 26 of the 40 colleges that are now being assisted, and consultative services will be available to the remaining 14.

As of February, 1958, a total of 30 American technicians have been assigned under this project and 47 Indian participants have gone to the United States for training. Funds provided in prior years will cover training for an additional 23 participants, and fund provided under the new amendment will cover training for a total of 57 participants.

The agreement includes provision for the supply of \$200,000 worth of laboratory equipment and books to Indian institutions.

<Pg-84>

USA INDIA

Date: Apr 29, 1958

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on Apr 26, 1958 between Shri D. Sandilya, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and

H.E. Mr. Bogdan Crnobrnja, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia in India, extending the validity of the Schedules attached to the Indo-Yugoslav Trade Agreement, concluded on 31 March 1956 and revised on 19 June 1957, for a further period of one year ending 31 December 1958, without any modification.

The important items of export from India to Yugoslavia, mentioned in the Schedule attached to Indo-Yugoslav Trade Agreement, are iron ore, manganese ore, mica, shellac, myrobalan and its extracts, tea, coffee, tobacco, spices, hides and skins, cotton textiles, raw wool, wool waste, jute goods, handicrafts and cottage industries products.

Among the chief items of import from Yugoslavia included in the Agreement are dyeing and tanning substances, iron and steel products, rolling stock, copper, aluminium, lead and zinc products, diesel and steam locomotives and tractors, turbines, motors and electrical transformers and gears, various types of machinery such as metal working machinery, mining machinery, cranes, ships and cement.

The trade between the two countries has been on the increase since the signing of the Agreement and this trend is expected to be maintained during the current year. Exports to Yugoslavia during the first ten months of 1957 amounted to Rs. 250,000 and imports to Rs. 17,300,000.

The chief items of export from India to Yugoslavia have been iron ore and vegetable oils. In imports iron and steel accounts about 74 per cent of the total. Other important imports from Yugoslavia into India are non-metallic mineral manufactures, chemicals, drugs and medicines, electrical goods and apparatus and machinery of all kinds.

<Pg-85>

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Apr 26, 1958

May

Volume No

1995

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record		1958 May
Volume V	No. 5	iviay
CONTENTS		
BULGARIA Trade Agreement Extended		87
BURMA Provisional Trade Agreement		87
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Agreement on Deferred Payment		87
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the Security Council		89 93
JAPAN Indo-Japanese Agreement on Scheme for Industries	96	
NEW ZEALAND Aid under Colombo Plan		96
PAKISTAN Statement on Dr. Graham's Report		97
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Technical Assistance Agreement		98
<pg-i></pg-i>		

BULGARIA BURMA GERMANY INDIA JAPAN USA NEW ZEALAND SRI LANKA PAKISTAN

Date: May 01, 1958

Volume No

1995

BULGARIA

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi May 20, 1958 between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. Asparuh Mladenov, Commercial Counsellor and Trade Representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in India, extending the validity of the Schedules attached to the Indo-Bulgarian Trade Agreement, concluded on 18 April, 1956 and revised on 20 June, 1957, for a further period of one ear ending 31 December, 1958, without any modification.

The important items of export from India to Bulgaria, mentioned in the Schedule attached to the Indo-Bulgarian Trade Agreement, are tea, coffee, spices, unmanufactured tobacco, hydrogenated vegetable oil (edible), lac including shellac, cotton raw and waste, wool raw and waste, drugs and medicines, bicycles and parts, coir yarn and coir manufactures, sports goods etc.

Among the chief items of import from Bulgaria into India included in the Agreement are drugs and medicines including penicillin, chemicals, electrical instruments and machinery equipment, metal working machines, diesel engines, radio sets, cement, stationary, etc.

Exports to Bulgaria during the first eleven months of 1957 amounted to Rs. 0.2 million and imports to Rs. 1.2 million. The export and import figures for the financial year 1956-57 were Rs. 0.477 million and Rs. 2.230 million respectively. Discussions are going on for the conclusion of a Trade Development Account with the State Trading Corporation in order to balance the trade.

BULGARIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: May 20, 1958

Volume No				
~~~	п		1.7	
	 		' A I	

1995

#### **BURMA**

Provisional Trade Agreement

Discussions have taken place during last week of April and first wee of May 1958, in New Delhi between the Burmese Trade Mission led by the Hon'ble U Raschid and an Indian Delegation led by Shri Nityanand Kanungo, regarding measures to be taken for the development of trade between India and Burma as contemplated in the Trade Agreement concluded between the two countries in September 1956.

The talks were held in a spirit of goodwill and mutual friendliness and provisional agreement has been reached regarding the measures which should be taken to promote trade between the two countries. A list of commodities in respect of which promotional measures will be taken has been drawn up. The Agreement is subject, however, to the approval of the two Governments, when its terms and conditions will be announced.

BURMA USA INDIA

**Date**: May 20, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

### Aggreement on Deferred Payment

The agreement reached with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany enables the Government of India, with the co-operation of the German firms and banks, to postpone by three years outstanding payments for the Rourkela steel plant up to a maximum of DM 660 million.

This was stated by Sardar Swaran Singh, Union Minister of Steel, Mines & Fuel, in a written reply to a question in the Lok Sabha, on May 09, 1958.

Under the agreement, added the Minister, the Government of India had to deliver to

<Pg-87>

the German firms concerned in lieu of cash payments, promissory notes in Deutsche Marks maturing three years after the date the payments fell due. The German firms would be entitled to negotiate the promissory notes in the Federal Republic of Germany. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would ensure that the firms were able to get paid by negotiation of the promissory notes.

The Minister further stated that all suppliers of plant and machinery for the Rourkela steel plant had agreed to accept promissory notes.

**GERMANY INDIA** 

**Date**: May 09, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the Security Council

The Government of India issued a Press Note on Apr 25, 1958 on India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Shri Arthur Lall's letter to the President of the Security Council refuting allegations made by the Representative of Pakistan. The following is the full text:

I am instructed by the Government of India to refer to letter dated 28 March, 1958, from the Representative of Pakistan addressed to the President of the Security Council, about certain administrative and audit arrangements in Jammu and Kashmir which has been circulated as Security Council document S|3981 and to say that the Government of India are surprised at this further attempt by the Government of Pakistan to mislead the Security Council.

Jammu and Kashmir has been an integral part of the Union of India since 26 October 1947 when it acceded to India. The accession took place in accordance with the procedures laid down in an Act of the British Parliament, namely, the Government of India Act of 1935, as amended in 1947, which laid down the procedures to be adopted by the Government concerned, viz., the Governments of the U.K., India and Pakistan. The position that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union has been the basis of India's complaint to the Security Council and of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949 and the assurances given by the Commission to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council. The Government of Pakistan are also fully aware that the Government of India did not accept the resolutions of the Security Council dated 30 March, 1951 and 24 January, 1957 which have been quoted in the letter from the Representative of Pakistan and that the Governments of India and Pakistan have both accepted the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January, 1948 and they are engaged by the two resolutions dated 13 August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949 of United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

The Government of India have not violated any Security Council resolution that they have accepted nor have they repudiated any of their international engagements. The Government of Pakistan on the other hand have, throughout the last ten years, acted in violation of the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January, 1948 which they had accepted and have failed to carry out their obligations under the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August, 1948 and 5 January, 1949. They have consolidated their aggression of Indian Union territory which they continue to occupy unlawfully and have been committing further aggression by promoting subversion and by numerous acts of sabotage in Indian Union territory.

The Government of India take serious exception to this deliberate misrepresentation by the Government of Pakistan of measures taken in normal course to secure administrative efficiency and proper audit control in the functioning of the Governments of the constituent States of the Indian Union. This attempt of the Government of Pakistan to seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Union of India is obviously intended to cover up their continued violations of the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan

<Pg-88>

and to confuse the basic issues in the Kashmir situation.

It is requested that this communication may kindly be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

INDIA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Apr 25, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri A. K. Sen's Speech at the International Conference on Law of the Seas

Shri A. K. Sen, Union Minister for Law and Leader of the Indian delegation to International Conference held in Geneva on Law of the Seas, made the following speech on Feb 28, 1958.

Since this is the first time I am addressing the Committee since your election, may I express on my behalf and on behalf of my delegation our delight in seeing you presiding over the deliberations of the Committee. Sir, your contact with us has been very close, especially the Ministry which is under my charge and I can only tell you, Sir, that we are extremely happy that you are here to preside over our deliberations.

May I also, Sir, before stating the point of view of my country express our sincere appreciation of the great work produced by the International Law Commission, the draft covering the work of the 8th Session coming in the wake of previous drafts and showing by the draft itself the terrific amount of work put through and the hard labour undertaken by the Commission. I have no doubt, Sir, that whether we can agree on all points or not we shall certainly agree on this that the International Law Commission has done a great work and a fine job, and it has really made our task more easy than it would have been but for the report.

It is necessary to state generally and also in certain particulars the point of view of my country regarding the proposals of the International Law Commission. Generally speaking, Sir, we believe that the framing of any International Law relating to the sea cannot be merely a matter of expediency or a matter of reiteration of rules of conduct. It must be something more. I have tried to glean from the report of the International Law Commission the principles which appear to have motivated their recommendations. Whether I am right in my analysis or not is a different matter. But in my view there is a particular and significant principle underlying the entire draft and it is necessary to explain it. It is really an attempt to give effect to the general realisation in our time that the sea like the resources of nature must generally be appropriated to the use of mankind, for the benefit of all, to make our life broader, richer and fuller. Throughout the ages, Sir, the endeavour of man has been to conquer nature and to harness her for his own advantage, to make his life, as I said, richer and fuller. True it is that some nations had in the past gone ahead of others in this grim battle against nature. True it is that some nations had appropriated larger slices from their conquest than others, but, nevertheless, today we are happy at this thought that there is a general acceptance amongst us all that the resources of the world, of the sea and in the future possibly of the air as well, must be generally utilised for the benefit of all, the powerful nations as also the backward nations, more developed ones and the underdeveloped ones. It is this realizations of the responsibility by those who have been more fortunate than others in leading the battle against nature and the conquest of nature that has made an International life possible, that has made the task of improving the underdeveloped areas of the world more easy to achieve. I am happy to say, Sir, and I am sure there will be very few to dissent against that view,

that today those who are more powerful, those who have more resources, those who have achieved more in the shape of material comforts or amenities realise that this enjoyment has given to them a very heavy responsibility namely, that they must share their good fortune with others less favourably placed. That, I understand. has been the common impetus with all the conflicting power blocs today. Whether they agree or disagree on important matters or not is not so important today as the broad agreement amongst them that the world as a whole must be made fit for the life of the humanity. It is this realization and this significant fact marking the onward march of civilisation which I assume lies at the basis

### <Pg-89>

of our efforts and endeavour to formulate a Law of the Sea, namely that more must be shared and less must be appropriated so that humanity as a whole benefits from what is a nature's legacy to mankind. It is in order to achieve this difficult harmony that I presume the International Law Commission has taken such great pains to formulate its proposals. It is necessary to elaborate this point a little further. To make the seas, the ocean the common property of all necessarily brings it into conflict with the peculiar interests attaching to the coastal States. Such interests may vary from State to State, from climate to climate, from areas to areas because of many diverse factors and forces obtaining in any particular area, the necessity of security and various other factors which we need not detail or try to enumerate. It is sufficient to notice that this conflict makes an absolute appropriation of the ocean generally for the use of mankind difficult to achieve. Such a general appropriation without any reservation naturally brings in its wake a conflict between this general requirement of humanity and the particular interests of particular areas peculiar to coastal States. Our task will really be worthy of achievement if we can strike a delicate balance, a proper harmony between these two rival claims of particular areas. This is the problem viewed generally in its application. It might take different forms but it is fundamentally the problem today. On the one hand there is our eagerness to see that the sea, that all the resources of nature should be drawn upon for a common feast by humanity and there is on the other hand our eagerness as members of coastal States to see that this general feast may not deprive the daily bread or the daily necessities of the various constituencies. It reminds me of the words of a great Sanskrit Philosopher. Dealing with the high seas he said, "On the sea shore of the endless world is the great feast of humanity." This is true today as it ever was, and it is to make this feast enjoyable, to make it worthy of realisation consistent with the preservation of the reasonable interests of all the different States that will really lead the way for our work, and for a proper formulation of a common law of the sea.

Now, Sir, that at once opens up various ways to look at the problem and also exposes the various difficult problems which await solution today. As I said before that at one time, not very long ago, the high

seas were only regarded as the common highways for commerce and trade and navigation. A purely negative aspect of the high seas was really realised or sought to be used and expressed. The sea is there open to mankind for carrying merchandise and trade. That was the basic idea even at the time of Grotiers. The appropriation of sea to serve the needs of men was not so much appreciated. I am very thankful to the International Commission for paying a good deal of attention to this aspect of matter which is so vital because it opens up a large reservoir for man to draw upon, increase the supplies of those necessary materials which make life worth living today. It is not merely the negative aspect of sea which concerns us, it is the more positive aspect, namely, the exploitation of the resources of the sea, augmentation of the resources of sea and also possibly such aspects as preservation of the resources of the sea which really assume much more importance today than the freedom of navigation in the old sense. There is really no divergence of views on the point that the seas must be left open and kept open for trading as well as for navigation. That limited recognition of a fundamental fact, I don't think was ever blurred by any other matter as this was settled at the beginning of the 19th century beyond any dispute. Two celebrated judges--one in England and another across the Atlantic in America--settled the law for all times. The first case was the wellknown case of Le Louis. Lord Stowell delivered his judgment sitting in the Exchequer Chamber. It is a very celebrated judgment. I think it is reported in Dodd's report Vol. 2 p. 210 at page 243. He said that nations of the world have an equal right over the unappropriated parts of the sea for free navigation. Again, two very significant limitations. One, the

unappropriated parts of the sea that means the high seas not comprehended by the territorial waters, historical bays and various other special areas. Barring those areas the right to navigate was recognised as a fundamental right enjoyed by all States. The other limitation was that it was the right to navigate only, a limited right. The right to exploit, the right to augment, the right to participate in the resources of the sea whether in water, under water or under the sea-bed were matters which were not considered. The second celebrated judgment is that of the great American judge, Judge Story in the very well-known case of Marina Flora. Judge Story, as you know, had a great flourish in

### <Pg-90>

the employment of his language, a great master of the English language. He said, "Upon the ocean, in times of peace every State possesses an entirely equal right. It is the highway of all, appropriated to the use of all, and no one can vindicate to himself any special claim or prerogative there." It seems to me that Judge Story advanced the matter a little further for he not only regarded the high seas as high ways of commerce but also conceived the high seas as appropriated to the use of all. That aspect, Sir, has assumed very great importance today and about this I was trying to express our view. Now, Sir, as I said that this conflict must continue so long as the world is divided into different States, between the

larger needs of humanity for proper utilization, for proper participation in the exploitation of the seas and its resources and also for the proper use of sea as a common highway for commerce and trade and on the other hand the special needs of others and special areas. This conflict takes the form of various problems like the territorial waters, continental shelf and the contiguous zones. Now, as you know, neither the Hague Codification Conference nor the International Law Commission arrived at a general agreement regarding the proper breadth of the territorial seas which will be accepted by all as the proper breath. The reason is obvious. As I said that this work of bringing about harmony between the freedom of the sea and the particular interests of particular States cannot always follow the same way for everyone. Our task should be to find the largest area of agreement as regards this particular matter. I am happy to say that over a very broad area we have agreement. Over this particular matter of territorial sea we have to arrive at some formula which will bring about the greatest measure of agreement among the States. As you are well aware, the big maritime powers have been recognising a threemile limit to be the proper breadth of the territorial sea. The United Kingom and

America support that view. There are others who prefer the six-mile limit. So far as my country is concerned, by a Proclamation of the President issued in 1953, we prescribed a six-mile limit for our territorial waters. There is support for that point of view in the report, of the Rapporteur appointed in the 4th Session of the International Law Commission. In his report which is document A.CN-4|53 he supports the idea of a six-mile limit. The reasons are obvious. Due to technical improvements increasing the speed of the coastal vessel and increased efficiency of the coastal States in supervising the waters guiding their shores, a six-mile limit is regarded by many as the proper and reasonable limit, for security reasons and for reasons which may be of an economic nature or of other types.

The International Law Commission in its 8th Session reported that there is no particular agreement amongst the nations as regards the proper breadth of the territorial sea. I regret to say that I cannot agree with my esteemed friend, the Leader of the United Kingdom Delegation, that the three-mile limit is now a fact of International Law. I would respectfully point out that it is not so and that all States have not agreed about that particular prescription of International Law. But I agree, Sir, that as a matter of International Law a limit beyond twelve miles is not recognised by the consensus of opinion prevailing in the field of International Law. Our Government, therefore, agree with the Commission that in order to achieve a uniform rule, in order to achieve the greatest measure of agreement between States adhering to divergent views on the matter it is better to strike at some formula which would strike a balance between the rival views held by different States and which would at the same time conform to the well recognised prescription of the International Law that the territorial waters should not extend beyond twelve-miles.

I am happy to say, Sir, that Article 3 of the draft recommendation of the International Law Commission recognises these factors. If I may read, Sir, Article 3. It reads thus:--

That Commission recognises that International practice is not uniform as regards the delimitation of the territorial sea;

The Commission considers that International Law does not permit an extension of the territorial sea beyond 12 miles;

The Commission, without taking any decision as to the breadth of the territorial sea up to that limit, notes, on the one hand that many States have fixed a breadth greater than 3 miles, and, on the other hand, that many States do not recognise such

< Pg-91 >

a breadth when that of their own territorial sea is less;

The Commission considers that the breadth of the territorial sea should be fixed by an International Conference.

Sir, May I humbly propose on behalf of my Government that since it appears to be extremely difficult to achieve unanimity of views regarding the breadth of the territorial waters which may be prescribed by all the States, it may be really worthy of consideration as to whether or not we should adopt an Article which would prescribe the limit beyond which territorial waters cannot extend and yet at the same time leave the ultimate discretion with the coastal States to fix the breadth for the particular coastal State within the ceiling. If we take the ceiling of 12 miles we may leave the ultimate discretion with the coastal States to fix their territorial waters within that ceiling. That will certainly achieve a greater unanimity than we have achieved at the present moment on this rather difficult problem. As I said this is an important form of the contradiction which results whenever the needs of the freedom of the sea comes in conflict with the particular needs of the coastal States.

Then, Sir, we have the other problems. The problem of innocent passage, the problem of historic bays, the problem of merchant ships plying within territorial waters, the jurisdiction of the coastal States over them, Government ships carrying on commerce as also carrying on non-commercial activities, warships of particular States plying in territorial waters and others. With regard to the recommendations of the International Law Commission regarding these matters, my Government are in general agreement, and in fact from Articles 1 to 25 we are in general agreement with the recommendations of the International Law Commission. Of course we have certain reservations to make. Now, Sir, we must all agree that the ocean must be thrown open to mankind as a whole. Those who have come earlier in the field must lead the underdeveloped countries as to how best to exploit the sea for their own needs. It is the responsibility given

to them along with the advantages they have acquired through centuries of past experience by their improved scientific techniques and other knowledge.

For instance, a very important matter which is vital for many countries that are underdeveloped today, is the exploitation of oiling areas occuring under the sea-bed. The under-developed countries are not yet equipped to exploit these sources to the maximum. They must be assisted by their more fortunate brothers, the more advanced nations who will exploit this not for their advantage but for the advantage of the areas which they mean to serve. There must be realisation that the power enjoyed by some States really affords opportunities to them to serve the more under-developed countries. I am sure, Sir, that with regard to that aspect of the matter there would be no disagreement in substance or in principle. In working out the outline there may be disagreement but so far as the general principle is concerned. I have not the least doubt that it will receive the general approval of this Conference, that the sea must be exploited, used, utilised and utilised more and more by conservation and by augmentation of its resources by everyone including those who have not yet been able to participate in its fruits in a common endeavour and that rules which are framed should assist the under-developed countries in conformity with the great human effort which is in progress today.

Now, Sir, I may mention another point which is complicated and thorny--a problem which it appears is going to be raised either here on the 2nd or in some other Committee -- the question of nuclear explosions in the high seas. It is contended by some that nuclear explosions carried out in the high seas not only interfere with the freedom of navigation on the high seas but also destroys the living and other resources of the sea and may possibly also cause widespread pollution. Whether it produces a widespread pollution in any vast area of the ocean of the living resources is a matter about which scientists have not yet agreed. Some say it causes pollution, others say it does not. The matter remains to be determined in future. But there is an apprehension of serious prejudice being caused to vast areas of the seas. There is no doubt about it and this apprehension has been loudly expressed by countries which happen to be situated in areas near those where nuclear explosions in the high seas have occurred and may occur in the future. It is worthy of consideration, Sir, whether this matter should be raised in a conference of lawyers who have assembled to frame a

#### <Pg-92>

body of rules for the sea or whether it should not be left for discussion in the 1st Committee of the United Nations General Assembly or the General Assembly of the United Nations as part of the general question of nuclear explosions. The view of our Government is well-known on the matter. We are against any nuclear explosions. We believe, Sir, that the peace of the world cannot be established by rival powers engaging in explosions of frightful weapons in their

respective areas or in trying to perfect frightful weapons of war whose consequences can hardly be imagined. We believe, Sir, that the way to peace is not the manufacture of dreadful weapons matched against each other but to bring about a climate which recognises that in the world there would be different States adhering to different ideologies, different ways of life and that nevertheless it is possible to live together. If we cannot live together the only alternative is mass destruction. There is no golden mean between the two possibilities. This is the firm conviction, Sir, which we have expressed in the past and we hope to do so in the future. We say so not in the assumption that we are wise than others. We say so very humbly because we sincerely believe that apart from the clash of arms, apart from the collision of the dreadful engines of war, there is a way of life which might sustain different ideologies and different ways of life to exist together which we call 'path of peaceful co-existence.' It is possible for all of us to live together in a spirit of tolerance, a spirit which recognises diversity of spirit, which recognises certain hard facts of life which can only be appreciated but cannot be destroyed. So far as our Delegation is concerned we are not yet decided as to whether this is a proper forum for a discussion on this question of nuclear explosions whether on the high seas or elsewhere and whether this matter should better be left to be dealt with where it has been dealt with in the past and where we hope it will be possible to find a fruitful solution, namely as a part of the general question of disarmament, the general question for the regulation of nuclear weapons as methods of war so that the utilisation of this vast energy, which man has discovered only for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind may be made possible and there may continue this limitless reservoir of nature for men to enjoy and not to destroy.

These are the general views which we want to express on behalf of our Delegation. As I said we are generally in agreement starting from Article 1 to 25 and want to emphasise that let the future law of the sea be framed only for this purpose, namely, for the purpose of common enjoyment of the sea by mankind for the benefit of all, for the underdeveloped countries, as for the developed ones, for the advanced countries as for the less advanced countries and let not this freedom of the sea be turned into a tool of oppression, as the freedom of enterprise of the Industrial Revolution had turned out to be an engine of oppression for those who were less favourably situated in life leading to untold social and economic evils which took quite a long time for the advanced countries of the West to remedy. Let not any rules be framed which can be turned into a tool of oppression or any physical advantage in the hands of the more powerful ones. Let the law be so designed that, it may ensure that for every State and every area of the world, there would be proper enjoyment of the sea not only as a highway for commerce but also as a great reservoir for mankind to draw upon for endless ages.

**Date**: Feb 28, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri A. K. Sen's Statement at International Conference on Law of the Seas

Shri A. K. Sen, Union Minister for Law, and Leader of the Indian delegation to International Conference held in Geneva on Law of the Seas, made the following statement on Apr 09, 1958 at the First Committee of the Conference:--

Mr. Chairman, Sir,

I speak with a great sense of responsibility while I take the floor to support the joint Indian and Mexican proposal relating to Article 3--document A|Con. 13 C. 1|L. 79. When I spoke in the course of the general debate in the First Committee, I stated that according to my delegation and my country there was no International Law prescribing a 3-mile limit for the territorial seas of a coastal State. Nothing has been said since then which would compel us to change our view. It is in my view unnecessary to delve into the history of this very complex but important aspect of International Law. It

<Pg-93>

is sufficient to say that only two things emerge with certainty through the complex web of history, namely,

It is universally recognised that the coastal States exercise sovereignty over a part of the sea adjacent to its coast,

There has been no uniformity as regards the width of the adjacent sea claimed by a coastal State as its territorial sea over which it seeks to exercise sovereignty.

I would only quote from the celebrated works of the American author, James Kent, from his Commentaries on Maritime Law (New York 1926). He stated in volume 1 at page 29 as follows:

It is difficult to draw any precise or determinate conclusion amidst the variety of opinion as to the distance to which a State may lawfully extend its exclusive domination over the sea adjacent to its territory, and beyond those portions of the sea which are embraced by harbours, gulfs, bays and estuaries and over which its jurisdiction unquestionably extends.

According to him, "All that can be reasonably asserted is, that the dominion or the sovereignty of the, shore over the contiguous sea extends as far as is required for the purpose of safety and for other lawful ends."

It is unnecessary to multiply the number of reputed jurists who have maintained that the fixed cannon shot rule or the one league limit has not been universally accepted in its application. My esteemed colleague, Ambassador Garcia Robles has already drawn the attention of the Committee to the views of Professor Gidel on this matter. It is difficult to imagine that a great writer like Professor Gidel would be lacking so much in precision that he would write something which he did not mean. In the admirable synoptic table prepared by the Secretariat in pursuance of the resolution of the First Committee dated 13 March, being document No. A. Conf. 13|C. 1|L. II. Ref. 1, a chart is given showing how different limits have been prescribed by different States who are represented in this Conference. A look at the chart will convince anyone that the three-mile limit has not found acceptance excepting from a few maritime powers.

An analysis of the process by which the great maritime powers, like U.K., U.S. and Japan, came to accept the limit of 3 miles for the territorial sea would show that various factors played their part. The predominant factor has been the eagerness to find the breadth of the territorial sea which would best serve the interests of navigation and fishing in which these great powers were greatly interested. It is not merely accidental that these great powers accepted the three-mile limit as the most reasonable one when their acceptance is viewed in the context of their large fishing and shipping interests stretching out into the waters adjacent to the coasts of other States. It is equally true that an exclusive appropriation of large areas of the adjacent seas by the coastal States would work substantial injury to the fishing interests of many of these States. The distinguished delegate from the U.K. has already explained how the interests of his country would be affected if a 12mile limit was prescribed for exclusive fishing rights of coastal States.

So long as smaller nations did not start upon exploiting the seas adjacent to their coasts for fishing and other purposes, the, conflict between the votaries of a 3-mile territorial sea and those claiming larger areas did not receive much attention. For the last few decades, however, the smaller nations have started exploiting their adjacent seas as a result of which this conflict has assumed fairly serious proportion. It is necessary for the Conference to appreciate this. It is also imperative for the big maritime powers to understand this. As I said in the course of my statement in the general debate in the First Committee, we must find a balance and a compromise to resolve this conflict. A vast majority of the smaller nations regard a territory up to 12-miles, depending upon the circumstances in each case, as necessary to safeguard their interests in the seas adjacent to their coasts. Many of the smaller nations

have preferred claims extending much beyond 12 miles. It will be not an insignificant success, however, if this Conference at least can settle the law that the territorial sea cannot extend beyond 12 miles and to that extent it will be achieving an element of certainty in this rather complex problem.

### <Pg-94>

It is with a full realization of the claims of smaller nations that we have proposed, in cooperation with Mexico, our resolution so as to achieve harmony between the claims of smaller nations and interests of big maritime powers. It is now clear that the majority of the States represented here do not favour a three-mile limit. There are many States, like ourselves, who have prescribed a six-mile limit, but who are ready to concede to other States the right to a wider limit up to a maximum of 12 miles should they consider it necessary to do so for their own interests. I presume that no States will go up to a 12-mile limit unless it is absolutely necessary for them to do so.

We are very happy to know that similar spirit of compromise has actuated the Canadian delegation and the delegation of the U.K. to table their own proposals. We deeply appreciate the spirit with which these proposals have been submitted and our delegation while it finds itself unable to accept these proposals, feels it its duty to extend its feeling of gratitude to the Canadian and the U.K. delegations for their fundamental desire to arrive at a compromise which is so essential for the success of this Conference and for the solution of all international conflicts. I agree with the leader of the U.K. delegation that their proposal marks a striking departure from their traditional stand in this matter. I hope this spirit of compromise, which has been so manifest in this Conference throughout, will extend beyond the confines of this Conference and will pave the way for happy solution of all international disputes and differences.

It is necessary, however, for our delegation to explain why it has found it difficult to accept either the Canadian or the U.K. proposal. Firstly it appears that neither will have general acceptance in this Conference and if we agree to arrive at a compromise it must be so for the purpose of receiving general acceptance at least the concurrence of two-thirds of the States represented here. It is the absence of a chance to receive such an acceptance, so far as these proposals are concerned, which has largely influenced our decision.

Secondly, the resolution which we tabled in collaboration with Mexico was really an expression of the views of a large number of States who felt that having regard to their special problems and circumstances, it was necessary to have a flexible formula which concedes a limit of 12 miles to the coastal State to prescribe its territorial sea. It seems that neither the British proposal nor the Canadian proposal has found favour with these large number of States and in the absence of their concurrence it is difficult for our delegation to accept any

proposal as a happy compromise, however meritorious it may be and however liberal it may be compared to the orthodox point of view of those supporting them.

Thirdly, those who support the Canadian proposal have expressed themselves quite candidly against the British proposal and the U.K. delegation has been no less emphatic in expressing their views against the Canadian proposal. In the context of these rather serious divergencies of views between the supporters of the two proposals, it is difficult for any State not subscribing to either of the views to accept one in preference to the other. It is difficult for our delegation to accept a position wherein we may be called upon, along with a large number of States to decide which is the better formula for compromise. It is to say the least the most onerous and odious task which is not welcome by us or those who support us.

Fourthly, coming to the important elements falling within these two proposals, it is necessary to point out that the British proposal seeks to leave the area beyond three miles open and unrestricted for all aircraft military or otherwise and for warships. This appears to be objectionable to many. Having regard to the terrific speed of modern military aircraft and Warships a six-mile limit even appears to be rather inadequate to many small countries. The Canadian proposal appears to be open to similar objections.

We would have been happy ourselves if every State or at least a vast majority of the States represented in this Conference accepted, like ourselves, a six-mile limit as their territorial sea and some special rights in respect to the sea adjacent to their territorial sea which they may deem necessary for the preservation of their special interests in conformity with the rightful claims and interests of their neighbours. But since there are many States, especially small States, who

<Pg-95>

feel that a 12-mile limit is necessary for their own special interests, our delegation finds it difficult to reject their claims.

I hope that by the time this Conference ends we shall be able to arrive at some happy compromise which will be acceptable to all merit and is likely to prove acceptable to the States. We feel that our proposal has this majority of States. Even if we cannot we shall be achieving a good deal if we can arrive at final decisions with regard to other non-controversial matters in this and other Committees and not depending upon Articles 1, 2, 3 or 66. If we can at least take a decision that no other States can extend its territorial sea beyond 12 miles limit We would have travelled a long way.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA JAPAN UNITED KINGDOM MEXICO

**Date**: Apr 09, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

**JAPAN** 

Indo-Japanese Agreement on Scheme for Industries

A comprehensive scheme for the establishment of a Prototype Workshop and Training Centre for small industries at Howrah has been drawn up following discussions between the Japanese Technical Survey Mission and officials of the Government of India.

The Japanese Mission under the leadership of Mr. K. Tachibana arrived in India on 23 April, and has been having a series of discussions with officials of the Government of India and of the Government of West Bengal. The Mission consists of experts in machine tool, foundry, forging, electrical measuring instruments, etc.

The details of the project, including the machinery and equipment and technical experts required for the Centre have been included in the agreed minutes of discussions signed on May 14, 1958 by Dr. P. C. Alexander, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. K. Tachibana on behalf of the Japanese Mission.

This was followed by an exchange of letters between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry and Mr. A. Shigemitsu, Counsellor, Japanese Embassy in India.

While the conclusions reached between the two countries have been endorsed in the exchange of letters, further discussions will take place between the two Governments on the implementation of the scheme of the project which has been drawn up.

JAPAN USA INDIA

**Date**: May 14, 1958

# Volume No

1995

**NEW ZEALAND** 

### Aid Under Colombo Plan

In a written reply to a question, Shri A. P. Jain, Union Minister fo Food and Agriculture, laid a statement on the table of Lok Sabha on 30 April, showing the progress in respect of dairy schemes, for which assistance was being received from the New Zealand Government under the Colombo Plan.

Regarding Kaira District Co-operative Milk Producers' Union Ltd., Anand, Bombay State, it was stated that in 1955, the New Zealand Government supplied equipment, valued at œ20,000 for the manufacture of butter and casein, to this Milk Union. The services of a dairy engineer to instal this equipment were also provided. The equipment was in use since 1956 for the manufacture of butter and casein of "Amul" brands.

Under the Bombay Milk Supply Scheme. about 800 maunds of milk were obtained daily from the Kaira District Co-operative Producers' Union Ltd., Anand. At present this was transported in cans in insulated wagons, which were refrigerated with ice. As this mode of transport was proving

### <Pg-96>

expensive, it was intended to change over to the cheaper and more efficient system of rail-road tankers. The Government of New Zealand supplied eight rail-road and four road tankers estimated to cost  $\infty 85,000$  under the Colombo Plan. These had been received in Bombay, and the underframes for the rail-road tankers were being constructed according to Indian Railways Standard Specifications.

A sum of æ85,000 had also been granted for the construction of a hostel at the Aarey Milk Colony, Bombay.

The statement further indicated that a vacreator valued at 64,200 was supplied in 1956 for use to process cream and ice-cream mix, sought to be handled in the new dairy in Calcutta of the Greater Calcutta Milk Scheme.

Under the international co-operation action project of the F.A.O., the Government of New Zealand, in association with some other countries, which were surplus in dairy products, helped the Greater Calcutta Milk Scheme by providing  $\alpha$ 41,000 for technical assistance, and agreeing to provide up to about 300 tons of skim milk powder at the concessional price of  $\alpha$ 50 C.I.F., Calcutta. during the three-year period 1959. Two dairy experts were employed for a period of one year with a part of these funds, and 58 tons of skim milk powder had been received at the concessional price.

A sum of 800,000, the statement continued, had been agreed to be given for purchase of dairy equipment required for the Delhi Milk Supply Scheme, of which &400,000 had been received.

The Central Dairy and a number of rural milk collection and chilling centres, which would house this equipment, were under construction.

The New Zealand Government had also made available the services of one of its senior technical officers for a period up to two years to help in the planning and in implementation of the Delhi scheme.

Dairy equipment worth  $\infty$ 42,000 and 20 sets of books on dairying worth  $\infty$ 850 were being supplied to the National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal. The equipment, a part of which had been received, And the books were to be used for training dairy students at that Institute.

Referring to the Patna Milk Scheme, the statement indicated that the New Zealand Government had originally agreed to assist the Cooperative Milk Union, Patna, to the extent of æ9,000 in 1954-55. But this had very lately been increased to æ40,000 to enable the Bihar Government to buy equipment for a new dairy, plans for the construction of which were being prepared.

NEW ZEALAND SRI LANKA INDIA RUSSIA USA

**Date**: May 14, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

Statement on Dr. Graham's Report

In. reply to a question in Rajya Sabha, on 5 May, the Deputy Ministe for External Affairs, Shrimati L. N. Menon replied: Dr. Graham has himself stated in general terms the Government of India's attitude to his Report. That attitude is governed by the basic facts of the situation. Unless these are recognised, a peaceful and lasting solution will not be found.

Dr. Graham put forward the following suggestions:

A renewed declaration by both parties in favour of maintaining an atmosphere of peace and observing the integrity of the cease-fire line. We are entirely in favour of maintaining peace and observing the cease-fire line, and we have adhered to this throughout these years. We pointed out, however, that such a declaration on our part might imply that there had been a breach of it on our side.

Withdrawal of Pakistan troops: This action has to be taken by Pakistan and in our opinion should certainly be taken so as to vacate the aggression.

<Pg-97>

The placing of U.N. troops on Pakistan territory along the Jammu and Kashmir border. This again is a matter for Pakistan to decide as the proposal relates to Pakistan territory only and not to the Jammu and Kashmir State. We consider the proposal to bring in foreign troops regrettable, but it was for Pakistan to agree or not to agree.

A meeting of the two Prime Ministers under Dr. Graham's chairmanship. We are always agreeable to a meeting of the two Prime Ministers whenever this may be considered feasible and profitable, But we are not agreeable to such a meeting taking place under anyone's chairmanship.

PAKISTAN INDIA

**Date**: May 14, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### Indo-U.S. Technical Assistance Agreement

The Governments of India and the United States on May 27, 1958 signed eigh Indo-American programme agreements under which India will receive \$285,555 in technical assistance in the fields of ground-water exploration, livestock improvement, industrial research, health, cooperative membership, education and agriculture.

The projects represent a portion of \$6.3 million programme of technical assistance to India under the United States fiscal years 1958 budget.

The agreements were signed by Mr. N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, for the Government of India, and Mr. Harry A. Hinderer, Acting Director of the United States Technical Co-operation Mission to India.

Under the agreement covering groundwater exploration, 153,000 dollars are provided to extend the contract of the Ralph M. Parson Engineering Co., an American firm which is furnishing technical services to the exploratory Tubewell Organisation, India. A total of four million dollars has been provided for this programme in previous years.

A sum of 41,100 dollars is provided for improvement of Indian livestock. It will be used to procure from outside India equipment needed for cattle, swine, and poultry development and for improved marketing methods.

In the field of health, 7,500 dollars are provided for audio-visual and other demonstrational materials for the Central Bureau, of Health Education, and 14,430 dollars for the procurement of 30 microscopes and other scientific equipment needed for five regional centres concerned with the malaria eradication programme.

<Pg-98>

USA INDIA

**Date**: May 27, 1958

# June

103

**Volume No** 

# Foreign Affairs Record 1958 June Volume VI CONTENTS FINLAND Trade Arrangement Extended ... .. ... ... 99 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Reply to Pakistan Complaint ... ... ... ... 99

Observation Group for Lebanon .. .. ..

PAKISTAN Canal Water Supplies to Pakistan 103
RUMANIA Trade Agreement Extended 105
SWITZERLAND Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation 105
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  D.L.F. Loan to India 105  EXIM Bank Credit Agreement 106  Technical Assistance Agreement 106  Assistance for Iron Ore Project 107  Project Agreements 108  Assistance for Control of Malaria 108
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Air Agreement 108
<pg-i></pg-i>

FINLAND INDIA PAKISTAN LEBANON SWITZERLAND USA

**Date:** Jun 01, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### **FINLAND**

### Trade Arrangement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on Jun 23, 1958 between Shri C. S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Erkki Hedmanson, Charge de'Affaires ad interim of Finland, on behalf of his Government, extending the validity of the Trade Arrangement between the two countries until 31 December 1958.

The Trade Arrangement was originally concluded on 12 January 1951 and has since been extended from time to time. Under that the two Governments have agreed to endeavour to expand direct trade between the two countries.

Under the letters exchanged the validity of the schedules to the Trade Arrangement as revised last year, has also been extended until 31 December 1958 with a few additions. The following commodities have been added to the list of items available for export from India to Finland: Surgical dressings, prawns and other canned provisions, hosiery and knitted wears (cotton and nylon), rubber goods (including gum boots) and canvas shoes. To the schedule of items available for export from Finland to India permissible types of internal combustion engines and other machines and apparatus have been added.

The important items in the list of exports from India to Finland are tobacco, hides and skins, cashewnuts, spices, jute goods, tea, coffee, shellac, coir yarn and manufactures fibre for brushes and brooms, myrobolans 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, wood-working, plywood, road making, etc. and electrical and tele-communication cables.

FINLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date**: Jun 23, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

### Reply to Pakistan Complaint

The following is the full text of the letter sent by India's Permanent Representative to United Nations, Shri A. S. Lall, to the President of the Security Council on May 11, 1958. This is in reply to the letter dated 6 May 1958, sent by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to U.N., to the President of the Security Council on the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah:

Excellency,

In continuation of my delegation's letter No. 144/PR of 1 May 1958, (Document S/3999), I have been instructed by the Government of India to refer to the letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the U.N. to the President of the Security Council dated 6 May 1958, about the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah, and to state that this is a further instance of the campaign of misrepresentation and vilification that Pakistan has been carrying on against India during the last eleven years.

Sheikh Abdullah was served with an Order of detention, under Section 3 (1) (A) (III) of the Jammu and Kashmir Preventive Detention Act by the District Superintendent of Police on 29 April at Sowra, a village six miles from Srinagar. The Jammu and Kashmir Government ordered the detention of Sheikh Abdullah as "his remaining at large was hazardous to the security of the State." It is not possible at present to set out in detail the reasons for the Jammu and Kashmir Government's decision to detain Sheikh Abdullah, as there is a Conspiracy Case pending against some 21 persons in the Courts in Kashmir and much

### <Pg-99>

of such material is part of the evidence to be adduced at the trial and therefore sub judice. sheikh Abdullah, it may however be stated, had been harbouring at his own residence proclaimed offenders wanted in connection with crime, including looting, arson and murder, organised and committed by some Plebiscite Front workers at Hazratbal on 21 February 1958. One of these proclaimed offenders was apprehended in Sheikh Abdullah's house at the time of Sheikh Abdullah's arrest. In the above mentioned conspiracy matter, the prosecution (The Government of Jammu and Kashmir) has alleged that since Sheikh Abdullah's arrest and detention in August 1953, "he, his relatives and associates, including some of the accused, decided to bring about the overthrow of the Government of the State established by law and to that end, to enlist the support of, and join hands with, Pakistan agents and officials. To achieve this object, the accused, between 9 August 1953 and 29 April 1958, amongst themselves and with other persons, known, and unknown, at Srinagar and diverse other places, both in and outside the State, conspired to over-awe by means of criminal force, the Government of the State."

The detention of Sheikh Abdullah and the prosecution of others involved in the Conspiracy Case are matters entirely within the jurisdiction of the Jammu and Kashmir Government as a constituent State of the Union of India. I am instructed by my Government to lodge an emphatic protest against the letter dated 6 May, from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to Your Excellency which is a blatant attempt at interference with the internal affairs of Jammu and Kashmir, one of the constituent States of the Indian Union, a member-State of the U.N.

The basic assertion in the letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan is that Sheikh Abdullah had not the slightest intention of resorting to violence or of creating disturbances in the State and that in fact Sheikh Abdullah had emphasised the need for Hindu-Muslim amity. Based on these premises, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has imputed various motives for the detention of Sheikh Abdullah. That this basic assertion of the, Pakistan Permanent Representative is totally false can be seen from the following extracts from the reports of foreign press correspondents who have been seeing things for themselves during their frequent visits to Kashmir:

### INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

**Date**: May 11, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Manchester Guardian

Jan 11, 1958.

"The Sheikh is hitting India below the belt where it hurts most, where there is enough of communal suspense and a flicker of potential truth for things to flare up. Whether it is a responsible stand even for a patriot to take is open to question. It is no good saying 'occurrences of 1947 must not be repeated' and then to try to open a recently healed wound."

INDIA USA

**Date**: Jan 11, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Glasgow Herald

Jan 13, 1958.

"But it is questionable whether he (Sheikh Abdullah) was wise in bringing the issue of communalism into the open. No one, as the Sheikh said, wants a recurrence of the events of 1947. But to insist on Hindu-Muslim differences might be the easiest way of bringing it about."

INDIA USA

**Date**: Jan 13, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

New Statesman London

Jan 31, 1958.

"A somewhat new and regrettable development evident in his speeches is his inclination towards communalism the Hindu-Muslim inhibition that the Indian Government has been trying desperately to erase from India's mind not at unsuccessfully...... His first address Srinagar is said to have been liberally interspersed with verses from the Koran and delivered in an atmosphere reminiscent of communal meetings in pre-partition India."

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

**Date**: Jan 31, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

News Chronicle, London

May 01, 1958"He also played the dangerous game of setting the Muslims against Hindus to increase his personal following--something which might have ended in the same terrible bloodshed of partition."

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

**Date**: May 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

### Manchester Guardian

May 01, 1958 1958

"Apparently the strain thrown on the administration by the unsettling activities of Sheikh Abdullah reached a breaking point. Finally, the decision has been

<Pg-100>

taken to detain the Sheikh in order to relieve the valley of unnecessary political tension."

Sheikh Abdullah had been making public statements calculated to inflame religious passions and seeking to create conditions of disorder and lawlessness and supplementing Pakistan's subversive and sabotage activities in Jammu and Kashmir. For this purpose, Sheikh Abdullah began to collect large funds to organise a force of so called volunteers who were the nucleus of a private army. While addressing a meeting at Srinagar last March, Sheikh Abdullah used vituperative language against the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir and, when part of the audience walked out in protest, Sheikh Abdullah exhorted his audience to 'kill traitors if there are any amongst you' and added that his Razakars (name of his militant force of volunteers) were prepared to meet the situation. These activities of Sheikh Abdullah were well known in Pakistan and they had the continued support of the Pakistan Government, as the following report from "DAWN" of Karachi dated 8 May, will show:

INDIA ANGUILLA USA PAKISTAN

**Date**: May 01, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Dawn, Karachi.

May 08, 1958.

"It is stated that some kind of a "Macquis" underground organisation may soon spring up in occupied Kashmir to defy Bakshi's authority. Sheikh Abdullah had planned such an organisation as part of his anti-Indian fight in occupied Kashmir, but the planning was not completed when he was rearrested."

This was also noticed by foreign correspondents for example, the 'Daily Telegraph,' London, of 3 May 1958, has the following report:

"Even his `Private army,' they (Sheikh Abdullah's adherents) say, was a purely mercenary force paid œ3 a month with Pakistan money."

It is well and widely known that conditions in Jammu and Kashmir are normal despite these attempts to create disorder. Already 25,000 tourists have visited the valley. Restrictions on the taking out of processions and the holding of political meetings without the previous permission of the District magistrate, imposed in March last, have been withdrawn in most places. Celebrations in connection with the Spring Festival started throughout the valley on 19 May.

In spite of this and the reports of independent observers to this effect, Pakistan press and Radio have been putting out false and tendentious reports to misrepresent conditions in Jammu and Kashmir, misleading the world, increasing tension between the people of India and Pakistan and promoting a war psychosis amongst their people as will be seen from the following:

"Today's despatch from our special correspondent in Srinagar provides little evidence of the symptoms of public disturbance--the shops in Srinagar were all open today and busy ensnaring tourists in the usual manner. There is no curfew in the town and no sign of outward tension beyond intensified armed police patrols."

(Telegraph, London, 2 May 1958)

"In Srinagar a huge procession was taken out by the Plebiscite Front workers and it was lathi-charged by Bakshi police--about three hundred persons are said to have been arrested during the 24 hours. One this 76 were arrested in Srinagar alone."

(Radio Pakistan, 2 May 1958)

In my last letter No. 144PR dated 1 May, 1958 (S|3999), I referred to Pakistan Government's campaign of hatred and calumny against India in violation of the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948. Pakistan has committed and continues to commit grave violations of this resolution and of every undertaking she has given. Pakistan invaded the State with its regular armed forces, in defiance of this resolution. The people of Pakistan are subjected to a continuous campaign of hatred against India and the Pakistan leaders have now thrown all restraint to the winds and openly advocate war and further aggression against India. The following extracts show how the authorities in Pakistan who are guilty of flagrant violation of the

resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January 1948 are committing further violation of this resolution and instigating further aggression against India.

<Pg-101>

Chaudhri Mohammed Ali, Former Prime Minister and Leader of the Tehrik-e-Istakam-e-Pakistan.

"We shall .... direct our armed forces to go to the rescue of the people of Kashmir in a peaceful manner to protect them from the indignities and tortures being inflicted upon them. We shall simultaneously offer to enter into a no-war agreement with India in order to assure the people of India and the world of our peaceful intentions."

(Pakistan Times, 7 April 1958)

"The open clash with Bharat may occur in one, two or at the most three years but occur it must."

"If you avoid an open clash with Bharat on Kashmir issue, you will have to resort to this unhappy measure when Bharat stops the supply of canal water to you after 1961."

Mr. Ali said that if war was inevitable after three years on the canal waters issue why not fight it out now on the Kashmir issue? It would do a lot of good to the people of Kashmir and Pakistan, he added.

(Dawn, Karachi, 3 May 1958)

(Mr. Mohd. All) "said it was his firm belief that war between Bharat and Pakistan was inevitable. There were two, alternatives, either to fight out valiantly or die a coward's death."

"He said he was a serious minded person and would not indulge in an irresponsible talk or put forward an impracticable suggestion. He was sure that if the people of Pakistan waged Jehad, Pakistan was bound to score a victory over her enemy, who would not otherwise agree to a fair and just solution of the disputes, between the two countries."

(Dawn, Karachi, 10 May 1958)

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, ex-Prime Minister and the Awami League Chief

"We can no longer remain an idle spectator of the tragedy perpetrated on the helpless people of Kashmir."

(Dawn, Karachi, 3 May 1958)

Mr. I. I. Chundrigar, ex-Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition in the National Assembly.

"We in Pakistan, cannot sit idle while the conspirators against basic human rights of our brethren in Kashmir are out to destroy all democratic ways of life."

(Dawn, Karachi, 3 May 1958)

Malik Firoz Khan Noon, Prime Minister of Pakistan

"The freedom of Kashmir will come not from any outside help but through its own internal strength. Bharat is brown colonial country of the worst type. What she is doing in Kashmir today in the 20th century no white colonial Power ever did."

(Dawn, Karachi, 10 March 1958)

The Prime Minister said that in their struggle the people of Kashmir would find the Government and the people of Pakistan whole-heartedly behind them.

(Dawn, Karachi, 27 April 1958)

Khan Jalaluddin Khan, Minister of State for Interior Khan Jalaluddin Khan, warned the United Nations and Bharat here yesterday that unless a fair solution was found for the Kashmir dispute `we might be compelled to shed our blood for the liberation, of Kashmir.'

(Dawn, Karachi, 26 April 1958)

Dr. Jehangir Pervez, Organiser of the "Greater Pakistan Movement."

"We regard the existing frontiers of Pakistan as unnatural and arbitrary.

We believe that grave injustice was done to Pakistan and Muslims of the Sub-continent at the time of the partition of the old provinces of the Punjab and Bengal. Even the Quaid-i-Azam, may his soul rest in peace, had to describe the Radcliffe Award as perverse.

This wrong must be undone. There lies the solution of all the ailments of Pakistan."

<Pg-102>

"We will first of all concentrate on the liberation of Jammu and Kashmir. This done we shall consider what next steps should be taken."

(Dawn, Karachi, 8 April 1958)

Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, the Muslim League President.

"War is the only solution of the Kashmir tangle."

(Dawn, Karachi, 6 May 1958)

Rawalpindi, 26 May: The President of Pakistan Muslim League, Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, said here last night that war with Bharat was the only solution of the Kashmir problem.

Khan Qayyum Khan said he would do injustice to the nation if he did not tell them in unequivocal words that there was no other means of solving the Kashmir problem other than waging war against Bharat.

'Our cause is just and our stand on Kashmir righteous. There is no reason why we should not win the war against India,' he declared.

(Dawn, Karachi 27 May 1958)

I request that this communication may be circulated as a Security Council document and brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

INDIA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM ANGUILLA USA LATVIA MALI

**Date**: May 08, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

bservation Group for Lebanon

India has agreed to accept membership of the U.N. Observation Group, which is being sent to Lebanon in accordance with the recent resolution of the Security Council. Shri Rajeshwar Dayal, until recently Ambassador in Yugoslavia and High Commissionerdesignate to Pakistan, has been selected as the Indian representative.

INDIA LEBANON YUGOSLAVIA PAKISTAN

**Date**: May 08, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

### Canal Water Supplies to Pakistan

The Government of India issued the following Press Note on Jun 12, 1958 on the Canal Water Question:

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to certain statements reported to have been made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the Chief Minister of West Pakistan and also to a Press Note issued by the Government of Pakistan alleging withdrawal by India of what has been described as "Pakistan's share of the historic supplies" from the Beas and the Sutlej.

The supplies in the river Beas, which during early kharif is the only source oœ supply for all the Sutlej Valley canals in Pakistan and the Eastern and Bikaner canals in India, have been abnormally low from about the middle of May. Towards the end of the month, the supply in the river was hardly half of the average of the previous 10 years. The other eastern rives—the Sutlej and the Ravi—have also been much below normal.

As a result of the serious shrinkage in river supplies, the Bhakra canals in India have either remained closed or have received only nominal supplies. Some of the channels of the Upper Bari Doab Canal did not receive any water. On all our canals, sowing operations have received a serious set back. Reports about this serious situation of drought which, in fact, extends over large areas of Northern India have already appeared in the Press.

The Pakistan Sutlej Valley canals have had the advantage since 1955 of an additional source of water supply from the River Chenab through the Merala-Ravi, BallokiSuleimanki and other link canals. The supply in the River Chenab has been suffi-

$$<$$
Pg-103>

cient to enable substantial quantities of water (even more than the total supply of the River Beas) being brought, through these link canals, to all the Pakistan Sutlej Valley canals, including the lower part of the Dipalpur canal. The Pakistan cultivator has thus been in a much better position regarding canal water supplies than his Indian counterpart.

From 1 April to 10 May, the Dipalpur canal received its full requirements as intimated by the Pakistan canal officers and substantial quantities were delivered below Ferozepur. From 11 May, the river supplies fell and it was not possible to meet the indent of either the Dipalpur canal or the Indian canals at Ferozepur. The Dipalpur canal was closed on May 15, on receipt of a request from the Pakistan canal officers to do so; it remained closed until 26 May. When this canal was reopened, at Pakistan's request, on 27 May, its indent was pitched high at 6,950 cusecs. The total supply in the

River Beas, at that time, being about 7,000 cusecs, it was impossible to meet this indent in full.

The total volume of water given to the Dipalpur canal at Ferozepur, during the month of May this year, was 50 per cent more than what this canal received in the same period in 1941 when the river supply was of the same order. In several other years, prior to 1947, the Dipalpur canal received less water than it did this year. As stated above, this canal should also have received this year some supplementary supplies from the link canals.

Daily intimation is sent by the canal officers in the Punjab to their counterparts in Pakistan about the supplies delivered to Pakistan canals. It was, however, only after 23 May that a number of telegrams were received from the canal officers in Pakistan complaining about shortage of water. Replies were sent promptly informing them of the low level of river supplies and the difficulties being felt in India on this account

The Indian and Pakistani delegations, during the discussions under the auspices of the World Bank, arrived at three agreements ad hoc for transitional arrangements for the period April, 1955, to March 1957. In these agreements, India was entitled to make "additional withdrawals" from the eastern rivers equivalent to Pakistan's ability to replace these withdrawals through its link canals mentioned above. The additional withdrawals made by India during the latter part of May this year were in fact less than those provided for this period in the Agreement for 1956. It may be pointed out that the withdrawals agreed upon in 1956 were fixed at a relatively low figure on account of the damage to the link canals caused by the floods of October, 1955, which had not been fully repaired. Since then, these link canals have been repaired and their capacity must now be much larger.

In view of the above, it is difficult to understand the complaints and press propaganda being made in Pakistan particularly when the conditions on the Sutlej Valley canals in Pakistan should be much better than that on the Punjab canals. Far from acting in a manner contrary to the spirit of the current negotiations, under the auspices of the World Bank, India has been imposing unilateral restrictions on her own withdrawals in accordance with the spirit of the Agreement of 4 May 1948, and the principles governing the withdrawals of water as put forward by the Bank for the transition period.

The Agreements for ad hoc transitional arrangements, referred to above, provided for exchange between India and Pakistan of data relating to river flow and canal withdrawals, on a reciprocal basis. On the expiry of the last of these Agreements in March, 1957, Pakistan discontinued the supply of this information while India continued to supply such data as was being supplied earlier in accordance with arrangements existing under the Agreement of 4 May 1948.

The Government of India have now proposed to the Pakistan authorities that both sides should resume, with immediate effect, the supply of data in accordance with the Agreement of 1956-57 and, as a gesture of India's goodwill and co-operation, instructions to this effect have already been issued to local canal officers in Punjab. It is hoped that Pakistan will also co-operate and resume the supply of data relating to its side.

<Pg-104>

### PAKISTAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Jun 12, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### **RUMANIA**

### Trade Agreement Extended

Pending negotiations for the modifications of the Indo-Rumanian Trad Agreement, concluded in March 1954, the validity of the Schedules attached to this Agreement has been extended for a further period of three months ending 93, 1958, through letters exchanged in New Delhi between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. D. Niculescu, Trade Representative and Commercial Counsellor of the Rumanian People's Republic in India.

There has been a sizeable increase in trade between the two countries since the conclusion of the Trade Agreement. Exports during 1957 were valued at 5.46 million rupees as against 0.8 million rupees in 1956 and 0.2 million rupees in 1955. Imports during 1957 amounted to 5.23 million rupees as against 2.4 million rupees in 1956 and 3.5 million rupees in 1955.

INDIA USA

**Date**: 93, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **SWITZERLAND**

### Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation

Discussions for the avoidance of double taxation between Switzerland and India took place in Berne between delegations of the two Governments from 16 to Jun 21, 1958. In regard to avoidance of double taxation in respect of air enterprises of one country operating in the other, an agreement has been initialled. It will be signed as soon as possible in New Delhi and will be applicable to taxation payable for aircraft operation as in financial year 1957-58. Preliminary discussions on other points have concluded and it is expected that further discussions thereon will be resumed later in the year.

SWITZERLAND USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 21, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### D.L.F. Loan to India

The first loan to be disbursed by the Development Loan Fund of U.S.A was given to India when two agreements were signed on 23 June, one in New Delhi and one in Washington covering a loan of \$75 million. An agreement allotting \$25 million for the road transportation schemes, \$5 million for the development of cement industry and \$5 million for the development of jute industry was signed by Shri Morarji R. Desai, Finance Minister, Government of India and Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to India. A similar agreement covering \$40 million for the Indian Railway system was signed in Washington by Mr. Dempster McIntosh. Manager of the Development Loan Fund and Shri H. Dayal, Charge de Affaires, Indian Embassy in Washington. Repayment by India will be in rupees.

The signing of these two agreements together with the loan agreement with the Export-Import Bank signed on Jun 12, 1958, completes the allocation of \$225 million given by the U.S. Government as loan to India during the fiscal year 1958.

An agreement was also signed covering \$57 million for allocation of surplus agricultural commodities in U.S.A. to India under the PL 480 programme. This will raise the total allocations under the programme

to India to nearly \$420 million and will make available an additional quantity of about 700,000 tons in wheat, milo and maize. Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador signed the agreement making the additional commodities available and Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance

<Pg-105>

signed on behalf of the Government of India. The rupees to be generated by the sale of the commodities covered by this agreement would be lent to the Government of India up to the equivalent of \$35 million for development projects to be mutually agreed upon between the two Governments. The balance of \$22 million will be utilised by the U.S. Government for various purposes also after consultation between the two Governments.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### **EXIM Bank Credit Agreement**

A formal Agreement was signed in Washington on Jun 12, 1958, relatin to the credit of \$150 million from the Export-Import Bank of the United States to the Government of India for the purchase of capital equipment for India's development projects.

The credit will bear interest at 5 1/4 percent and will be for a term of fifteen years, the repayment of principal commencing only on 15 January 1964.

As earlier announced (4 March 1958), the following types of activity both in the public sector and in the private sector are expected to be given facilities for acquiring capital equipment under this arrangement: Irrigation and reclamation, power, transport, communications, mining and certain selected industries, such as, textiles, chemical industries, fabrication of heavy structures, electrical equipment and machine tools. Changes can, however, be made in the list by mutual aggreement between the Government of India and the Export-Import Bank of the United States of America.

As usual with all loans made by the Export-Import Bank of the United States, purchases will have to be in the United States and will have

to be transhipped in U.S. flag ships.

The detailed procedures for utilisation of the credit have already been finalised by the Government of India and so far as the private sector is concerned, public notices have been issued on 18 March and 18 April 1958. It is expected that orders for equipment to be financed under the credit will all be placed within the next twelve months.

The Agreement was signed on behalf of India by Shri H. Dayal, Charge d' Affaires, and on behalf of the Export-Import Bank of the United States by its President, Mr. Samuel C. Waugh.

USA INDIA LATVIA

**Date**: Jun 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### **Technical Assistance Agreement**

The Government of United States and India on Jun 19, 1958 signed 10 project agreements under which India will receive a total of \$1,681,744 in technical assistance funds for various phase of Indian developmental activity. Included in the total is \$1,150,288 for assistance to Indian Technical Education Institutions.

The projects represent a portion of the \$6.3 million programme of technical assistance to India under the United States Fiscal Year 1958 Budget. The agreements were signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the United States Technical Co-operation Mission to India.

The agreement on technical education is a supplemental agreement to concentrate additional technical assistance in five Indian Engineering Colleges.

Under the agreement inter-university contracts will be executed with three U.S. engineering institutions to provide a total of 26 three-year U.S. engineering professor positions at the following Indian colleges:

Indian Institute of Technology at Kharagpur, Bengal Engineering College at Howrah, University of Roorkee at Roorkee, Guindy Engineering College at Madras, Poona College of Engineering at Poona.

Also, training opportunities in the United States will be provided under contract for 20 Indian participants in this field.

<Pg-106>

The other agreements provide funds as follows:

For Expansion and Modernization of Marine and Inland Fisheries-\$65,370 to provide additional commodities and technical assistance to the Deep Sea Fishing Station, Bombay and demonstrational equipment for the Fisheries Extension Centre, New Delhi.

For Building Materials--\$2,500 for additional equipment for the structural Engineering Laboratory of the Central Building and Research Institute, Roorkee.

For Grain Storage--\$28,409 for assistance to four Regional Food Grain Analysis Laboratories at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi and the Central Grain Analysis Laboratory of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

For Agricultural Information, Production and Training--\$5,500 for continued technical assistance to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the various states in the field of agricultural information and training.

For Crop Production and Development--\$51,343 cor hybrid maize and seed improvement in Punjab and Uttar Pradesh.

For Assistance to National Professional Education Centre--\$90,000 to continue services of one Professor of Educational Administration, a Guidance Specialist, and a Textbook Specialist for a period of two years each.

For U.P. Agricultural University--\$147,500 to assist the Government of India in the establishment of an Agricultural University of the U.S. Land Grant College type at Rudrapur, Uttar Pradesh.

For Indian Airlines---\$2,834 for training aids and laboratory equipment for an airline flight despercher training programme.

For Geological Survey of India--\$138.000 for diamond drilling equipment to be used in pilot projects in Almora district of the Himalayas, Singhbhum district in Bihar and Chitaldrug district in Mysore.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 19, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### Assistance for Iron Ore Project

An agreement was signed in New Delhi Jun 25, 1958 allotting \$20 million from the U.S.President's Asian Economic Development Fund to India for a multi-purpose project which would develop the Iron Ore Mines in the Rourkela area, would construct a new railway line from Sambalpur to Titlagarh and would also undertake improving the facilities at the port of Vizag in order to increase the export of Iron Ore from India to Japan. The agreement was signed by Mr. Howard E. Houston, Minister-Director, Technical Cooperation Mission and Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance. Mr. Shigemitsu, Counsellor of the Japanese Embassy in New Delhi, was present.

The U.S. Congress set up this Fund in 1955 with an idea to help projects for economic development in Asia in which more than one country would be interested. Accordingly, a project for improving the export of Iron Ore from India to Japan has been under discussion between representatives of the Government of India, Japan and U.S.A. since the Colombo Plan conference at Singapore in October 1955. After detailed discussions and examination of the feasibility of Railway constructions in the area involved by a firm of well-known American consultants, detailed negotiations were undertaken with representatives of the Japanese Steel Industry last year. An agreement was reached in March 1958 between an Indian Negotiating Team headed by the Cabinet Secretary and the Japanese Steel Mission led by one of their leading industrialists, Mr. Nagaho, that the multi-purpose project described above would be undertaken. The total estimated costs are roughly \$66 million. The Government India will bear the entire expenditure in rupees and Japan has also agreed to make available a line of credit upto \$8 million for purchase of necessary equipment in Japan. The U.S. Government has now accepted the project as eligible under the President's Asian Economic Development Fund and has agreed to finance foreign exchange expenditure upto \$20 million.

The allocation is a loan payable in rupees in 31 half-yearly instalments beginning 3 years after the disbursement of the loan and will carry an interest of 3-1 2 per cent per annum.

<Pg-107>

USA INDIA JAPAN REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE SRI LANKA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jun 25, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### **Project Agreements**

The Governments of India and the U.S.A. on Jun 26, 1958 signed five Project Agreements under which India will receive \$1,087,830 in technical and development assistance funds. The projects cover agricultural education and research, aviation ground facilities in Calcutta, technological training, the geological survey of India and agricultural machinery training centre at Budni in Madhya Pradesh.

The projects represent the final portion of the \$6.3 million programme of technical assistance to India under the U.S. fiscal year 1958 Budget. The Agreements were signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the U.S.Technical Co-operation Mission to India.

Under the Agreement covering agricultural research and education, \$430,000 is provided for additional contract costs of the University of Illinois, for expanding the contract services of 5 U.S. Universities to provide 13 additional full-time technicians, and for the training of 11 additional Indian participants by these U.S. institutions. \$365,000 is provided for the procurement of books, laboratory equipment and teaching and research aid required by the 40 Indian agricultural and veterinary colleges being assisted under this project.

A sum of \$180,000 is provided to procure Precision Approach Radar equipment and related engineering services for the installation of the equipment at the Dum Dum airport in Calcutta.

In the field of technological training, the Technical Co-operation Mission is making available \$88,800 to assist the Government of India in the establishment of an Indian Institute of Technology at Kanpur. The funds will be used to provide the services of a Team to conduct a survey in India and make initial recommendations for the pattern of the Institute.

Twenty thousand dollars have been made available for procuring geophysical field and laboratory equipment for use in support of work to be carried out by the U.S. geophysicists attached to the goephysical wing of the Geological Survey of India in Calcutta.

The remainig \$4,030 is provided to procure spare parts required by

the Agricultural Machinery Training Centre at Budni in Madhya Pradesh, in order to ensure effective utilization of the shop equipment and tools worth \$100,000 already provided by the T.C.M. to the Centre.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jun 26, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### Assistance for Control of Malaria

An agreement was signed in Delhi on Jun 30, 1958 between the Government o India and the United States Technical Co-operation Mission under which a sum of \$3,260,000 (Rs. 15 million) would be made available to India for the purchase of 5,250 long tons of D.D.T.

Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, signed on behalf of the Government of India while Mr. Howard E. Houston signed for the T.C.M.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 30, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

### Air Agreement

An Agreement between the Governments of India and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics relating to air services was signed at New Delhi on 2 June. The Agreement which was signed by Cheif Marshal of Aviation P. F. Zhigarev on behalf of the U.S.S.R. Government and by Shri M. M. Philip, the Communications Secretary, on behalf of the Government of India, will come into force immediately.

Initially the Air India International and the Aeroflot, which is the airline designated by the Soviet Government, will operate one

<Pg-108>

service a week between Delhi and Moscow in both directions. The specified route which the two airlines will be entitled to operate will be Delhi-Amritsar-Tashkent-Moscow. Any points on the specified air route may, at the option of the airline, be omitted on any or all flights.

Under the Agreement, the A.I.I. is authorised to carry international traffic in passengers, cargo and mail to and from Tashkent and Moscow and the Aeroflot is authorised to carry such traffic to and from Amritsar and Delhi. The Agreement sets forth the arrangements to be made by the two Contracting Parties for the safe operation of the specified air services.

Article 4 of the Agreement provides that the commercial aspects of the specified air services shall be the subject of a commercial agreement between the two airlines. Such a commercial agreement was also signed immediately following the signing of the bilateral Agreement between the two countries. The commercial agreement was signed on behalf of Aeroflot by Chief Marshal P. F. Zhigarev and by Shri R. Doraiswamy on behalf of the Air India International.

The tariffs to be charged for the carriage of passengers, baggage and cargo and the commercial practices, discounts, rebates, agency commission, etc. to be applied to the sale of transportation on the services to be operated under the Agreement have been settled and specified in the commercial agreement.

The commercial agreement provides that while each party will bear its own expenses connected with the operation of its aircraft, all revenues earned by each party will be brought into a pool and the pooled revenue shall be apportioned and divided between the parties at the end of each calendar month on the basis of the number of scheduled and nonscheduled one-way flights operated by each party during the calendar month.

The one-way tourist class fare between Delhi and Tashkent and Delhi and Moscow will be Rs. 628/- and Rs. 1,484/- respectively; the first class fares will be Rs. 785/- and Rs. 1,857/-, respectively.

The signing of the Agreement on the direct air service between the U.S.S.R. and India is another step in the development of the existing friendly relations between the two countries.

The negotiations between the two delegations were carried on in a cordial atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual understanding.

<Pg-109>

### INDIA USA RUSSIA UZBEKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jun 30, 1958

# July

	Volume No
1995	
CONTENTS	
Foreign Affairs Record	1958
Volume IV	July No. 7
CONTENTS	
AFGHANISTAN Trade Agreement Extended	111
Shri Arthur S. Lall's Speech in the	111 112 sident of the 121
INDONESIA Trade Agreement Extended	126
IRAQ Recognition of the New Government	126
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	

Loan for Refinance Corporation .. .. .. 126

### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Authority in Relation to Portuguese Possessions in India 127

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister Nehru's Reply to Prime Minister Khruschev's Letter .. .. .. 127

WORLD BANK

Loan for D.V. Corporation .. .. 128

<Pg-i>

### AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA INDONESIA IRAQ

**Date**: Jul 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **AFGHANISTAN**

### Trade Agreement Extended

As a result of discussions held during the last few days between the Indian Trade Delegation and the Afghan Trade Delegation an agreement was signed in Kabul on 11 July renewing the Trade Arrangements between Afghanistan and India for a further period of one year.

The two Delegations have agreed that within the framework of their respective import-export and foreign exchange regulations the two Governments will endeavour to promote mutual trade and achieve a balance of trade between the two countries. The appropriate authorities in both countries will provide facilities for the import and export of their respective products.

The Indian Delegation was led by Shri J. K. Atal, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs. The leader of the Afghan Delegation was Mr. M. R. Younossi, Director General of Foreign Trade, Afghan Government.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA

**Date**: Jul 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur S. Lall's Letter to the President of the Security Council

The following is the text of a letter from India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Shri Arthur S. Lall, to the President of the Security Council on 14 July. The letter exposes threats in Pakistan to violate Security Council resolution and Cease-Fire Agreement on Kashmir.

"I am instructed by the Government of India to refer to a letter dated Jun 25, 1958 (S/4036) from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan addressed to the President of the Security Council about threats in Pakistan and Pakistan-occupied Kashmir to cross the cease-fire line, in violation of the Security Council resolution of 13 August I948 and the Cease-Fire Agreement.

The Pakistan Representative's letter is yet another demonstration of the fact, repeatedly stated by India's representative in the Security Council over the last ten years, that Pakistan has done nothing to create and maintain a peaceful atmosphere as she has the obligation to do under the resolution of the Security Council of 17 January 1948 and Part I of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolution of 13 August 1948. On the contrary, Pakistan has been constantly stimulating hatred of India, uttering threats, promoting sabotage directly and indirectly, and creating a war psychosis among its people.

In paragraph 8 of my letter of 11 June 1958 (S/4024), I put forward unchallengeable evidence in the form of statements by the present Prime Minister, three ex-Prime Ministers and a Minister of the Government of Pakistan, inciting the people of Pakistan to hatred against India.

The aggressor who has annexed Indian territory by force, and imposed upon its people who are Indian nationals a Draconian regime unrelieved by any regard for civil liberties and human rights, is now trying to claim credit for this intention to control the so-called unrest and frustration which he had done his best to foster. Such professions of virtuous conduct will deceive no one, considering the Pakistan's violations of the Cease-Fire Agreement are recorded in detail in the proceedings of the Security Council including its latest act of aggression against India, viz. the organization and financing of subversion and sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir in which members of its Intelligence Service and armed forces are taking part.

As to allegations regarding the prevalence

<Pg-111>

of unrest and frustration, if any, and the causes therefor, the following report of a statement made by Sardar Mohammed Ibrahim, President of the so-called Azad Kashmir Government in a press interview in Karachi speaks for itself:

"In a press interview, Sardar Ibrahim said Mr. Ghulam Abbas wanted to gain political power in 'Azad Kashmir' and his move was directed not against India but against him (Ibrahim) and the Pakistan Government." (Statesman, New Delhi, 27 June 1958).

I request that this communication be circulated as a Security Council document and brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council."

Accept, Excellency, etc.

ARTHUR S. LALL

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations

INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Jun 25, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur S. Lall's Speech in the Trusteeship Council.

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative to the U.N., at the 22nd Session of the United Nations Trusteeship Council on 24 June in support of the draft resolution tabled by India calling upon Administering Authorities of the Trust Territories to stop Nuclear Tests in or proximity to any Trust Territory:

"May I, in commencing my brief observations on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, first thank the special representative of this Territory, and also the representative of the United States, for their helpful contribution to our discussions here.

I should like also to thank the petitioners who appeared before us for giving us the benefit of their views and for answering the questions which were put to them.

I should also like to say that the delegation of India wishes to express its sympathy for the victims of the three recent typhoons and to request the Administering Authority to convey our sympathy to the people concerned. In this connexion we would wish to commend the Administering Authority for the prompt assistance which they rendered to the stricken and suffering.

If the representative of Haiti will not mind my saying so, I should like to add that I find myself in agreement with everything that I heard him say, except his last sentence. Of course he will understand that I cannot agree about the last sentence of his speech because I am presenting a draft resolution on the subject. But I do want to stress this agreement because I feel that the fact that Haiti and India, which are situated in different parts of the world, have such closely parallel views on this Territory is important and significant.

Since other speakers, including the representative of Haiti, have made a broad survey of the various aspects of the Territory, political, economic, social, educational and industrial, I shall not repeat that type of survey. I do not think that the Council would wish me to show that I too have that sort of comprehensive knowledge of the affairs of the Territory. That is not my purpose in making this statement; so I shall try to be as practical as I can in these remarks.

Before I come to my own suggestion, I should like to note two or three points. One is that we have noted with interest and commend the Administering Authority for the notable headway which has been made in the field of elementary education in this Territory. We feel, however, that there is still a relative lack of facilities in some other aspect of education, particularly in the field of secondary and technical education.

Then, again we note with interest and commendation the existence of universal suffrage in this Territory and the growing number of charters for municipalities, the growing number of district congresses and the successful second meeting of the Inter-District Conference. All these are notable

<Pg-112>

and excellent developments in the political and administrative field. In fact, I think it is true to say that, in many respects, this Trust Territory has the good fortune to enjoy a generally benign administration. If the Administering Authority's representatives will not mind my saying so, the only risk indeed that I see in its benign

propensities is that perhaps it might tend to become too paternalistic in its administration of this Territory, which might conduce to a certain mood of political apathy in the area. I think perhaps that is something to be guarded against. However, I do not wish to make a long statement about the other aspects of activity in the Territory. I should like to come immediately to certain practical suggestions which my delegation would wish the Administering Authority to consider.

In making these practical suggestions, we would first advance the proposition that development in this Territory must be made in accordance with the spirit of Article 76 of the Charter; that is, in close consultation with the freely expressed wishes of the people.

Now that this Territory is advancing politically, economically and socially, the people of the Territory must be consulted more than ever before. In the light of this principle we would commend the following suggestions to the Administering Authority.

First, an educational commission might be appointed consisting of representatives of the Administration and of the people in equal numbers; that is to say, perhaps three or four members of the Administration and an equal number of representatives of the people. This educational commission should be charged with the task of making recommendations, particularly to develop intermediate, secondary and technical education such as an agricultural school. They should also be encouraged to recommend positive steps to develop the cultural life of the people.

Secondly, an industrial and commerce Commission might be appointed with a similar composition; that is to say, the Administration and the people in equal numbers, to promote the development in the islands of industries such as those which can be based on copra, for example, coir mats and matting, soap, vegetable oils, margarine and toilet requisites. This commission could also examine the possibility of a fishing industry, a fruit canning industry and they might also be the appropriate body to which some information should be furnished by the Administering Authority on a full scale and intensive geological survey which has been suggested in this Council both in the question period and now in the statements to which we have listened.

Thirdly, the delegation of India considers that a communications commission should be set up with a similar composition. In view of the interdependence of these islands, it is most desirable that communications should be strengthened and that great attention should be focussed on developments in this field. A communications commission could make recommendations to the Administering Authority on the development of interisland transport and also on transport for perishable comestibles such as fish and fruits, and eventually on transport required for the export of commodities from the Territory.

Fourthly, in our Opinion, it would be desirable to appoint a small

and carefully selected planning commission to co-ordinate the activities of the other commissions which I have mentioned and also to examine and to recommend to the Administering Authority what might be done in the fields of banking, co-operative marketing and general development of economic activity.

In making the suggestions, what has actuated us is that there is plenty of goodwill on the side of the Administering Authority. The people of the Territory are becoming increasingly educated. They are extremely peaceful and in many ways an example to most other peoples. What is required now is the association of people in the development of these various fields of economic activity, and what is required to attain that is a sound administrative organizational arrangement. It is for that reason that we commend to the Administering Authority the appointment of these several commissions headed by a carefully selected planning commission.

There is one other commission which we feel should be appointed, and that commission I am dealing with separately

### <Pg-113>

in the following brief remarks. I mentioned the possibility of perhaps just a little too much paternalism in the Territory. I know that is not the intention of the Administering Authority, but that might sometimes be the effect of almost too great efficiency and capacity. With that in view, my delegation suggests that a political commission should be appointed forth-with for these Territories. This commission should be asked to report by the end of 1959. It should consist perhaps of one representative each from the District Congresses, and where no District Congress exists, by a person selected by other means from that District--perhaps two representatives of the inter-district conference and a balancing number of representatives of the Administering Authority. This body should urgently examine, with a view to reporting by the end of 1959 on the following questions--among others, these are illustrative, but I think these are the important questions--first, the setting up of district congresses where they do not exist; secondly, the transformation of the Inter-District Conference into a Congress for the Trust Territory as a whole; thirdly, the political commission should make recommendations to the Administering Authority regarding appropriate statutory powers for the District congresses and for the Congress and for the Territory as a whole; fourthly, it should make recommendations to the Administering Authority for the "Micronesianization"--I hope that is the word which the Micronesians will accept--of the civil service; fifthly, it might receive from the Administering Authority a draft of the proposed organic law and be asked to furnish its comments on the draft law, being free also to suggest additions and other changes.

We commend these practical suggestions to the Administering Authority, and we feel that as there is no conflict between the Administering Authority and ourselves regarding the objectives of the Administering Authority in these Territories, regarding the clear directives of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, that the implementation of these suggestions of ours will promote what both the Administering Authority and ourselves regard as essential to promote in this Trust Territory.

I should now like to turn to the question of nuclear tests. The delegation of India has presented a draft resolution to which I would request some attention at this point. This draft resolution is a very simple and straight-forward one. It consists of two preambular paragraphs, and I am quite certain that the Administering Authority will accept both. The first paragraph states:

"Nothing that in the last few years there has been a steadily increasing volume of world opinion in favour of the cessation of the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons." I am sure that this is common ground for all of us in this Council. In fact, Mr. Sears stated yesterday that the United States has advocated the immediate suspension of all nuclear weapons tests under proper inspection as the first step of a disarmament agreement.

I think that the second paragraph of the preamble is equally acceptable to everyone here. It simply notes that "in terms of the United Nations Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreements, Administering Authorities have special responsibilities in Territories under their administration." That, of course, is common ground.

From these two paragraphs of the preamble we ask the Trusteeship Council to draw a certain conclusion, which is contained in the request to "the Administering Authorities of the Trust Territories not to conduct nuclear and thermonuclear tests in or in proximity to any Trust Territory."

As I said a moment ago, I think that the two paragraphs of the preamble should be acceptable to all of us. I do not claim that the only conclusion which can be drawn from those two paragraphs is the request we make in the operative paragraph of the draft resolution. I do however, claim that if the Administering Authority in this case-that is the United States--accepts the two paragraphs of the preamble, it should find the conclusion in the operative paragraph well-nigh irresistible. And I would mention here that, when the voting begins I shall ask that each of the paragraphs of the preamble be voted on separately. As I have said, I do not maintain that our conclusion is the only possible one, but if the Administering Authority in this case cannot accept

<Pg-114>

the conclusion, I would ask for an explanation as to why it cannot do so.

Having thus introduced my delegation's draft resolution, I would ask

the Council to allow me to explain why we feel that the draft resolution is appropriate at this juncture.

We are aware that in the very near future technical studies will commence in Geneva on possible control measures to monitor any decision which might be taken to stop nuclear tests. That, however, is a general issue, and the Administering Authority itself has frequently stated in this Council that we cannot concern ourselves with the general issue. We are concerned specifically with nuclear tests in Trust Territories. The position of the Government and delegation of India is quite clear: We are against all tests, anywhere, no matter who conducts them or for what purpose. I say that because I do not want anyone in the Trusteeship Council to have any doubt about that position, in view of what I am going to say.

At the moment--and this is the point I wish to make--we are not concerned with the above-mentioned general proposition. We are concerned only with the specific proposition of halting nuclear tests in a Trust Territory. That is to say, the problem which faces us is: Why should the tests be conducted in a Trust Territory when there are other territories in the world which are not Trust Territories, and when the Administering Authority itself has full command in its own metropolitan country of over three million square miles of territory-large parts of which are uninhabited? That is the issue, and we must face it squarely. That is the issue on which we shall ask for a vote.

This has nothing to do with the technical studies which are going to take place in Geneva. We wish those studies well, and we want all tests to be stopped. But, I repeat, the issue is: Why in heaven's name should these tests take place in a Trust Territory?

The proposition of the Administering Authority appears to be as follows. First, this Trust Territory is a strategic area. That is quite correct. It has been so declared in the Trusteeship Agreement itself. No one contests that. Secondly, the Trusteeship Council is concerned only with political, economic, social and educational matters. That, too, is correct. The Administering Authority has not pushed us to draw the conclusion that we therefore cannot discuss this matter; I appreciate that fact. I think, however, that the sense of this second argument is that we are not concerned with military matters in this area. Indeed, that is the Administering Authority's third point—namely, that all military matters are outside the Trusteeship Council's scope.

On the basis of those three points, the Administering Authority claims that it has the right to conduct these tests. I think that that is a fair statement of the Administering Authority's position. Does this mean that the Administering Authority is arguing that because, under the Charter and the Security Council resolution of 7 March 1949, the Trusteeship Council is restricted to the consideration of political, economic, social and educational matters, all residuary powers are vested in the Administering Authority's own hands and it can do what it wishes in this Territory? I would request

the Administering Authority to tell me if that is what is meant. In other words, is the Administering Authority saying that the totality of its activities in this Territory is not under the supervision of the United Nations and that there is a loophole somewhere which permits an Administering Authority to do what it wishes to do in a strategic area? I would be grateful for a categorical reply to that question. I repeat: Is it the Administering Authority's position that the totality of administrative activities in the Trust Territory is not under the general supervision of the United Nations and is not carried out under powers given to the Administering Authority by the United Nations?

I would put it to the Administering Authority that there is no loophole in the Trusteeship System. There are no powers which the Administering Authority has except those contained in the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. A trustee cannot exercise residuary powers. That is well known. Time and time again--to take an analagous case--a trustee goes to a court and says, "This is what I want to do," and the court says, "This is not within the

#### <Pg-115>

terms of the trust". A trustee has, I repeat, no residuary powers. If there are any residuary powers--and I do not think there are--they are latent in the people of the Trust Territory and can be exercised only when the people themselves achieve self-government. That is the concept of the Charter.

As I have said, I should like to know whether the Administering Authority is suggesting that there is a loophole and that it has powers under the Charter which permit it to exercise sovereignty. For what is happening through these tests? It is the exercise of sovereignty. Now, the trustee is not a sovereign in this Territory. The trustee has specific powers under the Trusteeship Agreement. I should like the Administering Authority to tell us categorically under what authority it is exercising sovereign powers in this Trust Territory. And, I repeat, unilateral decision to conduct tests in this Territory.

I put it not only to the Administering Authority but to all members of the Trusteeship Council: Is not the Administering Authority, by conducting these tests, exercising a sovereign right which it cannot exercise as a trustee? I submit that we have reached an impasse here. This impasse is constituted by the fact that the Administering Authority can claim the unilateral right to hold these tests if it lays claim to sovereignty in the Trust Territory.

Sovereignty and trusteeship cannot co-exist in respect of one and the same Territory. That is the position, and there is no escape from it. Either the Administering Authority is a trustee or it is a sovereign. Since it is a trustee--and I am sure that it admits that position--it has no sovereign right whatsoever in this Trust Territory.

I should like to say--I have already said it, but I should like to say it now in these words--that the only rights any Administering Authority has in a Trust Territory are derivative rights, derivative from the Charter and from the Trusteeship Agreement, and there is no question of sovereign rights in the whole concept of the Charter or of the Trusteeship System. I suggest, therefore, that we dismiss as incompatible with the Trusteeship System the possible view that the Administering Authority has any sovereign rights in this Territory. It has only derivative rights because only such rights are compatible with the Trusteeship System.

It is clear--and I use the word "clear" because the Administering Authority does not contest the position--that the Trusteeship Council is concerned under the Charter, Article 83(3), and under the Security Council's resolution of 7 March 1949 with all "political, economic, social and educational matters" in the Territory. I have inserted the word "all" but, after all, when resolutions and the Charter say that we are concerned with these matters we are concerned with all of them. I should just like to make that point.

Secondly, it is quite clear that in a strategic territory the latent sovereignty of the people continues unabated. This is not my view. It follows from the express provisions of Article 83(2) of the Charter, namely, that even in a strategic Trust Territory "The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area". And those objectives, of course, include self-government and freedom. That is a right which the Administering Authority, I know, does not wish to abrogate or diminish, but may I say that it is a right also which the Administering Authority cannot abrogate or diminish.

In this connexion I feel it necessary to refer to a reply which Mr. Sears gave to one of the members of the Council in answering a question, and I would request him kindly to clarify this reply in due course. Mr. Sears says, "For security purposes we have an ocean defensive system". I take it that "we" here means the United States. For security purposes the United States has an ocean defensive system and, Mr. Sears adds, "certain parts of the Trust Territory are considered in that system". The reason I raise this point is this. The Administering Authority is limited in its functions in this Territory, even in strategic areas. Even in a strategic area--that is to say, in the area where the United States has an ocean defensive system--it is bound to fulfil the political objectives of Article 76 of the Charter. That is clearly stated in Article 83(2). I would like it to be made quite clear by the Administering Authority itself that the fact that it has an ocean defensive system in this Territory will not operate as brake on the

#### <Pg-116>

further development of this people towards freedom. In other words, it must be quite clear, and the Administering Authority must kindly tell us that it is quite Clear, that its ocean defensive system is

not incompatible with the granting of freedom and self-government to this people, because the granting of freedom and self-government to this people is an inalienable right under the Charter, even in strategic areas, even in areas where the Administering Authority sees fit to set up an ocean defence system. We would, like this point to be clarified by the Administering Authority. In fact, as I was saying since there is a clear provision of the Charter here I am sure the Administering Authority will accept this position.

Now since this Territory is a strategic area there is a sharing of responsibility in respect of it between the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council. Taking first the responsibilities of the Security Council, we might list them as follows in respect of a strategic area: first, to achieve the basic objective of furthering international peace and security; this is contained in Article 76 (a) of the Charter, read with Article 84; second, to carry out all functions of the United Nations--this is now Article 83 (1)--except those in respect of which, subject to certain provisos, it asks for the assistance of the Trusteeship Council; that is in Article 83 (3). And the Security Council's responsibilities in respect of international peace and security are only clear when Article 24, 76, 83 and 84 are read together, and they must be read in the light of the general and incontestable position that no trustee can claim any kind of sovereign powers in respect of its trust. All its powers, I repeat, are purely derivative.

Reading these Articles together in the light of the general principle that the trustee has no sovereign powers, what emerges, I think, is the following. First, in respect of strategic areas, the trustee is responsible to the Security Council, except to the extent that the Security Council has empowered this Council. Now the Security Council is primarily responsible under the Charter for maintenance of international peace and security. This is laid down in Article 24 of the Charter. But in terms of Article 84 a trustee must see to it that a strategic area plays its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. The words "the Trust Territory shall play its part," occurring in Article 84, are extremely important for they imply that there is an over-all integrated responsibility for international peace and security, a part of which may be played by the Trust Territory. That is the implication--that there is an overall integrated responsibility, a part of which may be played by the strategic area. And of course that is so. That integrated responsibility, rests primarily with the Security Council in terms of the Charter. Furthermore, because that over-all responsibility rests primarily with the Security Council, what Article 84 does is to give the part that may be played by the Trust territory to the Administering Authority to administer.

What is that part? That part is spelt out clearly in Article 84. Article 84 states clearly the measures which the Administering Authority may take in a strategic Trust Territory to ensure that that Territory does play its part within the whole concept and ambit of the Charter in the maintenance of international peace and security.

These specific powers and actions of the Administering. Authority are that it may make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the Trust Territory in carrying out obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the Administering Authority, and then there are certain other small matters concerning local defence which are not germane to this point. These are the specific powers which vest in the Administering Authority in order that the Territory may play its part in the totality, the totality being the responsibility of the Security Council.

The conducting of tests cannot by any stretch of interpretation, or of imagination for that matter, be brought within the specific actions which the Administering Authority may take and which are mentioned in article 84 of the Charter. It follows therefore that if the Administering Authority contends that international peace and security require that these tests be conducted in this strategic area, then the Administering Authority must go to the body primarily concerned in the United Nations--and please remember that the Administering Authority has no powers except those which it derives

#### <Pg-117>

from the United Nations--and it must ask that body's permission, that is to say, it must ask the permission of the Security Council before it can carry out such tests. This is an inescapable conclusion from the Charter.

To argue, as has been argued, that the Security Council accepted the Trusteeship Agreement in 1947, about a year after the first tests were conducted in these islands, is no answer--and this for several reasons. For one thing, in arguing this way the Administering Authority is admitting the right of the Security Council to object to tests. That is what it has done, otherwise it could not have argued this way at all, but in any case the Charter position is quite clear, the Administering Authority has no sovereign powers in this Territory, it has only derived powers. Can it show from where it derives the power to conduct tests? It cannot, because it has no power to conduct tests, such power is not set out. However that may be, the Administering Authority has argued that the Security Council had not taken away its right to conduct tests. What does that mean? Does it not mean that the Administering Authority has admitted to this Council by implication that the Security Council has that power? That is the only correct interpretation that any reader of the Charter can put upon it.

There is another reason why this argument about the Security Council having accepted the Trusteeship Agreement in 1947 is untenable. It is this From 1947 onwards the Trusteeship Council, having entered into the Trusteeship Agreement, has become firmly seized of its responsibilities and thereafter, measures for international peace and security in this Trust Territory, other than those explicitly stated in Article 84, cannot be taken without the permission of the Security

Council after 1947. Therefore this argument about what happened in 1946 falls on several grounds; it just does not apply.

My delegation takes the view that it is absolutely clear, in terms of the Charter that the permission of the Security Council is required before these tests can be carried out in a strategic area in a Trust Territory and if the Administering Authority does not accept this view, it can only do so by claiming sovereignty which it cannot claim under the terms of the Trusteeship System. It can only do so if it can show us where such powers have been given to it by the Charter. No such powers have been given.

But this is not all. Because the Security Council has given certain responsibilities to the Trusteeship Council, and having regard to the very nature of these nuclear tests, the functions of the Trusteeship Council are also involved. In short, and I state this point even before I attempt to argue it, the consent of the Trusteeship Council is also required, although such consent alone is not enough and the primary censent of the Security Council is also required. However the consent of both bodies is required. Why? This is so because the Trusteeship Council is responsible for the welfare of the people of the Trust Territory, including the social and economic aspects of that welfare. Any activities in the Trust Territory which in any way diminish the economic resources of the Territory and which disturb the right of the people to live where they please in the Territory or to move about freely in it would create a position contrary to the Charter obligation under Article 76 to promote the economic and social advancement of the people. The Administering Authority has not denied that there has been some effect on the economic resources of the Territory as a result of these tests; a petitioner told us yesterday that the shellfish of certain areas are no longer edible. The shellfish are an economic resource of this Territory; they are no longer edible, therefore the economic resources have boon diminished and not advanced, as they must be if Article 76 of the Charter is to be complied with. Here, therefore, there has been non-compliance with Article, 76 of the Charter. Further, the Administering Authority has--and this is not disputed, in fact I think they have told us themselves--that they have restricted the right of movement and habitation on certain islands. In this connextion, I should like to point out that the fact that the tests have been conducted near or on uninhabited islands does not alter the position at all. The uninhabited islands of this Territory are as much part of the homeland of the peoples of this Trust Territory--and I request the Administering Authority to take note of this--as uninhabited parts of the United States or of India are of the homelands of the American and Indian People. Please let us make no mistake about

#### <Pg-118>

this. The Administering Authority has no greater power on the uninhabited islands of this Territory than it has on the inhabited islands. No such distinction is drawn either in the Charter or in the Trusteeship Agreement. The powers are the same. The Administering

Authority cannot say that because certain islands are uninhabited it enjoys greater powers there. It does not; the powers are exactly the same. The disruption or damaging of the resources of the uninhabited islands is a lessening of the economic resources of the peoples of the Trust Territory and therefore the Trusteeship Council's power under the terms of the Security Council resolution read in conjunction with Article 83 of the Charter are attracted and no tests can take place unless the Trusteeship Council agrees.

I must add that I do not see how the Trusteeship Council can agree to tests unless the Council itself decides to abrogate its Charter responsibilities. In any case, its agreement alone is not enough and if the Trusteeship Council were to fail in this respect still the tests could not take place unless the Security Council also were to agree.

It is quite clear that under the Charter, and consistent with the law of Trusteeship, the Administering Authority has no sovereighty and must, unless it can show a specific power granted by the Charter to conduct tests, go to the Organisation from which all its powers flow, and in this case, because of the far-reaching effects of nuclear tests, the powers of both of Security Council and the Trusteeship Council are involved.

These reasons, I submit to this Council, are weighty and conclusive, and to them I wish to add another reason which, in another way, is even more compelling.

The people of the Trust Territory do not favour these tests. It is true, of course, that the people of a Trust Territory are wards and legally the position is that they cannot always say what is best for them. But in this case they are right. And I shall tell you why they are right. Yesterday, Mr. Mason Sears, the representative of the United States, referred to the forthcoming report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. He said he thought it was a unanimous report. Well, it is nearly unanimous. Since he has referred to this report, though it is not published, I am constrained to do so myself.

I am constrained to point out here that Mr. Mason Sears, and the other members of the Council, will find in this report the unanimously accepted statement that nuclear and thermonuclear explosions involve new and largely unknown hazards to present and future populations. I repeat, to present and future populations. These hazards by their very nature are beyond the control of the exposed persons. That is what has been unanimously agreed to by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiations.

How can we in the Trusteeship Council, in good conscience, agree to expose the peoples of these Trust Territories to these new hazards, new hazards to present and future populations, hazards which are by their very nature beyond the control of these persons? Can we in

good conscience agree in this Trusteeship Council to expose the people of these Trust Territories--not only the present people but future generations--to these new hazards? I would like the Administering Authority categorically to give me an answer to this question. It is not relevant that there is agreement to hold the technical discussions in Geneva. We are glad of that agreement. But can the Administering Authority tell me whether in the light of this conclusion, to which their own scientists have subscribed, they can in good conscience conduct these tests in a Trust Territory, and in which, moreover, they have no powers under the Charter to conduct tests at all?

That is why I say, and I repeat it that when it comes to the vote on my draft resolution (T|L. 856), if the Administering Authority can vote in favour of the two preambular paragraphs, they will find the conclusion irresistible. And I do not think that they will find it resistible. I do not see how they can. If they can, we are willing to withdraw the draft resolution. We will not press this resolution to a vote if the Administering Authority can answer these arguments, if the Administering Authority can tell us how

<Pg-119>

??? good conscience they can subject the people of a Trust Territory to these new hazards, which their own scientists have agreed exist. How can they do this in a Trust Territory?

If they must carry out the tests, let them subject their own people to these tests. What right has the United States to subject the people of Trust Territories and Asian people to these tests? I would ask Mr. Mason Sears to imagine that he was a Burman, to imagine that he was a citizen of the United Arab Republic or an Indian, and if he were that and if he were asked by an Indian or an Arab or a Burman, why the United States conducts these tests in a Trust Territory, what answer would he give? They have a huge territory of over 3 million square miles and large parts are uninhabited.

Are they conducting these tests in this area because these are Asian people? And if they are not, they must tell us why. We must answer to our own people about this matter. What answer can Ambassador U Thant give? What answer can I give? What answer can the United Arab Republic give to this charge? Why is it that the United States conducts these tests in Asia? Why is it? Is there some terrible fate that makes the United States always unleash nuclear weapons in Asia? They did so in the war and now they are doing so in tests. This is totally not understandable to the peoples of Asia. They have a huge territory. The issue is not that there are other agreements going to be reached in Geneva; the issue is simply this. Under the Charter, if you have the powers, point them out to us categorically. If you do not have the powers, you cannot claim sovereignty in these islands and you have no powers.

Even if you have the powers, are you going to overlook the

consideration that here are your own scientists who say that you are creating by these very tests new hazards? And are you going to subject the people of Trust Territories to these new hazards? I make this statement categorically. If the United States decides to subject people to these new hazards, well please subject your own people to these hazards, you have no right to subject other peoples to these hazards. These people are not your citizens, They are the citizens of the United Nations under Trusteeship Agreement.

It gives me great pain to say this. The United States is a great country. It is a civilized country. How can this civilized and great country go into this Trust Territory, where a most peaceable people live, and subject them to new hazards which their scientists say exist--Asian people? Why is it that the United States does this? How does it expect us Asian members of this Council to defend and to understand these tests in our own countries? How can we defend them?

Now I know that the United States is interested in what people in Asia feel about the United States. How can we defend this in our countries? We are totally defenceless against this charge that these tests should not be conducted in Trust Territories. And I beg the United States to stop these tests immediately. This is unfair to the people of Asia. This is against the Charter. There is no authority for it and it is unfair too in terms of the whole concept of trusteeship when American scientists themselves have said that new hazards are created by these tests.

If Mr. Mason Sear's answer is that in the interests of international peace and security the United States must conduct these tests, well then conduct them in the United States. What right has the United States to conduct them in a Trust Territory? If it has any right, it can only be a right given specifically by the United Nations, and no such right has been given.

I would like categorical answers to these points. If there are no answers, I request the United States delegation to vote for the draft resolution and to adopt it unanimously in this Council. The representative of the United States knows very well that if he would vote for this resolution, everyone else would. I maintain that the conclusion in my resolution is irresistible on grounds of Law, on grounds of humanity, on grounds of scientist evidence, to which his own scientists are parties. Therefore, I commend our draft resolution to the unanimous adoption of this Council."

<Pg-120>

INDIA USA HAITI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND BURMA

**Date**: Jun 25, 1958

### **Volume No**

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

#### Shri Arthur S. Lall's Letter to the President of the Security Council

The following is the text of a letter from India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Shri Arthur S. Lall on 6 July to the President of the Security Council, refuting allegations made against India by Pakistan's Permanent Representative on the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah:

"In the interests of the functioning of the United Nations in accordance with the spirit and the letter of its Charter, it may well be best entirely to ignore the intemperate communication addressed to you by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan and circulated as Document No. S/4032 of 19 June 1958. However, members of the Security Council in particular, and Members of the United Nations in general, will probably wish to know the facts relevant to the contents of the uncalled for letter from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan. I will therefore deal very briefly in this letter with some of the major misrepresentations contained in Document No. S/4032 of 19 June 1958.

In paragraph 3 of his letter of 19 June, the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan attacks in a most extraordinary manner my use of the Daily Telegraph of London dated 2 May 1958. It is perfectly admissible to use two extracts from the same publication-whether book or newspaper--in the form of a composite quotation. This is what was done in my letter of 11 June. If the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan had only troubled to read the letter carefully, he would have noticed a hyphen which breaks the quotation into two distinct parts. The first part, which is underlined by him, serves as a kind of heading or introductory passage for the distinct succeeding part which includes the essence, in the words of the Special Correspondent himself, of the despatch mentioned in the first part of this composite quotation. I am sorry that this juxtaposition of two salient facts which naturally caused much discomfort to the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan, should have resulted in so much unfortunate vituperation and waste of words and effort by him.

Incidentally, the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has sought to support his untenable position by attaching as appendix I to his letter an allegedly photostat copy of the relevant news despatch in the Daily Telegraph of 2 May 1958. I will refer a little later in this letter to the curious document furnished by him.

In paragraph 5 of his letter, the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan seeks to make much of the parenthetical phrase inserted in the last quotation in paragraph 5 of my letter of 11 June 1958. I would request you kindly to reread that part of my letter. It will be observed that the parenthetical portion inserted in the quotation from the Daily Telegraph of 3 May 1958 is meaningless in its present position. Obviously it was purely by a typographical error that it had been inserted after the pronoun "they" instead of before it. The words in parenthesis are meaningful and pertinent to the point contained in paragraph 5 of my letter of 11 June 1958, only if they are placed before the pronoun "they" instead of after it. I would request you therefore kindly to read that quotation with this correction. I am grateful that the attempted mud slinging by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has at any rate afforded us an opportunity to correct this typographical error and thereby to give added meaning to my own letter of 11 June 1958.

In the light of tile foregoing remarks, the general accusations made by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan in various paragraphs of his letter are clearly groundless and do not warrant any further attention or comment.

In paragraph 3 of this letter I have referred to the photosat of the news despatch in the issue of the Daily Telegraph of 2 May. I am unaware of the edition of the Daily Telegraph to which the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan is referring. With this letter I am filing the original of the news despatch as it appeared in the Daily Telegraph of 2 May, and I am reproducing a copy as an appendix to this letter. It will be observed that the text of the original despatch filed with this letter, and the copy attached by me as an appendix, differ materially from the alleged photostat

#### <Pg-121>

produced by the Acting Representative of Pakistan. For example in the alleged photostat the words, "It seems to show that Sheikh Abdullah was a latent rather than an actual menace. But a menace he was", are put in the mouth of the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. The text of Mr. Gordon Shepherd's despatch, which I have filed with this letter, shows that these words were not uttered by the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. They are part of the comments made by the Daily Telegraph correspondent immediately following his quotation from the remarks of the Prime Minister which ends with the sentence, "I have been a little surprised at the lack of any reaction so far." Thus the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan, in order to bolster the incorrect meaning which he wishes to give to the words of the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, has attributed to him words which in fact he did not use.

The following portions of Mr. Gordon Shepherd's published despatch which are contained in the text flied with this letter have been omitted from the alleged photostat flied by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan.

"When we had finished he strolled across the lawn to some benches

where an assortment of Kashmiri were collecting. It was one of his twice-weekly general audience hours when any citizen is allowed to come in and present his grievances. Today's gathering, I was told, was neither more nor less than usual."

"....But the indications so far are that Sheikh Abdullah's followers are not getting very hot under their astrakhan hats and are finding discretion the better part of valour."

As I have said, I do not know from where the Acting Representative of Pakistan has procured his photostat, but it is quite clear that the portions omitted in his alleged photostat, and which appear in the original publication, do not assist his ill-founded contentions.

The Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan seeks to justify his totally unconstitutional and supererogatory interest in the affairs of a constituent state of the Indian Union. Since Jammu and Kashmir acceded to the Indian Union in accordance with the terms of the statutory procedures laid down by an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom--the Government of India Act, 1935--and since these procedures have been accepted by the Governments of India and Pakistan, there can be no question that the type of interest which the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan is taking in the domestic affairs of India is in violation of Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, as repeatedly pointed out by India's Representatives in the Security Council, not only is the fact that Jammu and Kashmir is a Constituent State of the Indian Union the basis of India's original complaint to the Security Council, but it is also the basis of the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 and of the assurances given by that Commission to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council.

Finally, it is necessary to draw attention to the two quotations contained in paragraph 13 of the letter from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan. Statement of this character are unfortunately the exception in Pakistan, and must be read alongside the continuous outpouring of vehement and warlike words emanating from responsible persons, journals of opinion and newspapers in Pakistan, some of which were cited in my letter of 11 June 1958. Presumably, it was the intention of the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to lull the apprehensions both of the Security Council and of India by citing small portions from only two statements. However, rare utterances of this kind amount to no more than lip service to the comprehensive appeal for all measures calculated to improve the situation which was contained in the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948, and to which both India and Pakistan pledged their adherence. Their impact on the situation and their value in terms of the Security Council resolution is entirely lost in the context of the frequently reiterated and growing volume of statements from Pakistan indulging in threats of force.

I request that this communication may be circulated asia Security Council document

<Pg-122>

and brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council."

Accept, Excellency, etc.

ARTHUR S. LALL,

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,

Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations.

APPENDIX I

INDIA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jun 25, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### SHEIKH "IN LEAGUE WITH PAKISTAN"

Kashmir Premier Defends Arrest of 'Menace'

From Gordon Shepherd

Daily Telegraph Special Correspondent Srinagar (Kashmir), Thursday

Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, Prime Minister of Kashmir, described to me today the reasons which led him to order the rearrest of Sheikh Abdullah, his principal political opponent. He accused Sheikh Abdullah outright of conspiring with Pakistan to launch religious disturbances among the Kashmir people.

Sheikh Abdullah was seized at his house in Srinagar early on Wednesday and driven to Kud goal in the neighbouring province of Jammu. Ghulam Mohammed said: "We acted like any other Government would have done given the information in our possession. If Sheikh Abdullah had opposed me by normal means and had come forward with an alternative programme he would be free today.

"Instead he preached Moslem fanatacism and that was too dangerous here for us to tolerate indefinitely." I said: "Sheikh Abdullah began

to use the religious appeal in mosque speeches soon after his release from captivity in January. Why was his rearrest delayed?"

#### GIVEN EVERY CHANCE

Refused "To Come Round"

Mr. Ghulam Mohammed replied: "We could have acted long ago. But we wanted to give him every chance to see sense and come round. This he simply refused to do. There were also other considerations."

I asked whether Abdullah's reported secret contacts with Pakistan were among these "other considerations." At this question the Prime Minister removed his sunglasses and tapped them on the table for emphasis. He said: "There is no doubt that Sheikh Abdullah was in league with Pakistan.

"It was from there that in all probability he was getting the funds with which to raise his private army. I cannot say more on this now as a statement is being prepared on his activities which I may make myself in a few days."

#### **CARRIED STICKS**

Brigade of "Ansars"

Mr. Ghulam Mohammed's mention of a "private army" refers to the socalled Brigade of "Ansars" which Sheikh Abdullah was recruiting from his sympathizers. They wore a badge of inverted crossed swords and carried "lathis" or stout sticks as "weapons."

There were about 4,500 of them shortly before his arrest. I asked: "If Sheikh Abdullah's organization had grown into such a menace how was it that thirty-six hours after his rearrest there has still been not the slightest sign of protest from his followers?"

The Prime Minister replied: "We have been asking ourselves that. I have been a little surprised at the lack of any reaction so far."

#### A LATENT MENACE

Question of Public Trial

It seems to show that Sheikh Abdullah was a latent rather than an actual menace. But a menace he was. When asked whether his prisoner would be brought to trial and given a chance to defend himself in public against these charges Mr. Ghulam Mohammed was cautious.

He said: "We shall see. This matter is being gone into and I shall see what my legal experts recommend."

<Pg-123>

Mr. Ghulam Mohammed referred to the "nonsense" broadcast over

Pakistan Radio today that Kashmir was in a state of turmoil. He asked me to convince myself that there had been no mass arrests and that life is continuing normally.

Without a tour of the gaols the first point would be difficult to check. But as I reported yesterday, there is no reason to suppose that more than two of Sheikh Abdullah's supporters have been imprisoned with him.

The shops in Srinagar were all open today and busy ensnaring tourists in the usual manner. There is no curfew in the town and no sign of outward tension beyond the intensified armed police patrols.

Mr. Ghulam Mohammed seemed more apprehensive when I asked about the latest position on the cease-fire line with Pakistan. "Something might be tried there, but so far the line has remained absolutely quiet," he said.

#### ARMIES UNCHANGED

#### Pakistan Frontier

"There do not appear to have been any unusual movements of Pakistan troops and our own forces have not been changed." He concluded with a special appeal to Britain for sympathy with his position.

"Your people know these particular problems better than anyone. Indeed, it is your old preventive detention legislation which we have used. Just look where we are on the map.

"Apart from Pakistan we have Russia, China and Afghanistan on our borders. In that exposed position political stability in our tiny state is absolutely essential."

#### KASHMIR'S DESIRE

"All We Want is Peace"

"We just cannot afford to have any turbulence. All we want is to be left in peace to get on with our economic plan and do more to raise the living standard of our people. That counts far more in the long run than mass hysteria."

Mr. Ghulam Mohammed, who formerly served in Sheikh Abdullah's Cabinet, is a powerfully-built and confident man of 50. Our talk took place in the garden of his rather frowsy red-brick villa in the centre of the town.

When we had finished he strolled across the lawn to some benches where an assortment of Kashmiri were collecting. It was one of his twice-weekly general audience hours when any citizen is allowed to come in and present his grievances. Today's gathering, I was told, was neither more nor less than usual.

#### **DUBIOUS METHODS**

Public Hearing Needed

It is impossible to comment on his statements until the evidence to which he referred is produced. Only a formal and public charge of high treason against Sheikh Abdullah would nullify criticism of the methods used in silencing him.

It is also impossible to predict whether the complete calm in Kashmir will last. Tomorrow, the Moslem Sunday, will be the test period. But the indications so far are that Sheikh Abdullah's followers are not getting very hot under their astrakhan hats and are finding discretion the better part of valour.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA AFGHANISTAN CHINA RUSSIA

**Date**: Jun 25, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### SHEIKH "IN LEAGUE WITH PAKISTAN"

Arthur S. Lall's Letter to the Secretary-General on Representation of China.

The following is the text of a letter, dated Jul 14, 1958, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by Shri A. S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the U.N.

Sir,

In accordance with the instructions of the Government of India and pursuant to Rule 13(e) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, I have the honour to propose the following item for inclusion in the agenda of the thirteenth regular session of the General Assembly.

"Question of the Representation China in the United Nations."

An explanatory memorandum in terms

<Pg-124>

of Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure is attached. The United Nations as constituted today enjoys the participation of the effective Governments of most of the world. It is self-evident that the

Organization can achieve its purposes only if it includes those Governments which are willing and able to fulfil the obligations contained in Articles 2 and 4 of its Charter.

Among the founder-members of the United Nations in China, and because of its importance in matters relating to international peace and security China is also a Permanent Member of the Security Council. The representation of China in the United Nations derives its special significance not only from these facts but also from the size of her population, the richness of her resources and the vital contributions she must make to the solution of important issues before the Organization. It cannot be gainsaid that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China is the only Government which exercises effective control over China. The stability of that Government is today undisputed, and it has diplomatic relations with 27 Member States of the United Nations, including two of the Permanent Members of the Security Council, and has developed normal commercial relations with 63 countries of the world. It has participated in several international conferences, such as the Geneva Conference on the cessation of hostilities in Indo-China and the Asian-African Conference at Bandung. Even though the Central People's Government has so far been prevented from taking its rightful place in the United Nations, its spokesmen have frequently upheld both the Organization and its Charter. For example, the Prime Minister of China spoke strongly in support of the organization at the Asian-African Conference at Bandung.

It is necessary to consider the question of the representation of China in the United Nations not only from the point of view of the legitimate rights of the Chinese people and their Government, but also from the point of view of the effectiveness of the Organization itself. There is today no doubt that only the People's Government of China is in a position to comply with those decisions or recommendations of the United Nations Organization which affect China specifically or which are addressed to all Member States. In this connection, it may be recalled that speaking in the First Committee at the twelfth session of the General Assembly the distinguished delegate of Australia said that in the opinion of his Government, a disarmament agreement which did not impose suitable obligations on the People's Republic of China would not be of much use in that part of the world. There is little doubt that an effective disarmament agreement which is one of the major and urgent objectives of the United Nations and of all peoples, cannot be reached without the participation of China. The artificial situation whereby one-fourth of the peoples of the world are denied representation in the United Nations cannot but diminish the effectiveness of the Organization.

To make representation in the Organization conditional on the approval by other States of the genesis and the form of a Government or of its administration is not consistent with the Charter of the United Nations itself. This is borne out by the fact that the United Nations has frequently accepted the representatives of revolutionary Governments as the duly accredited representatives of Member States.

It will be recalled that the League of Nations too came to see the wisdom of moving toward a realistic universality rather than of excluding certain Governments on the basis of their revolutionary origins. Moreover, after the recent expansion of the membership of the United Nations it would not be consistent to cite as a reason against the correction of the representation of China the existence of a particular resolution.

In view of the aforementioned considerations, and of all the relevant circumstances, the Government of India once again urge that the General Assembly consider the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. Accordingly, they have proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled the "Question of the Representation of China in the United Nations.

<Pg-125>

PAKISTAN CHINA INDIA USA SWITZERLAND INDONESIA AUSTRALIA

**Date**: Jul 14, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **INDONESIA**

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters have been exchanged at Djakarta between the Charge d' Affaires ad interim, Embassy of India, on behalf of the Government of India and the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the Government of Indonesia, extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries up to Dec 31, 1958.

The principal commodities listed for exports from India to Indonesia under the Agreement are cotton textiles and yarn, jute goods, tobacco, linseed oil, hardware, pharmaceutical products and chemical preparations, tea chests, sports goods, rubber tyres and tubes, porcelainware, paper and boards, machinery including agricultural implements, diesel engines, sugarcane crushers, textile machinery, electrical equipments including motors and batteries, sewing machines, hurricane lanterns and the household utensils.

Among the items listed for exports from Indonesia to India are copra and coconut oil, palm kernels and oil, essential oils, spices including betel nuts, timber, tin, rubber, hides and skins, canes and rattans, gums and resins, tanning materials, sisal fibre and tobacco wrappers.

#### INDONESIA INDIA USA

**Date**: Dec 31, 1958

# Volume No

1995

**IRAQ** 

Recognition of the New Government

The Government of India in a Press Note issued on Jul 23, 1958 have decided to recognise the new Government of Iraq. A communication to that effect has been sent to the new Government.

IRAQ INDIA

**Date**: Jul 23, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Loan for Refinance Corporation

Rupees 260 million will be made available for loans to medium-sized industries in the private sector under an agreement signed in New Delhi on 29 July between the Governments of India and the United States.

The agreement makes this new source of rupees available to the Refinance Corporation for Industry for loans to medium-sized industries for periods of three to seven years. The purpose of these loans is to provide increased industrial production in the private sector and will be extended primarily to projects in the private sector in the second Five-Year Plan.

This sum of Rs. 260 million is part of the PL 480 proceeds from the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities. The Agricultural Commodities Agreement between the Governments of India and the United States,

signed in August, 1956, provided for the rupee equivalent of \$55 million (Rs. 26 million) to be reserved for relending to private enterprise through established banking facilities under procedures agreed upon by the two Governments.

The agreement was signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission.

<Pg-126>

**USA INDIA** 

**Date**: Jul 23, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Authority in Relation to Portuguese Possessions in India

A Government of India notification on Jul 24, 1958 states that the Government of Egypt (now merged into the United Arab Republic) having agreed to be in charge of all Indian interests in territories under the jurisdiction of the Government of Portugal, all diplomatic and Consular officers of the Embassy of the United Arab Republic in India are hereby authorised to perform the duties of a Consular agent in relation to Goa and other Portuguese possessions in India.

INDIA EGYPT PORTUGAL

**Date**: Jul 24, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister Nehru's Reply to Prime Minister Khruschev's Letter

Prime Minister Nehru on Jul 20, 1958 has sent the following reply to Mr.

Khruschev, Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I have just received the text of the letter you have addressed to me. In view of the urgency and vital importance of the contents of your letter, I am immediately sending this reply. I am grateful to you for the letter you have sent. I entirely agree with you that we are living through one of the most serious crises in the history of mankind and that, at this moment of peril, it is the duty of governments as well as others to approach these questions with wisdom and calmness, and not to take any action which might worsen this situation and provoke a world conflagration. Whatever the views of governments might be in regard to other matters, reason and even self-interest drive to the conclusion that the maintenance of peace is essential for all of us and that war must be avoided. This means that the approach to this and like questions must not be through military strength and pressures, but by calm negotiation and the firm determination that peace must be maintained.

You are aware, Mr. Prime Minister, of our firm conviction that armed intervention by a foreign power in any country is most undesirable and that foreign troops should be withdrawn from the countries where they have entered. This is not only in accordance with justice and the freedom of the countries concerned, but also avoids international complications which may lead to a catastrophe. Therefore, we have urged the Governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain to withdraw their forces from the Lebanon and Jordan.

We would welcome a peaceful approach by negotiation through the United Nations or its Security Council or otherwise, with a view to helping the United Nations to take steps to end the conflict in the Near and Middle Eastern region. We are always prepared to offer our services for this purpose whenever they are asked for and needed.

I am grateful to you for your kind invitation to India to join in the Conference of the Heads of Governments suggested by you. If there is agreement about the holding of such a conference, it should not be difficult to fix a suitable venue and an early date. We shall gladly offer our services to it in the cause of peace, if they are needed.

I understand that the Conference suggested by you is different and separate from the proposal for a high level or Summit Conference which has been under discussion for some time. The present proposal is made for the limited purpose of dealing with the critical situation that has arisen in the Middle Eastern region.

With warm regards,

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

<Pg-127>

#### USA JORDAN LEBANON INDIA

**Date**: Jul 20, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **WORLD BANK**

Loan for D.V. Corporation

The World Bank on Jul 23, 1958 sanctioned a loan of \$25 million to meet the foreign exchange costs of the present stage of expansion of the Damodar Valley Corporation.

Earlier, the World Bank had sanctioned in 1950 a loan of approximately \$18.5 million and in 1953, a second loan of approximately \$19.5 million. After some cancellation at the request of India, the effective amounts of these two loans were about \$27 million.

The present loan is, therefore, the third sanctioned for the D.V.C. It is expected to cover some six to seven million dollars of expenditure already undertaken for the project.

The loan will be for a period of 20 years and the rate of interest is 5-3/8%.

Recently the World Bank had sanctioned two other loans, one for the expansion of Madras Port and the other for the improvement of Calcutta Port.

<Pg-128>

**INDIA** 

**Date**: Jul 23, 1958

August

**Volume No** 

1995	
CONTENTS	
F	
Foreign Affairs Record	1958
	August
Volume IV	No. 8
CONTENTS	
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Agreement to Establish Technological Institute 129	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIO Shri. Arthur S. Lall's Speech at t General Assembly Indian Nationals in South Africa	he United Nations 129
Prime Minister's Speech on Fore Prime Minister's Reply to Debate Foreign Policy Debate: Prime M Foreign Policy Debate: Prime M	e on Foreign Policy 145 Finister's Speech 150 Finister's Reply 154 Down at Damascus 158
NEPAL Indian Military Mission	158
PAKISTAN Prime Minister's Statement on Border Incidents 159 Indo-Pakistan Canal Water Dispute 161 Manhandling of Indian Officials 161 Indian Killed at Bolapara 161	
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHIN Indian Nationals in China Repatriation of Chinese Students	161
POLAND Cultural Agreement Ratified	162

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Assistance for C.D. and N.E.S. Schemes ... ... 162

<Pg-i>

#### GERMANY INDIA SOUTH AFRICA SYRIA USA NEPAL PAKISTAN CHINA POLAND

**Date**: Aug 01, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Agreement to Establish Technological Institute

An Indo-German Agreement on the establishment of a Higher Institute of Technology at Madras was signed in Bonn on 7 August by Duc. Van Scherpenberg, State Secretary, Federal Foreign Office on behalf of the German Federal Republic and Indian Ambassador Tyabji on behalf of India, thus bringing a step further the project for which the offer was made by the German Government two years ago during the visit of our Prime Minister. Under this Agreement Germany will provide teachers, laboratory, and workshop equipment as well as a library at a cost of 15 million Marks. Plans are being made for the instruction and research activities to start in July 1959.

Besides the German staff coming in the early stages Indian trainees will be trained in German institutions to ultimately take their places. A beginning has been made in this regard taking advantage of Professor Thacker's visit by selecting Indian candidates in Germany.

While signing the Agreement, Duc. Van Scherpenberg said it marked a major step in Indo-German Co-operation and expansion of training facilities available to this generation of young Indians, who would build the India of tomorrow. He remarked it was the first agreement of its kind in which Germany was participating to promote technical and educational contacts with India. In his reply Shri Tyabji expressing his pleasure at being able to sign such an important agreement so soon after his arrival conveyed the Government of India's gratitude for the generous offer made by the Federal Government of Germany and commended the part the Institute would play in meeting India's requirements of scientific and technical personnel in her development plans. He also particularly thanked German officials associated with this project but for whose interest and enthusiasm such quick progress on the Agreement could not have been made. Prof. Thacker, Secretary, Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, was also present at the signing ceremony.

**Date**: Aug 01, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur S. Lall's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations on 18 August at the Third Emergency Special Session of the General Assembly, on U.S.S.R. Draft Resolution demanding withdrawal of foreign troops from West Asian countries:

At this very important and crucial juncture in the development of their affairs, I wish to express to all the Arab representatives in this room and to their Governments and peoples the friendly greetings of the Government and peoples of India and our sympathetic understanding of the international aspects of their problems. I have, of course, deliberately used the phrase "the international aspects of their problems", for as far as their internal affairs are concerned we can only express our views and sympathies as and when we might be asked to do so by the Arab countries themselves, and on no other occasion.

It is not opportune to reminisce at any length today on our extensive and friendly contacts with the Arab world stretching over many centuries and, indeed, millennia. In the great period of the Arab renaissance there were friendly and often very lively discussions and even disputations between their scientists and ours and their men of letters and ours, and in the many faceted secular India of today there is a warm welcome and a secure home for those Arab communities that have settled within our borders.

Though I do not wish to dwell on these matters, it is not possible for me as an Indian of this generation ever to forget, or to refrain on this occasion from mentioning, the outstanding assistance rendered to the cause of Indian nationalism and the resurgence of India by a distinguished son of Arabia whose death our whole nation mourned about a year ago, no one more deeply than the Prime Minister of India himself. I am speaking of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the great Indian national leader, who came to us from Arabia. He was born in Mecca and then he came to us and did so much to develop and inspire our own national movement. It was

he who was President of the Indian National Congress in ??? momentous days for India when we ??? our independence.

Fittingly, ??? now to Arab nationalism, that ??? and dynamic force in the Middle East. ??? might be permitted to say so, we understand that nationalism. We understand it as a ??? expression, and the rightful expression of the ??? of the Arab peoples. It is the same force that we have found among ourselves, a force which is still at work in our own country and in other parts of the world, particularly in Asia and in Africa, where, for some time and for various reasons which I will not now go into, it had lain dormant.

On Arab nationalism, specifically, Prime Minister Nehru recently said:

Arab nationalism must be recognized by other countries. It is an obvious, patent and clear fact which cannot but be recognized. There have been many failures in the past for lack of understanding of this force.

It is, I submit, entirely incorrect to think of Arab nationalism as some kind of imperialism. Nationalism as such and imperialism are, exhypothesi, incompatible one with the other. It is not imperialism for people to express their nationalistic aspirations which, indeed, are the basis of the modern nation States of the Western world. If I might say so, it is one of the extraordinary ironies of the present situation that a great deal of criticism of nationalism in the Arab world comes from just those parts of the world where the life of the people is squarely based on a vigorous, flourishing established nationalism. Surely this is something on which we should all reflect, because unless we look on Arab nationalism in the perspective of history and of our times we will continue of misunderstand it and, perhaps, continue to take action unfortunately--though we hope very much that this will not be the case--which will threaten the peace and the security of the area and of our entire world. Should not those who criticize Arab nationalism examine their own foundations? And should they not remember how often those very foundations, of which they are proud now, perhaps regrettably had to be soiled with violence and bloodshed?

But on the whole, whatever the nature of their own origins, those ??? firmly established their nationalism ??? to discern in the march of ??? growth and the development of the human personality, and a steady decrease of internal violence. Perhaps many of them would say that at one stage violence inevitably had to be used in order to give the people an opportunity to develop themselves, in order to rescue the peoples from the stranglehold of a narrowly based feudalistic or colonial or class-ridden concept of life. Let us, then, apply these very cannons to Arab nationalism today. Let us not criticize those who are searching for and taking the path which we ourselves, many of

us in the manners compatible with our own history and traditions, have trod

When news came to New York of that brief and relatively orderly revolution which occurred in Iraq on 14 July there were cries in this very building from responsible spokesmen of outrage at the horror and the violence which was being perpetrated. It is not anyone's desire-and I am sure that it is not the desire of the Iraq people or its Government--to praise violence, but the salient point here will emerge only if those who have deplored violence in Iraq will just look at the process of the development of the nationalism and its effects nearer their own homes. Besides, have those who raised their voices against violence forgotten the violence and unfortunate brutality of the period in Iraq immediately before the revolution? Would they not agree that the new Government of Iraq is conducted itself in a manner which is far more humane than that of its predecessor? And this is very understandable because the uprising in Iraq was the uprising of a people which had suffered too much oppression, too much concentration of power in the hands of a few, too little respect for the people, too little attention to its needs and aspirations.

Thus we can now see in Iraq the logical process unfolding itself, a process of liberation front many bonds. And this is a process which in itself will greatly enhance stability and peace in the area of Middle East. So, if we examine these matters closely, it will have to be admitted that just that revolution which the representatives of certain countries made even the basis, or partly the basis, of their military action in Lebanon and Jordan, and so completely deplored here as being a sign of instability in the area, is actually and in fact, when objectively considered, a great step forward in the achievement of stability and peace in the Middle East. Those who have read their history correctly cannot but see in the recent events in Iraq a development which, in spite of the element of violence which was involved, is very much to be welcomed. May I say how happy we are to see in our midst the Foreign

#### <Pg-130>

Minister of the new Government of Iraq and our colleague, Ambassador Hashim Jawad, for whom many of us have long cherished admiration and the most friendly feelings. And what of Lebanon and Jordan? For them too, the Government and the peoples of India have the most friendly feelings, may I assure them. We feel for them in their struggles and in their hardships. We consider it axiomatic that they too must decide for themselves their own future; we consider, furthermore, that they are entitled to do this without interference from any quarter, no matter what the motives.

I have probably said enough, and I hope said enough that is widely acceptable to this Assembly to indicate the basic reasons why the Government of India viewed with grave concern the landings of foreign troops in Lebanon and Jordan. We have given the most careful

attention to the various reasons which were adduced for these actions. Sometimes it was difficult for us to follow those reasons, for they seemed to shift from one stand to another. But whether they were reasons based on Article 51 of the Charter, a stand which we regard as totally unacceptable and inapplicable to these cases, or if they were reasons based on the fight to protect foreign nationals or on the alleged right to assist a regime or Government, we were, may I say, not impressed. On the other hand, we could not but see very grave dangers inherent in the situation created by the entry of relatively large numbers of foreign forces armed and equipped in a manner which could let loose such a carnage of destruction as has never been seen in the long history of the Middle East. And moreover, these forces by their very presence--the presence of massive striking potential--cannot but interfere in the normal political and other forms of expression of the life of the people. I do not have to dilate upon this. It is expecting too much of human beings, even of the brave Arab people, to think that they can develop in freedom and in the manner which they would choose for themselves when they stand in the shadow cast by the massive presence of the armed strangers within their gates. And there is another important reason, another important aspect of this matter which must engage our attention. As the Prime Minister of India has said:

Even if outside forces intervene with sincere and honest designs they would have to side with one group or another in the country with consequences fraught with grave danger.

In our view, the whole situation will continue to be full of danger and will continue to be explosive so long as foreign forces remain on the soil of Lebanon and Jordan. There can be no settlement, and indeed no talk of an acceptable, workable and dignified settlement, and no return to normalcy until this element of foreign troops has been removed.

It is not our intention in this debate to raise our voices in bitterness or in invective. That is very far from our purpose. We do not think that sort of debate would conduce to a settlement. But before we suggest some of the ideas for a settlement which might be helpful, if accepted by the countries immediately concerned, for it is they who must first tell us what is acceptable to them, we feel that an appeal to certain countries would not be amiss. As I have said, we have not been able to accept the reasons for foreign forces being taken to the Middle East and this, as I said, has not been for lack of trying to understand these actions. To us it almost seems as if those who have thus acted had taken out a directive paper from the drawer of some misplaced archive of the eighteenth or the nineteenth century. Somehow time has lunged backwards into the past and produced actions which are totally out of date and out of step with the present. We earnestly hope that these ancient archives and these wrong drawers of history will not be opened again. We do appeal to all countries to remember that whatever wise step may be taken in the future--and we hope that wise steps are about to be taken both in this Assembly and we hope by national Governments unilaterally--it

will unfortunately be a long time before the natural resentment, the natural feeling of violation and insecurity caused by even a temporary stay of foreign forces, can be undone in that area in which they are now stationed. We will, I hope, in the next few days find a method, find the mechanism which will lead to a very speedy withdrawal of foreign forces. But we will not, I fear, in these few days be able to undo the human harm and to calm the stirring of human passions which will have resulted from this from of foreign presence in the Middle East. That result will require the protracted operations of the healing hand of time and the continued wisdom of all those concerned.

But in spite of the scar which will remain, and indeed so that the scar should not be too large and too painful, we cannot but act as quickly as possible. Nor can we overlook the fact, the very dangerous fact, that the presence of these troops creates the hazard that at any moment there may be set alight some incident from which could flare up such a bloody conflict

$$<$$
Pg-131>

as might well destroy the peace of the world. So from all points of view we must act quickly, and as wisely as we can.

Now if there is anything that emerges as a pointer from these brief remarks of mine, it is that we would be compounding folly and dealing a grave blow to the development of those very forces in the Arab world which should be encouraged if we were to replace the present type of foreign presence by a similar type of United Nations presence--that is, by armed forces. There could be no greater folly than this. Thus there would seem to be no question whatsoever of sending United Nations or other forces to the Middle East. And there can be no question whatsoever of the United Nations devising means to arrest the development of Arab nationalism in each State in the area. Nor can there be any question of there being any other form of United Nations activity which might interfere in the internal affairs of an Arab State. It would certainly be ironical if the United Nations itself, in spite of the provisions of the Charter, were to launch some kind of interference in the affairs of an Arab State, and of course it would be interference totally incompatible with the Charter if the United Nations would seek to bolster up a particular regime or a particular Government.

Of course, it would be an interference if the United Nations should seek to exercise any form of police powers within the jurisdiction of a State. We must be quite clear about these matters; otherwise we shall merely be sowing such seeds of discontent in the area as will, biding their time, surely spring up in a harvest which will render ridiculous such devices as I am trying to suggest should be now totally ruled out.

There has been much talk also of indirect aggression. In fact, at one time we got the impression that this Assembly was meeting to consider indirect aggression, even though for ten years the United Nations has been unable to define aggression itself.

Charges of indirect aggression, Prime Minister Nehru has said, are "inherently and essentially and inevitably a part of the cold-war technique", and he added that such talk "really ignores the basic issues there".

The point really is: Are we going to miss the wood for the trees? Are we going to concentrate our attention on the cheering from the sidelines, even the booing, even the caterwauling, even perhaps a certain amount of egging on, and not look at what is actually happening in the arena itself? If we do this, we shall put ourselves into a totally false, unrealistic and also somewhat ridiculous position.

To cut this matter short, let us beware of stifling Arab nationalism--and, as I have said, nationalism and imperialism are incompatible with each other. Let us beware of stifling, even attempting to stifle, Arab nationalism, for the simple reason that if we were to do this we would be trying to deny to others what we have made the basis of our own statehood. We would be denying our own national heritage, we would be suppressing the development of creative processes in human communities, and we would forfeit any claim to have acted wisely. Of course, it is absolutely essential that all States respect one another's independence, territorial integrity and full sovereignty, and there must be no interference whatsoever in one another's affairs. But, having said this, do not let us bring under interdict those vital, robust stirrings in the Arab countries of today which have their springs within the countries concerned themselves. And, if these robust stirrings yearn for a certain degree of co-operation among the countries of the Arab world, that is the affair of the Arab peoples, and it is not for us on the sidelines to talk to them about indirect aggression. We have no doubt that the Arab States will make wise adjustments with one another. Whether a State retains in full its own separate identity or whether it enters into a particular form of relationship with its neighbours as a matter for decision in each case by the States concerned and not for

So, in searching for a solution, let us not get lost in talk about indirect aggression. If the cheering or booing, and so on, on the sidelines is regarded as too vociferous, there are friendly ways, as there are in private life, with a smile, of counselling or calling attention to neighbourliness. We all must remember these virtues, for we all need to practise them, and I want to make it absolutely clear that I am not addressing these remarks specifically to the Arab countries. We all, perhaps without exception, need to remind ourselves of these things.

The immediate, the foremost, the crying need is to remove the grave and present danger in the area; that is to say, we must turn our attention to the question of foreign forces in the Middle East. In doing so, I would once again repeat that we must remember the very grave dangers that are inherent in the presence of these forces; the grave dangers to international peace which concern every single country in this Assembly. We would, therefore, express the hope

#### <Pg-132>

that United States forces will in the immediate future, and United Kingdom forces likewise in the immediate future, leave Lebanon and Jordan. We want to assure the United States and the United Kingdom again that we are not taking part in this debate for any reason but to attempt to contribute to a peaceful and speedy settlement in regard to the situation which confronts us. We have no desire to engage in invective or even in criticism. But we appeal to them to respond to the wishes of those in our part of the world who have some experience in these matters, and, may I say, to heed this appeal particularly when it comes from a very friendly country, from a country which has been able, in co-operation with the United Kingdom, to overcome some of the worst features of the past 200 years of our history, from a country which is not speaking from any personal motives, and from a country which, therefore, may be able to speak, we hope, not too unacceptably. We request the United States and the United Kingdom to withdraw from an action which will not, we feel we can assure them, conduce to any purpose which they themselves might have in view. We do not at this point wish to go into the economic inter-relations between the Western world and the Arab Middle East. We are convinced, however, that those inter-relations are a matter for discussion, as and when necessary and as agreed upon, around conference tables in a civilized and peaceful way and that any show of force as background moves or as direct thrusts into the economic arena are doomed to failure and will only make relations between the West and the Arab Middle East worse in all fields, including the economic. Therefore, as a country which has had long connexions with the West and which is a neighbour of the Arab world, and as a country which, if I may venture to say so, represents no small proportion of those peoples of the world whose experiences have in some respects been similar to those of the Arab peoples, we again ask the United States and the United Kingdom to consider and to heed our request and to accept our assurance that it is made in friendliness and in the conviction that it is in the best interests of all concerned.

Now, I have already said that we must not commit the folly of substituting one armed presence for another armed presence. May I say here briefly that much has been said in this debate about acting in accordance with the Charter or acting in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. We welcome the motives of such statements. However, we find nothing in the Charter which would even remotely sanction the sending of armed forces into the area in the circumstances and in the situation which exists. So far as we can see, apart from the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, the whole spirit of the wording of the Charter is that there should be no use of force whatsoever and no threats of force and no display of force. We do not, therefore, see any basis for statements invoking the Charter or

the spirit of the Charter in defence of using armed force or of making a display of force in the present situation. As I have already pointed out, we exclude Article 51 of the Charter because none of the circumstances of which it speaks is applicable to the situation which confronts us. However, if either of the countries in which foreign forces have entered should ask for any strengthening of United Nations observation, then we think that it should be possible to take steps to meet its wishes.

Here it might be opportune, in view of other statements which have been made, to make some observations on the suggestion that if only the United Nations has had a police force at the present juncture, it could have quickly thrown it into action in Lebanon and Jordan. I wonder whether we could devise a formula which would create a kind of chameleonlike force capable of changing its colour or character so as to act, if required, as a UNTSO operation, a UNEF operation, or a UNOGIL operation. I submit that we could not do so. These operations are so different, one from another, that no single force could answer to all these widely differing requirements. To rush a standard type of force into delicate situations which cannot possibly be standardized is to court added trouble and disaster. In any event this is a matter which we should not resolve on now. If there is to be any consideration at all given to a matter like this, it must come up in the normal way and be looked at from all points of view. To slip it in, as it were, by a side door at this emergency session where we are considering a specific problem in a certain area of the world would, in our view, be unwise and totally unwarranted.

Let us, then, focus our attention on the matter which concerns us at this moment. Let us remove the cause of resentment in the Arab world. Let us remove the grave potential danger to world peace. Let us enjoin on all of ourselves brotherliness, non-interference, and respect for each other's sovereignty. Let us take these actions urgently lest the potential dangers should split wide open with a crash that would involve us all. Let us remember this when we talk of long-term measures: that they can be taken only in freedom and by the countries mainly concerned. Let it be those countries that will, in due time, if they

<Pg-133>

??? they see fit, ask us to join with ??? of such measures.

??? of India will welcome any ??? in line with the foregoing views, and if necessary and desirable, we will assist in their formulation and presentation to this Assembly. In that connexion, we might find it necessary once again to seek your indulgence, Mr. President, to come to this rostrum.

INDIA USA IRAQ JORDAN LEBANON CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Aug 01, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur S. Lall's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Shri Arthur S. Lall, Indian Permanent Representative the United Nations, on 21 August at the Third emergency Special Session of the General Assembly on 11-Power Draft Resolution on West Asia situation:

The Asian-African Members of this organisaion expressed their views today on the very happy developments which are before us through the representative of Sudan. I felt, however, that the occasion was such that it was impossible not to join the voice of India to those which have already early been heard and to those which after mine.

It was a unanimous decision of the Security counsil that led to the convening of this emergency specials session of the Assembly. And it is most befitting that it should be a unanimous decision of the General Assembly which closes this emergency special session. I would like to very briefly that it is not only with joy but with pride that we have seen our Arab colleagues come together in a unanimous decision in the draft resolution(A/3893) which is before us under today's date.

We see in this the beginning of a new era of co-operation and prosperity a new era of peace in the Middle Eastt in which we, as a neighbour will share. We have friendship for all the peoples of the Arab World and for all of their States. Their prosperity and their peace is ours.

We would also like to say a brief word arising of the statements which have been made by the secretary of State of the United States and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom. This is an Arab draft resolution. It asks for peace and prosperity in the Arab world. It asks that the foreign troops now in Labanon and in Jordan should be withdrawn at an early date. I think it is a matter also for greatification in this Assembly that the representative of the United States and the United Kingdom have said that they will fully support this draft resolution. We are grateful for this is a contry which wishes to see peace in this world of our and which realizes that this peace depends on the co-operation of all

countries. We are sure that the action of the United States and the United Kingdom in supporting this draft resolution is a reaction based on their desire to co-operate fully with the terms of this draft resolution. We have no doubt whatsoever that there will be an early withdrawal of the troops now in Lebanon and Jordan. We can only interpret the support of this draft resolution by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom as meaning precisely that.

I think it is also necessary to say that our delegation, for one, and several other delegations did have real difficulties of principle with the draft-resolution--the draft resolution which has been described today as the Norwegian draft resolution, although from reading the text I would say the draft resolution sponsored by Canada

and six other countries--and, as is widely known in this Assembly, we had suggested along with friends informally that that draft resolution required emendation in three important points. We are glad to see that the Arab draft resolution, which will soon be the unanimous recommendation of this Assembly, covers all those three points. It would not have been possible for us to give any endorsement, direct or indirect, to the movement of forces into Lebanon and Jordan; and we are glad to see that there is no noting of the declarations which referred in terms to those actions.

We are also glad to see that it has been decided as the wiser course that if consideration is to be given to the creation of a United Nations stand-by force, that matter will come to the Assembly in the normal course and not be slipped in by a side door at this Assembly, which is not considering that issue. In that respect too, this draft resolution saves an important point of principle; that is to say it saves the point of principle that important issues must be brought to this Organization by the front door and not by the side door.

Finally, the seven-Power draft resolution was unfortunately not explicit on the question of the withdrawal of forces. This draft resolution is explicit on the question of the withdrawal of

<Pg-134>

forces; in terms it asks for the early withdrawal of the foreign troops now in Lebanon and Jordan.

These were the three points on which we would have asked for the emendation of the seven-Power draft resolution, and we are very happy to see that the Arab draft resolution, with the expected statesmanship of our Arab colleagues, did what we expected it would do on these three matters.

As I said, it is with great joy and pride that we commend the people of the Arab world, who are our close neighbours, for having brought this draft resolution to the General Assembly. We will vote for it and we wish the Secretary-General Godspeed in his new venture.

In that connexion, I am sure that the Assembly will bear with me if I say that a distinguished part has been played in this situation by the group of persons of various ranks which has now come to be known as UNOGIL. At this moment I do want to place on record the appreciation of the delegation of India for the work which has been done by the UNOGIL organization so far. I do not want to go into the question of their reports at this juncture. If necessary, that could be done later.

With these few brief remarks, I should like to repeat that the delegation of India will vote for the draft resolution which has been put before us by our ten Arab colleagues.

#### INDIA USA SUDAN JORDAN LEBANON CANADA

**Date**: Aug 01, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

#### Indian Nationals in South Africa

In reply to a question Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on 14 August, "In pursuance of the U.N. General Assembly Resolution dated November Nov 26, 1957 the Permane n the Permanent Representative of the Union of South Africa at New York on 8 April, 1958, conveying the Government of India's desire to enter into and pursue negotiations with the Government of South Africa. No reply has so far been received from the South African Government. Steps have, however, been taken to include the item regarding the question of treatment of persons of Indian origin in South Africa on

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA

**Date**: Nov 26, 1957

# Volume No

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on West Asian Situation

the agenda of the forthcoming session of the U.N. General Assembly."

In reply to a "Calling attention" notice in the Lok Sabha on 14 August, 1958 Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement on the situation in West Asia:

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad of this opportunity to make a statement in regard to the situation in West Asia. A very large number of questions and notices have been addressed to me in regard to this situation, and instead of trying to answer each question separately, it would be perhaps a little better if I dealt with it by

a statement.

The facts are generally known; nevertheless, I would like to give a factual account of what has happened in the past few months. The House may remember that on 18 February last, replying to the debate on the President's Address in the course of the Budget Session, I indicated some of the developments which had taken place in West Asia. Since then grave and even ominous events have occurred in that part of the world. For sometime, there had been rumblings in the Lebanon. The Opposition there did not agree with the policy being persued by the Government of the day under President Chamoun. The question arose--President Chamoun's continuance or not in the Presidentship. His term normally expires on 24 September. But he let it be known that he desired to stand again, although that involved a change in the Constitution. That is, he wanted the Constitution to be changed, so that he might stand again for the Presidentship. This was not at all agreeable to the opposition there. They started a big agitation against it. Thereafter, a very prominent editor of a newspaper at Beirut, which favoured the opposition was killed and I think this was the spark that lit the fire of violence on a relatively big scale leading to this conflict between the Government and the opposition there.

This continued for sometime. Behind it was

<Pg-135>

really a basic difference in policy between that of President Chamoun and the opposition. But the actual matter at issue became one of President Chamoun continuing in office or not as President.

Then, on 22 May, 1958, the Government of Lebanon complained to the Security Council

"in respect of a situation arising from the intervention of the United Arab Republic in the internal affairs of Lebanon, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

The complaint mentioned, among other things, the infiltration of armed bands from syria into Lebanon and the supply of arms from Syria. As a result of this complaint, the Security Council on the 11th June, 1958, adopted unanimously a Swedish resolution deciding to

"dispatch urgently an observation group to proceed to Lebanon so as to ensure that there is no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other material across the Lebanese borders".

This resolution also authorised the Secretary General to take necessary steps for organising the Group. Pursuant to this, the group was finally constituted in Beirut by the 19th June and was composed of Mr. Galo Plaza of Ecuador as Chairman, Major General Odd Bull of Norway as Executive Member and Shri Rajeshwar Dayal of India as

member. The Group established with the help of a number of military officers several observation stations and sub-stations. The Group submitted its first report on 3 July. It was clear from this report that whatever might have happened in the past, the group had found no evidence of any significant infiltration into the Lebanon from the Syrian side during its stay there.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold, who had been to the Lebanon shortly before, stated on 3 July that to his knowledge, there was no foundation for the statement made that there had been massive infiltration into the Lebanon.

The presence of the U.N. Observer Group had a salutary effect on the situation in Lebanon and in the second week of July there were indications that same kind of settlement between the Government of Lebanon and the opposition there might be reached. Then something happened. That was the coup d'etat in Iraq on 14 July which resulted in a new Government coming into power in Baghdad. Because of the coup d'etat, as is known, the King, the Crown Prince and the Prime Minister Nuri es-Said were killed. There were also deplorable acts of violence by the crowd. But by and large, the new Government of Iraq avoided excesses and was soon in full control of the whole of Iraq and maintained law and order. It was evident that this new Government was popular.

Immediately after this coup d'etat at Baghdad events moved swiftly. On 15 July, i.e. the next day, 2,000 United States marines landed in Lebanon in order, it was stated, to protect American lives and to encourage defence of Lebanese sovereignty and integrity. It was said that the forces had been landed in response to an urgent plea received from President Chamoun of Lebanon. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the British Foreign Secretary, stated that his Government fully supported the U.S. action in landing troops in Lebanon.

A meeting of the Security Council was immediately called to discuss the situation resulting from these developments. Since then, of course, many more troops had been sent. It might be noted that these troops were sent to the Lebanon really when the situation inside Lebanon was settling down. It was obvious that it was not because of the situation in Lebanon, but because of the coup d'etat in Iraq and the possible consequences from it that were feared.

A day later, i.e. on 16 July, the United Nations Observer Corps in Lebanon submitted an interim report in which the Group said that it was "able to report to the Security Council that it has as of 15 July access to all parts of the frontier." That is to say, previously it was stated that the Observation Group's report was not very helpful, because the entire frontier was not under observation. What is the good of their saying that through half the frontier nothing had happened? Something might have happened through the other half. From the 15th, they were in touch with the whole frontier and, therefore, they were in a fairly satisfactory position to observe any movement across the frontier.

On 17 July, British paratroops landed at Amman from bases in Cyprus and Mr. Macmillan told the British House of Commons that these troops had been sent in response to a request from King Hussein. On the same day, Jordan complained to the Security Council about the interference in its domestic affairs by the United Arab Republic.

## <Pg-136>

I might mention that during these days, I received a large number of messages from various Heads of States and others, from Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Diefenbaker of Canada, President Eisenhower, President Nasser, Mr Bandaranaike, Prime Minister U Nu, Prime Minister of Indonesia and others. These messages as well as the information supplied by our Missions abroad kept us fully and continually informed of the serious situation and also indicated the line of thinking of various Governments. It was evident that the situation was a very grave one and might lead to military operations on a large scale and indeed to a major war. During these days, occasionally one had the feeling that we were on the brink of a war.

On 19 July, I received a message from Mr. Khruschev suggesting that there should be an immediate meeting of the Heads of Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France and India, to which the Secretary General of the United Nations should also be invited and that this meeting should endeavour to find some solution. I accepted this proposal and said in reply that I would be prepared to attend such a meeting if our presence was required by all concerned and if we felt convinced that we could make any useful contribution. Some of the replies that Mr. Khruschev received from other Heads of Governments were not wholly favourable to his proposal. But, nevertheless, it appeared that a so-called summit meeting was likely to take place at an early date.

Meanwhile, the Security Council was engaged in discussing a Japanese resolution which requested the Secretary General

"to make arrangements forthwith for such measures, in addition to those envisaged in the resolution of the 11th June, 1958, as he may consider necessary in the light of the present circumstances with a view to enabling the United Nations to fulfil the general purposes established in that resolution and which will, in accordance with the Charter, serve to ensure the territorial and political independence of Lebanon so as to make possible the withdrawal of the United States forces from the Lebanon."

There were some aspects of this Resolution which we did not like, although the explanation made by the Japanese representative in the Security Council cleared up some of our doubts. But in any event the Resolution was finally not passed by the Security Council which adjourned until the outcome of the proposal made by Mr. Khruschev was known.

The correspondence of Mr. Khruschev with the Heads of Governments of the USA, UK and France has already been published. The idea of summit conference gradually faded out and it became apparent by 5 August that there was no possibility of such a high-level conference in the near future. Accordingly, the Powers concerned agreed to meet immediately in the Security Council for recommending the convening of a special emergency session of the General Assembly. This session met 24 hours later on the 8th August and decided to adjourn until the 13th August, i.e. yesterday. India was represented there by our Permanent Representative, Shri Arthur Lall.

Now, the proceedings of this special session are going on and reports have come of the speech delivered by President Eisenhower in which he made certain proposals. Reports have come also of some proposals that are being put forward by the Soviet Government and other powers there. It is rather difficult for me at this stage to comment on this partly because we have not got full information as to what is happening there and we should like to have that information and time to consider these various proposals before we send our instructions to our representative or comment on them otherwise.

I might mention, however, that on the 8th August the United Nations Secretary-General made a statement before the General Assembly in which he suggested that the United Nations might continue to play some part in these areas and might so adopt its role both in Jordan and in Lebanon as to help in the search for a satisfactory solution. Here also, what the Secretary-General has said has to be carefully considered before we can express any firm opinion and although we have seen something about what he has said, we have not yet had the full report about it.

Here, I would like to say that our country, as the House knows very well, does not approve of military alliances and carries out a policy of nonalignment. We would welcome every country to do that, but it is quite another thing to tell a country that you must have an enforced neutrality Anything enforced is not good. Even a good thing becomes bad if it is enforced in that particular way. Therefore any approach of compulsion that way and some kind of supervision is not likely to be accepted by the people of that area.

Now, on 23 July, the Government of India recognised the new Government of Iraq. Before that and since, chiefly after, a very large number

<Pg-137>

of countries have recognised this new Government of Iraq, including all the Great Powers. Nearly all have recognised.

The situation in the Lebanon has undergone some changes but continues to be rather obscure. A new President-General Shehab--has been elected. The old President, however, continues and has announced his intention to complete his term which ends on 24 September although

his Government is reported to have offered its resignation. This has created certain difficulties because the Opposition is not prepared to function normally under the present President--President Chamoun. Further, the Opposition is opposed to President Chamoun sending his own representative to the United Nations' special emergency session of the General Assembly because they say that he will not represent, according to them, the views of the people of Labanon and would only represent President Chamoun. So, all these difficulties have arisen there. In fact, so far as I know nobody has yet gone to the General Assembly session from Lebanon. On the Government side they have not yet sent somebody because they have not made up their mind and on the Opposition side they wanted to send somebody but he did not get the visa.

Now, the American authorities have announced that they would withdraw their troops from the Lebanon as soon as the Government of Lebanon asks them to do so. Only yesterday it has been announced that they have withdrawn a small part of their troops from there, but the major part still remains. In Jordan it is not clear in what circumstances the British Government would withdraw their troops though they have announced their intention of doing so some time in the future.

Our general views in regard to this position in Western Asia have been frequently stated and are certainly well-known to this House. Our approach is not inimical to any country there. It is friendly to all countries, but inevitably our sympathies are with the Arab countries there and with Arab nationalism which represents today the urge of the people there. Also, according to our general policy and as well as our particular views on this situation in Western Asia we do not accept that foreign troops should be used in any territory in this area in the circumstances prevailing there. We are convinced that there can be no settlement and no return to normality till foreign troops are removed. We have, therefore, and so far as we can, pressed and continue to press for the withdrawal of these troops at the earliest possible opportunity. We have also made it clear that in our view the United Nations should not send any kind of Police or armed forces in the Lebanon or in the Jordan because that has been suggested sometimes. If it is suggested that the United Nations Observer Group should continue for some time or should even increase its personnel we would be prepared to consider such a proposal favourably, but any such proposal can only have a chance, of success if it is accepted by the Arab countries concerned.

Sometimes it is stated that these countries apparently should be treated like tender infants and should be under the guardianship of bigger countries. Well, whether they are tender or they are infants I do not know, but it is quite clear that they do not like this offer of guardianship and patronage. In fact, such suggestions are resented by them.

Now, as I said, the position has been discussed in the General Assembly and I do not know what the outcome may be, but it must be remembered that there is a certain relaxation of tension because it is always better when people are talking than when they are not talking and are preparing for war. There has been that relaxation, but the whole position is full of danger and will continue to be dangerous and explosive so long as foreign forces remain there.

We can consider these events in Western Asia in isolation but that will not help us to understand them well. One has to take to some extent a historic view of developments. For hundreds of years these countries in Western Asia were under Turkish domination. They came out of it at the end of First World War in 1918. The Western powers decided what they liked without really caring very much about the wishes of the people. Probably there was no organised way for the people to express their views and so things were made worse. New nations were created--where they were viable, they were very much better--and the contacts of the Western Powers were with the rulers of their own creation or, chiefly, with the landed gentry of those areas. There were few contacts with the people. The whole period between the two World Wars was one when Arab nationalism was trying to push out this foreign domination and gradually making some way in that direction. Then came the war and tile postwar period, when much has happened, as the House knows, in various countries of the Middle East.

Now the major fact is the growth of Arab nationalism in a very powerful, resurgent way Egypt took the lead in this matter and under the wise leadership of President Nasser has played a

## <Pg-138>

very important part, and Nasser, in fact, became the most prominent symbol of this Arab nationalism. And this fact, which is patent, was neither liked nor appreciated by many powers and an attempt was made to split up the Arab countries, to split, in fact, Arab Nationalism. And the House may remember various talks about building up the Northern Tier Defence and about the Baghdad Pact. Whatever the motives of the Baghdad Pact may be--the motives were supposed to be to protect these countries from any attack or invasion from the Soviet Union and to give these countries some kind of security and peace--as a matter of fact, the result was far from security. All the troubles of these countries increased. The Arab countries were divided. At any rate, the Governments were divided--some in the Baghdad Pact and some outside it. And while the Governments were divided and they carried on a cold war against each other, the people almost in every Arab country were powerfully affected by this tie of Arab nationalism. Thus, in the countries associated with the Baghdad Pact, there was a divergence, a hiatus between the Government of the country and the people, the people looking more and more towards Arab nationalism and the Government looking in another direction and rather ranged against this spirit of Arab nationalism. How big this hiatus was can be seen from the coup d'etat in Baghdad which surprised everyone. I believe it surprised even the people in Iraq and Egypt, and the surprise is not essentially that it took place but the speed with which it took place and the complete success which

attended it. It shows how utterly divorced from public opinion the Government of Iraq was. When some change was made the relief was tremendous all over Iraq and people flocked to the side of the new Government. So this attempt at not recognising the spirit of Arab nationalism, trying, to come in the way and obstructing it, really achieved the opposite effect; it encouraged nationalism as this kind of thing will do.

It was said that some kind of Arab Empire is being built up, which is dangerous. I do not know about the future, but I see no empire, much less an Arab Empire. But, certainly, all this has resulted in the Arab nations coming nearer to one another and will no doubt bring about a great deal of co-operation between them.

The theory, as I said of vacuum was advanced, as if the removal of the influence of some great powers must necessarily be filled in by some other powers and, therefore, they should not go. It is an extraordinary appraisal of the situation which did not recognize the effect of this Arab nationalism which had become such a dominant force.

Now, much reference has been made to indirect aggression Well, indirect aggression is inherently, essentially and inevitably a part of the cold war technique. In fact, there is no indirect aggression if we have no cold war. The world is full of indirect aggression, full of attempts, though not in a military way in other ways, at influencing other countries, trying and sometimes creating or upsetting situations in other countries. In the same way, ever since the Baghdad Pact came in there was this tussle between the countries, the Arab and other countries of the Baghdad Pact and the Arab countries outside the Baghdad Pact. There was no doubt this tussle and each side wanted to injure the interests of the other side. But this talk of indirect aggression really shows ignorance of the basic issues there. Therefore, it is confusing.

Now, during these days we have expressed our views with moderation and have endeavoured to avoid any action or utterance which might add to the tension. We have no desire in this matter, as in any other, to be involved in the cold war. Where our services are required, we shall always be prepared to offer them if we feel that they will do some good. We are convinced, however, that any effective solution must be based on the recognition of the dominant urge and force of this area, that is, Arab nationalism. Thus, any settlement must have the goodwill and co-operation of the Arab nations. The need for oil by the Western European countries is patent, and while it is vital for them there should be no difficulty in arriving at a friendly arrangement which ensures this supply of oil. The presence of foreign forces of any kind in these areas will be a constant irritant leading to trouble, if I may say so, peace in this area, as indeed anywhere else, will come if this area is removed from the orbit of the cold war and adopts the five principles of the Panch Sheel. Everyone of these Arab countries has tremendous problems of development to face. If the threat of war is removed from them, they will apply themselves

to these problems and become a source of strength to the forces of peace.

Now, there is one other aspect of this problem which cannot be ignored, and that is the continuing element of danger in the relations between the Arab countries and Israel. Ever since Israel came into existence, it has been a source of constant irritation to the Arab countries. The invasion by Israel of Egypt two years ago is fresh in our memory. Apart from this, there is the big problem of the refugees, the old Palestine refugeesú The Arab countries have looked upon Israel as an output from which their freedom might at any time be threatened.

## <Pg-139>

Israel on the other hand fears the Arab countries which surround it. There can be no real peace in this area till this difficult problem is settled in some satisfactory way. Naturally, any real settlement can only be with the goodwill of the countries of these areas and by removing fears. There can be no settlement by war which, if it occurs, may well become a major war.

I have referred to the dangers inherent in this situation as between the Arab countries and Israel, and the forces behind them sometimes also. I should like to make it quite clear that I do not suggest that any attempt should, or can be, made to deal with this problem now. I am certain that this question should not be raised at this stage; it will have to wait for some time. Only when the other problems of Western Asia have advanced towards a solution and present-day passions have cooled somewhat, can this difficult problem be tackled. It is not for me to suggest when this position may arise and how it should be tackled; that is for the countries concerned.

During the past few weeks I have received many suggestions from friendly Governments with whom we are intimately connected. In their anxiety to maintain peace and advance the cause of freedom of Asian and African countries they have made several proposals to us for limited conferences or joint statements and the like. While I share their anxiety and appreciate their proposals, it seemed to me that in a situation like the one we are passing through, any limited action of the kind suggested would not be helpful; it is the Powers principally involved in these disputes that have to be brought into the area of discussion. I am, however, grateful to all these Governments and countries which have made these friendly suggestions. It may be that in the future a situation might arise when some of those suggestions would be more feasible than they are at present.

I should like to say here that we have been very well served, during these past critical weeks, by our representatives abroad more especially by our representatives in Beirut and Baghdad where all these difficult situations were developing.

USA LEBANON SYRIA ECUADOR INDIA NORWAY IRAQ CYPRUS JORDAN CANADA INDONESIA FRANCE JAPAN UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI EGYPT ISRAEL

**Date**: Nov 26, 1957

## **Volume No**

1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech on Foreign Policy

Initiating a debate on India's foreign policy in the Lok Sabha on 19 August, the Prime Minister said: Mr. Speaker, 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."

A few days ago, I think on the 14th of this month, I placed a statement before this House in regard to the situation in West Asia. For the last few weeks, this situation in West Asia has dominated the international scene. I do not, therefore, propose to go into any details in regard to that situation. Indeed, as the time at our disposal is limited, I do not wish to take up too much of this time; I would rather say that hon. Members had more time to give their advice and criticisms which we can consider and then I could perhaps answer this debate tomorrow morning, if that suits you. So, I should briefly refer to two matters: one is the situation in West Asia and the other is our unfortunate troubles in regard to the Indo-Pakistan border. Even in regard to that I made a statement a short while ago in this House.

Now, to take up the latter part first nothing very special has happened since I made that statement. Firing occasionally continues on both sides and nothing is more extraordinary than the accounts of these incidents on the border in the Pakistan Press. I can very well understand people in Pakistan reading their newspapers imagining that the Indian Army is on the march across Pakistan. It is an extraordinary state of affairs which has absolutely no basis in fact. But if people are given that kind of information all the time, naturally they begin to believe that there is some truth in it.

As a matter of fact--I do not know who is responsible for that--I should like to refer to an incident as to how there is apparently a good deal of confusion in the minds of the authorities of Pakistan. Two days ago, Saturday afternoon, I received a letter from the Prime Minister of Pakistan, who was, I believe, in London then--it is a long letter giving his version of the Indo-Pakistan border incidents. I would not like to go into that because his version differs

basically from our version. But at the end of that letter, he said:

"I have since seen in newspapers your statement made in the Lok Sabha on August 11, expressing your readiness to discuss the border disputes with me. I will be most happy to meet you to discuss

<Pg-140>

the border problems at a time and place mutually convenient. The Secretaries' meeting which was scheduled to be held in Karachi on August 23, 1958, could be held after our meeting in order to consider details."

In addition to this we were specifically told by the acting High Commissioner of Pakistan that the Secretaries' meeting could not be held on this day because the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan was in New York and would not return in time. Therefore, he suggested that it might be postponed for a week. In my reply to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, I said--this letter was sent early yesterday morning--

"I shall gladly meet you and discuss these border problems. I would have thought, however, that the better course would be for the Secretaries to meet first and discuss these matters in some detail and then somewhat later for us to meet. I would, therefore, recommend this course to you which appears to be more likely to gain results. If, however, you feel that we should meet even before the Secretaries do so, I shall agree to that also."

I read out not because of the intrinsic importance but because in today's newspapers, there was an extraordinary statement. I am sorry, I have not got the paper.

Mr. Speaker: Which newspaper? Hindustan Times or .......?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Every paper, almost. I may repeat it from memory. The Prime Minister of Pakistan on arriving at Karachi was asked about this and he said that it was silly to suggest that the Prime Ministers should meet before the meeting of the Secretaries-the very sentence, or phrase that occurs in his letter and about which afterwards I pointed out that it was better for Secretaries to meet before. But now he characterises the idea of the Prime Ministers' meeting before the Secretaries meeting as silly. Then somebody apparently pointed out to him that the meeting of the Secretaries had been postponed. He said: why postpone it? Then it was said by somebody there that it was postponed at the request of the Government of of India. It was the reverse of the case because we do not want to postpone at all; we agreed with some reluctance.

I merely wish to point this out to indicate how confused things happen to be at the other end and how, possibly, all these reports about border incidents, etc. get twisted and contorted in the passage from their border to Karachi or London, wherever the Prime Minister may be. If one cannot trust even the Prime Minister's letter as to

what he meant to say, it either means that he has not seen his own letter before it was despatched or else it has escaped his memory.

Anyhow, so far as these border incidents, or indeed so far as any other incident in regard to India and Pakistan are concerned, any person, I am sure every Member of this House does not want these incidents to continue; does not want this firing across the river to continue all the time, occasionally killing a person. It is neither war nor peace. It is just frustration, irritation and annovance and a great deal of discomfort and dislocation to the people living there. Why should we want it? It is an absurd proposition. But the fact of the matter is that each side, when this firing takes place, develops a certain nervous state--each side on the border, I mean; and naturally, if a person fires from the other side, another person fires from this side and there is the river in between usually. They are not firing at a target more or less but it hits sometimes and the damage is likely to be more on our side by the physical fact that our villages are nearer the border than the other side of the river or Karimganj is there just a fair-sized town--on the other side the people are much farther away.

Another difficulty has arisen. We have decided long ago--that is, Pakistan and India--that exchange of territory as a result of demarcation will take place only together, not in bits. What happens is, where a certain decision had been made in favour of Pakistan naturally, we are agreeable to hand that over, but only when the decision in our favour is also implemented. Now that may be delayed. Meanwhile they claim that territory and fire, and sometimes attempt to take possession of it. In Tripura there is the village of Lakhimpur etc. I am not going into details. I have got the newspaper and I shall read out the exact words. Mr. Noon said, Pakistan had not asked for a postponement of the Secretaries meeting to discuss border issues. He said: "It is silly to suggest that the Secretaries should meet after the meeting of the Prime Ministers."--exactly what he had asked for in his letter to me. The report says: "Mr. Noon said, he had asked the Pakistan Foreign Secretary, Mr. Baig, to return by the 23rd of this month. When his attention was drawn to the official announcements in Delhi and Karachi that the conference had been postponed by a week at

## <Pg-141>

Pakistan's request, a foreign office official who was at the airport told Mr. Noon that the postponement had been decided upon at India's request. Mr. Noon then said: "If that is so, we have no objection". He, however, made no reply when told of his reported letter to Mr. Nehru in which it had been stated the Secretaries' Conference could be postponed, pending the Prime Ministers' meeting."

Now, Sir, I have this morning received a further message from the Pakistan Government, through their High Commission here, agreeing that the Secretaries' meeting should take place first and after that, at our mutual convenience, the two Prime Ministers could meet. So

naturally, we agree--that was our suggestion in our reply. The Secretaries' meeting will now presumably take place on the 30th, I think, of this month and, so far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan early next month.

Sir, to refer briefly to the situation in West Asia, the matter is before the United Nations General Assembly now, and it appears from the Press as well as from the messages we get that there is what is called "intensive diplomatic activity" going on there. Whatever that might mean, presumably it means that people are meeting each other repeatedly, one after the other, discussing draft resolutions trying to convince each other, trying to get support for a particular resolution

We have received, and the newspapers have given, some report about these draft resolutions some have not yet been given. So far as we are concerned, it has never been our policy to seek to condemn through these resolutions even though we might think that a country had erred, because any such approach of condemnation inevitably bring in the cold-war approach, and people function in terms of the cold war, that is in terms not of the particular merits of the question, but rather in terms of their basic feelings towards this group or that group.

At the same time, in regard to the West Asian situation we have said right from the beginning that, according to our thinking, it was unfortunate and harmful for foreign troops to be sent there, and that there will be no peace there, no settlement there, or no real advance towards settlement--final settlement may take, of course, some considerable time--till these foreign troops are withdrawn from the Lebanon and Jordan. We went a step further--though I should confess to you we did not think it absolutely necessary, but in the interest of peace we went a step further--and said that if this was done, we would be agreeable to some U.N. Observers remaining in the Lebanon and even to have their numbers somewhat increased if that was asked for; also, that even some U.N. Observers might even be sent to Jordan. But we made it clear that we would not be agreeable to, what is called, a police force of any kind, whether under U.N. auspices or anybody else, to go into either of these countries.

This has been our basic position. That, of course, only deals with the early steps. Merely by the withdrawal of the foreign forces the problems are not solved, but a situation is created when problems can be considered objectively and a solution aimed at.

Some of the resolutions placed before the United Nations General Assembly rather ignored this basic position and bypassed it. Some indicate that the withdrawal of troops may take place in the future or, should take place in the future provided certain conditions are fulfilled. So far so good. But the whole approach of making this withdrawal of troops conditional off other things happening seems to us not a right approach.

I shall not go into the past as to why these troops went there, under what conditions. Obviously the troops were sent to Lebanon, not because of what was happening in Lebanon,--because that was in a sense under control and there was the U.N. Observation Group there,--not because of anything that had happened in Jordan,--though, undoubtedly, some people feared that other things might happen in Jordan--but really they were sent because of what happened in Iraq, the coup d'etat in Iraq, and the fear that it might spread. I am not going into that here. The new Republic of Iraq is now recognised by, if not all, a very large number of countries, big and small, by the western countries, by the countries of Eastern Europe and most Asian countries. It is a stable and popular Government as one can expect.

In Lebanon a certain advance has been made. A new President has been elected, General Shehab. There is a curious position in the sense that the new President has been elected, and the old President, Chamoun, continues and intends continuing to the last day of his term, that is September 24. That creates a certain uncertainty, more especially because meanwhile the United Nations General Assembly is meeting. Who is to represent Lebanon? A representative of the old regime--a passing regime of President Chamoun--or the new regime that is likely to come in, in a few weeks' time? And, the two differ considerably in regard to their foreign policy--I do not know about internal policy. So difficulties have

## <Pg-142>

arisen. The United States of America have stated that they are prepared to withdraw their troops from the Lebanon if the legal government of Lebanon ask them to do so--the legal government at present being that of President Chamoun and, apparently, he has no present intention of asking them to do so, although it is known that the person who is going to follow him five weeks later not only will ask, but even now in the interval, has asked for that. Meanwhile, some part of the U.S. army has been withdrawn, a relatively small part. All I can say is, that in our opinion, it is not so much a question of the form or the words of a resolution although resolutions count. Of course, they are important because they express, they are supposed to give expression to the collective will of the nations at the United Nations. But, it is more what lies behind that resolution, what the intention is that matters, and unless that intention is one to recognise the obviously changed and changing situation in Western Asia, these resolutions will be out of date even when they are passed and will not meet that situation.

The basic situation in Western Asia is positively the rise of Arab nationalism in a vital form. I have no doubt about it that all over the Arab countries this is felt. I do not for a moment say that this means necessarily that there should be one Arab nation. That does not follow. It is not for me to say; it is for the countries concerned. There may be two nations or three. But, that they all have a strong feeling of Arab nationalism. There is no doubt about it in my mind or in anybody's mind who has studied the situation that President Nasser

has become a symbol of this resurgent Arab nationalism and is respected and admired all over the Arab world. That does mean, I repeat not necessarily that all these Arab countries should become one country. That is one of the basic facts.

The other basic fact is that the political and economic development has not kept pace with this development of Arab nationalism. To some extent they have been trying to catch up and they have been forced to catch it up. When they resisted it as two or two-and-a-half years ago during the Suez crisis when Anglo-French forces and Israelite forces invaded Egyptian territory, there was an immediate upheaval. Not because of military victory so much, but much more so because of world opinion, the decision was largely in favour of Egypt. Even the United Nations threw its weight in that direction. These attempts to pull back, you might say the course of events, failed and they are bound to fail unless instead of failing by themselves, they involve the world in a major war.

Again, we have faced in the last two weeks a situation of extreme gravity. There is no doubt in my mind that on several occasions, two weeks ago, on two, possibly three occasions, we were on the verge of a major war. Any little incident could have started it. When the hounds of war are unleashed, nobody can bring them back again. That was somehow avoided. It did not take place. We were very very near it. I think we are away from that very critical phase. But, it will be wrong to imagine that we are out of the wood or out of danger from the point of view of war. Certainly, the difficulty is, as soon as the immediate danger is removed, the people relapse, countries relapse; even statesmen relapse and go back to what is called, as I referred to, intensive diplomatic activity regardless of what might be happening. There is intense diplomatic activity going on in the United Nations building in New York. What about the countries in Western Asia? Probably the persons least consulted in the matter will be the people of those countries in Western Asia whose fate is being considered and decided. Not wholly; of course, they cannot be ignored; they have their representatives too. But, broadly speaking, that is to some extent so. That is why I say we live in the political and international sphere often enough in a world of make-believe, of unreality just as there is a tremendous act of make-believe. So far as the United Nations are concerned, there is not the Peoples Government of China. It is an extraordinary thing. It has nothing to do with one's likes or dislikes. But it is not simply realising or accepting a major fact of the present age. If conclusions are arrived at ignoring major facts, the conclusions are not likely to be correct. When conclusions in regard to Western Asia are arrived at ignoring all the real forces in Western Asia, all the living force and an attempt is made to bolster up out of date conditions or regimes, difficulties arise. Then suddenly something happens which surprises people like the coup d'etat in Iraq.

There is one word I should like to say. There is much reference now to indirect aggression. I remember, I am old enough to remember, the

long discussions in the Old League of Nations in the twenties about disarmament and about aggression and an attempt to define aggression. These discussions resulted in the production, I think, of numerous large volumes containing the reports of those discussions; no other result. Of course, instead of disarmament, we had the second World War: time after. My point is, even aggression as such, they found it

<Pg-143>

very difficult to define. Now, we have another word 'indirect aggression' which is bandied about and used and who is going to define it, I do not know.

I suppose there is indirect aggression. In fact, the whole essence of military approach, the whole essence of the cold war approach is the approach of indirect aggression. I submit it means nothing else. It means pressure, what is called a cold war approach. It is an approach of propaganda, approach of pressure, approach of military threats, an approach of building up armaments. All this is indirect aggression in that sense. The House may not approve of it; I may not; that is neither here nor there. I am merely suggesting that there is indirect aggression involved in everything that is happening. There was indirect aggression undoubtedly in Western Asia as between members of the Baghdad Pact and the opponents of the Baghdad Pact. Neither liked the other. Each party wanted to weaken the other party as much as possible by propaganda and the rest. We may not perhaps like that type of propaganda. That is neither here nor there. The point is, justifying something which is otherwise unjustifiable by saying that there has been indirect aggression does not seem to be a proper and correct approach or a helpful approach to the problem. I have always been of the view and I have stated this in this House often enough that these problems cannot be solved, especially this problem of Asia and Africa, by the military approach. They can be shelved, they can be suppressed for some time or postponed. Therefore, I earnestly hope that in regard to these West Asian problems there will be an attempt not to think in terms of suppressing people there or even, I may say so, of imagining that a political problem can be by-passed by dealing with economic issues. Economic issues are of high importance, and on my part I welcome that President Eisenhower has said in regard to the economic help being given to the West Asian countries. But that does not set aside the major political problem. The economic part can only work if the right political approach has been made. Any solution of the West Asian problem must necessarily have the goodwill and cooperation of the countries of Western Asia, it is obvious.

I just referred to the nearness of war two weeks or three weeks ago--a war in which, there is not a shadow of doubt, if it is once started, the full panoply of the weapons of the atomic age will come in, the consequences of which each hon. Member is left to imagine. But may I refer, in this connection, to something, war or no war, which goes on, and that is, the atomic tests. There is an argument sometimes that the harm that these tests do is so little that it can be ignored. Now, recently, the General Assembly of the United Nations

appointed a scientific committee, and this committee has made a report. I wish to read some very brief extracts from it. The report by the 15-nation committee, based on two years' study of mass data, said:

"Radio-active contamination of the environment resulting from explosions of nuclear weapons constitutes a growing increment to world-wide radiation levels. This involves new and largely unknown hazards to present and future populations. These hazards, by their very nature, are beyond the control of the exposed persons."

Then again,

"One general conclusion that clearly emerged from the Committee's studies was that even the smallest amounts of radiation are liable to cause deleterious genetic and perhaps also, somatic physical effects." that is, distortion, etc.

"The present knowledge of the long-term effects of radiation did not permit the scientists to make a precise evaluation of the possible consequences to man of slight exposure, but the committee adds even a slow rise in the environmental radio activity in the world, whether from weapon tests or any other sources, might eventually cause appreciable damage to large populations before it could be definitely identified as due to irradiation. The situation required that mankind proceed with great caution in view of possible under-estimation".

These are some extracts from this report from a very competent scientific body appointed by the United Nations, consisting of scientists from 15 countries.

This is the background of all international politics today; it must be remembered whether it is in Western Asia or anywhere also. We have managed, for the time being, to escape during the last two or three weeks this world war, We may escape again perhaps, but if this background continues and this military approach and these atomic tests continue, and apart from this, the accumulation of atomic weapons continues, when a time may come when perhaps we do not escape.

<Pg-144>

At the present moment, I am told that the capacity of the United States of America and to a somewhat lesser extent, of the Soviet Union for the production of atomic bombs, nuclear bombs, is so great that it is tremendous. They are piling up tremendously. Remember this. Apart from tests, the piling up of the atomic weapons continues in every country at the rate of tens of thousands a year--atomic bombs--and it is stated that there is enough material in each of these countries to bomb this world out of existence if they so choose.

Well, this thought tends to pull up one a little and take one out of

the normal grooves of thinking in international or other politics. Therefore, I mention this to show how we live on the verge of possible catastrophe, and the only way to avoid it, apart from coming to agreements and settlements, it is, if I may say so in all humility, to make a different type of approach, mental approach. No country, no people responsible for the Government of the country, whatever their inner feelings might be, can adopt what I would call a pacifist attitude, that is, giving up the idea completely of armies, of defence forces. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the other attitude, the military attitude, has also completely failed, and will fail even more disastrously if persued.

Therefore, I submit, while we have to take such precautions as we can in the defence of our country, we must start and more especially the great countries must start thinking and speaking in other terms and other language.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM JORDAN LEBANON IRAQ ISRAEL EGYPT CHINA

**Date**: Nov 26, 1957

# Volume No

1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Debate on Foreign Policy

Replying to a two-day debate on India's foreign policy in the Lok Sabha on Aug 20, 1958 August, the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I listened with care and due respect to the speeches made yesterday by various hon. Members of this House, more particularly to the eloquent speech full of feeling which my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani made. Much was said yesterday and sometimes what was said appeared to be or might even have been intended to be in criticism of Government's policy. But excepting two hon. Members I think it is worth noting that in spite of odd criticisms of emphasis or of some particular minor aspect, the whole burden oft he speeches yesterday was essentially acceptance of the policy of the Government. Two hon. Members who, I regret to say, have not yet been convinced of this policy from their various points of view are hon. Raja Mahendra Pratap and Shri Brajeswar Prasad. Perhaps if I may respectfully suggest to them to confer together and try to convince each other, both might agree.

Now in dealing with these matters we consider each particular question in some isolation, although no question can be isolated from

this context of world conditions. Nevertheless, we cannot always be considering the whole world. We have to consider a question to some extent isolated from the rest. We may consider, on the other hand, the broad world situation, the background of it, why it has arisen and in what direction it is going. Both are necessary, i.e., a perspective of the situation, seeing the roots which have given rise to the present situation and the direction in which it is going and then a more detailed view. Prabably we are likely to err in not taking that perspective view when I say 'we', I mean politicians generally, whether they are in Government or outside--because we are usually so full of the troubles of the moment that we do not or we have not the tune really to think of the distant future. It is well, therefore, that some of us anyway take that perspective view and look upon these questions from the ivory tower of an academician like Acharya Kripalani. It is important that we should not forget that view point and I for one welcome what Acharya Kripalani said, although I do not agree with some of the things that he said. But I can very well understand the pain and torment through which he must go and through which any sensitive person must go when he looks round the world today and sees how high principles are proclaimed and not adhered to and how in the name of peace something the very reverse of peace is done.

He criticised Panch Sheel, or rather he criticised the inception of it--the occasion for its inception--and how it had been broken in various parts of the world by those who said they adhered to it. It is perfectly true that the ideals of Panch Sheel have been broken and are likely to be broken in future, just like every ideal that you put forward, whether it is truth or anything else, is often broken and denied. That does not make truth untruth. That does not make a good ideal a bad ideal, because the man who proclaimed it has broken it or has not acted up to it. If that was so, much that we do and what we say in this House or outside, all of us--and I am not speaking for any individual--will find great

### <Pg-145>

difficulty because the world is an imperfect world. We are imperfect. We cannot live up to our potestations; often enough we are weak or circumstances are against us. Then, are we to give up our ideals or the proclamation of the truth because we happen to be feeble specimens of humanity or the world is not prepared today? May be, the philosopher can examine the situation, that way and say, "Well, the right thing was said but the world was not ready for it." Therefore, let us find some other way because after all whenever truth is proclaimed it is good, but at any time and more especially in a democracy you have to have not only the truth but the receptiveness to the truth, the capacity to face truth, the capacity to act up to the truth in the vast mass of people.

We talk about democracy a great deal today. Everything we challenge in the name of democracy. Students say that their professors should go in the name of democracy. Children should decide because numbers count or the elders should do. In the name of democracy, all manner of things are said, as if democracy was a mere counting of heads without any other principle, rule or standard of behaviour: a most extraordinary way democracy is bandied about.

I am not dealing with democracy. What I am saying is, the real difficulty always in any human behaviour, more especially in the behaviour of groups, societies, is that a high truth may be proclaimed, may be observed by the great man, call him what you will, a prophet or a great leader. But that prophet, however great he may be, will not succeed unless he can convince others of the truth. He can only convince them to the extent that they are receptive and prepared for it. Even so, he has to tone down because others can seldom be wholly ready for it. So, when you come down to the plane of action, when you come down more particularly to the democratic plane of the action, you have always to see how far the people will go, how far the people will act up to a certain principle that you have laid down.

Anyhow, my point is that the fact that some countries have not lived up to their protestation does not weaken the force of a certain correct policy like Panch Sheel. Panch Sheel is nothing new. If I may say so respectfully, in an odd moment it struck me to apply that word. But there is nothing about the idea itself. It is an obvious thing. It just fits in with our way of thinking, with the way we have grown up. Once it was applied, the mere fact that it somehow caught on shows that there was something real about it. The fact is that even people who do not accept it, people in other countries, other nations, statesmen and others, who, perhaps, do not particularly fancy the way the Panch Sheel idea came into existence, nevertheless, they all pay tribute to it. You see the force of an idea: how although it is not acted upon, yet, nobody dare deny it. I am not aware of a single country. They may not have acted up to it. They may not have even proclaimed their adherence to it. But everyone, when you ask the question, says that is the only way. That shows the utter strength, the rightness, of this idea. Indeed, if you examine it from the purely practical point of view and leave out high morality, there is no other way that nations can behave to each other. The other way is the way of conflict and if you avoid the way of conflict this has to be done.

The hon. Acharya Kripalani said that Panch Sheel was born in sin. According to the Christian doctrine, we are all born in sin--I do not know--and we try to get out of that. But, he said that because this was included in the Indo-Chinese treaty in regard to Tibet this is hardly the occasion for me to go into the history of Tibet or what happened then or what action we took then and what other action we could have taken. But, I should like Acharya Kripalani to go into this a little more deeply. I can very well understand his sentiments, his feelings in the matter. But, to understand what the position has been in Tibet in the past, what it was on that particular occasion and more particularly what possible courses of action were open to us I should like him to consider that, because, merely not liking

something and expressing one's disapproval is surely not enough when you have to take positive action. I submit I cannot go into this story. I submit that Tibet, long long ago, before the present Government's regime was there, was looked upon and considered by the world community as being under the suzerainty of China. At no time did any country, any foreign country consider it independent. They considered it as autonomous under the suzerainty of China. Indeed there had been internal trouble between Tibet and China. We had some trouble over this matter at the time of Chiang Kai-Shek, that is to say, when Chiang Kai-Shek was controlling the destinies of China.

In reply to a question if the Tibetans accepted it the Prime Minister said: I am saying the word community. What I am suggesting is that we as Government of India always acknowledged the suzerainty of China whether it was before independence or after. That was what we inherited and other countries also.

## <Pg-146>

We came into the picture more particularly apart from our close contacts and cultural contacts which have been of long standing not in a particularly good way when Col. Younghusband, at the beginning of this century, on behalf of the British Power in this country invaded Tiber and rather forcibly established positions there and gained certain rights for the then Government of India, which really was an extension of the British Government. Those rights continued a kind of special extra territorial rights in Tibet of India which really the British exercised through India, keeping little armed forces here and there and all that which normally independent countries do not have.

Whether Tibet was free to act for itself or was functioning under the suzerainty of China, I do not quite understand how India or the British acting through India had a right to put their platoons, companies of troops at odd places in Tibet on the plea of protecting their commerce and this and that. That was the position. Naturally, when we became independent, we did not wish to have any extra territorial rights in Tibet. We wanted, naturally, the Tibetans to function in freedom as they wanted. Anyhow, whatever others did, we did not wish to interfere in Tibet's life in that way.

Then came the Chinese revolution and the Chinese claimed suzerainty or even sovereignty over Tibet. They said, at any rate,--how far they give effect to it is another matter--that Tibet was an autonomous region of the Chinese State, and they acknowledged the autonomy of Tibet. In strict law, leaving out sentiment for the moment, there was nothing that could challenge that position from our point of view. We had acknowledged it before the communist period, in Chiang Kai-Shek's period, before Chiag Kai-Shek came into the picture. Whoever it was in China, they had continuously acknowledged that position. As I said, whether that was directly acknowledged or passively acknowledged that was the position that every other country acknowledged. Nobody had ever challenged that position. It is

completely true that there have been periods in Tibet's history when Tibet itself had not acknowledged it. When Tibet was strong it did not acknowledge it. That is so. I am talking of our position in this matter. What position could we take up?

We took up a certain position and the messages then exchanged have been published, letters, etc. We hoped we could not possibly interfere. Neither in law nor in fact can we interfere unless it is considered interference to deliver a strong speech of approval or disapproval. In these circumstances, I do submit that the action we took in regard to Tibet was the only logical, legal, constitutional and sensible action that a Government could take. I should like those gentlemen like Acharya Kripalani who feel about this matter To think about all these aspects and not suggest that any action that we took in this regard was either a wrong action in itself or was an action which led to wrong results. We cannot control the destiny of other countries, Tibet or any other. But the action that we took was not only the right action, but to the extent it did, it was a helpful action.

But, as I said, coming back to Panch Sheel, we have to consider, and Acharya Kripalani no doubt has considered, whether there can be any other policy of international relationship except the one indicated in these five principles. I cannot think of any other; the other is conflict and domination of one over the other. If that is the correct policy, then it is a good policy and it is a policy which should be proclaimed all the time even though some of those who proclaim it do not act up to it or practise it.

Replying to a statement made by a member from the Opposition that India should not participate in the proposed Summit Conference as her participation would have merely "Rubber-stamped what others had agreed to", since according to the member that was what had happened in regard to Korea and Indo-China, the Prime Minister said: I do not think his history or information about these is quite correct. If these Great Powers which are opposed to each other--the United States of America, the Soviet Union and other Powers--come to an agreement, I do not say that necessarily it must be an ideal or good agreement. I do not say that. It is conceivable that while they are opposed to each other, they may come to an agreement which is not good for the small nations. I cannot rule that out. Nevertheless, in the present context, the dangers come from the conflict of those Great Powers. That will be another kind of danger, if it ever arises, when the great nuclear Powers come together and decide to control the rest of the world. In theory you may think of it, but that question does not arise today. If they agree, well, at any rate, whatever the other consequences may be, the present grave dangers would be avoided. If they agreed today to put an end to the production of nuclear bombs, I say it is a gain, a tremendous gain. If they agree to any kind of big disarmament, it is a gain for the world, it relieves the world. So, I would welcome that agreement, and if by chance

I have a say in the matter, I would try to bring about that agreement.

But why should Acharya Kripalani imagine that if we go there, we merely act as rubber-stamps of anybody? That is not the reputation we have acquired in other countries or, I think, even in our country. Why should he labour under this unhappy impression? We may have been right or we may have been wrong, that is a different matter, but nobody has accused us yet of being rubber-stamps anywhere. And why, may I ask, have sometimes our services been asked for, whether in Korea or Indo-China? And how does Acharya Kripalani imagine that we played the part of rubber-stamp in either of these places I do not understand at all. As a matter of fact, in both of these matters, we played a rather distinguished part, though a distant one sometimes but a distinguished part, and though I say it, I am prepared to add that but for that part, there was far graver danger of war continuing. In fact, I think that in the past history of our international affairs, the part we took in Korea (it was a little less though it was there) and the part we took in Indo-China (it was also an indirect part but an important one)--these two events stand out in complete justification of the way we function. We do not push ourselves in, we do not shout, we do not wave flags, we do not denounce, but we try to help. Sometimes we have succeeded in helping a little, sometimes we have not, but we did succeed in these two, and it is surprising that these two incidents should have been brought up as examples not of success but of helpless failure. Acharya Kripalani apparently thinks that we should be able to put the world right, we should be able to solve the problems of the world, of Korea, Indo-China, may be of Germany, may be of other places. I have no such presumption. I do not presume that. All we could do in those places was to help in preventing dangerous developments, in preventing war. We did that. Take this country or Indo-China which had been ruined after six, seven, eight years of war, and itmight have been ruined ill further. Well, our coming into the picture created a certain hope, gave time to think, a certain interval was created, and if Acharya Kripalani goes to these countries of Indo-China, he will perhaps appreciate a little more of what these people think of India's efforts and India's services.

How can we put an end to Korean problem? That simply means we should put an end to basic problems or one of the basic problems of the world today, this struggle between two mighty colossuses, mighty powers or groups of powers. It is utterly beyond our capacity. Who are we to say that we can do that? But we can, as any country can, big or small, make a difference by pleading for a right cause, provided the cause is right.

Sometimes it is suggested--one hon. Member suggested; I think it was Acharya Kripalani--that we should, the small countries of the world, small in a military sense, should band themselves together. Now, if that refers to what has been called a third force, well, it is almost a contradiction in terms, because numbers do not create a force--

moral pressures, yes, but not a force. If you are thinking in terms of the great military powers of today, you do not make the slightest difference by militarily weak countries banding themselves together in terms of force, physical force: if it is in terms of moral pressure, certainly, I agree, but even in the case of moral pressure, if it takes the shape of banding together, the moral side rather goes into the background, and the physical side comes up, the third force side which again rather lessens that moral pressure.

Therefore, it is completely right that countries should come close together; countries of a like way of thinking should come close together, should confer together, should jointly function, whether it is in the United Nations or in other places in the world. That exactly has been the policy of India and of other countries, because we do not presume to call ourselves leaders; and we dislike being called leaders of Asia, leaders of any group. We want comradeship with other countries, and on that basis, we have tried to work together, and we have been in the most intimate relationship with a number of countries, our neighbours, and even countries farther away. And we have done so--and that is important to realise--without breaking our friendly ties with other countries, because the approach appears to be that we must become hostile to the other countries, and thus, gathering together a number of like countries, like us, that is, militarily weak, and other countries, and raise our voice in hostility to the great powers. That, I consider, is a wrong approach. Therefore, we have opposed the idea of a third force because it has no meaning except in terms of physical force, which we have not got, and also because the moment you talk in these terms, you adopt to some extent the cold war approach and language of hostility.

We can, and we do, criticise other countries, activities, whether in the United Nations or here, but we have always endeavoured to do so not in the manner of the cold war, not by denouncing. Who are we to denounce? Who are we to hold

### <Pg-148>

forth the light to others, when we have enough darkness in our own land and in our own minds? I feel ashamed of going out to the world and telling them what to do. For my part, and I am completely honest about this, I would rather say that we were cut off from the world for a while and looked after our own affairs. We cannot do that. Physically, that is not possible, because we are a part of this world, and things happen in the rest of the world which affect us.

Two curious criticisms are made. One is that sometimes we are interfering too much. The other is--and that was made yesterday repeatedly--that we do not take the initiative to go to other hands. Shri Khadilkar said that we had allowed the initiative to go to other hands. I do not know whether he expects us to be a knighterrant jumping out, taking initiatives all over the place. I do not propose to do so. Sometimes, we have taken the initiative, but even when we have taken it, it has been from behind the scenes, it has been

quietly, modestly and without pushing ourselves forward, without shouting whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere. So, I agree with him that on this present occasion, and often, we have deliberately not taken the initiative. Here is this question of Western Asia, a highly important question in which many of our most intimate and friendly countries are involved in which the future of the world is involved from the point of view of peace or war. We have, of course, been, as I said in the course of a statement I made the other day, in the most intimate touch with a large number of countries and their leaders, and given a great deal of thought in this matter, sometimes ventured to offer some advice confidentially. But we did think, and we do think that we should not throw about too much of directions to others as to how they should behave. It is not becoming; it is irritating to others. If quietly we can suggest something, we do so. But Shri Khadilkar would say, that is not taking the initiative, that is not marching ahead with a flag in hand, seizing the initiative. True, we have no desire to do that. We are a modest people, I hope, and we certainly are a modest Government, and we have enough problems of our own, and such influence we have got in the world is because of our modesty, not because of our shouting. There are plenty of countries which shout, and there is a habit today of shouting and of directing and passing resolutions of condemnation of this or that. I do not think anything will come of this habit of codemnation, this reflex action from the cold war.

I realise that many things are happening in this world, and in this country indeed, which I do not like, which this House does not like. We try to the best of our ability to deal with the situation, sometimes succeed a little, and sometimes fail. In this matter of Western Asia, I really have nothing more to say than what I had said previously, except that any resolution that is brought up in the United Nations, which does not clearly and specifically ask for or lead to the withdrawal of foreign forces cannot be accepted by us, because we think that is basic. I do not say this by itself will solve the problems of Western Asia or of the Arab world, because they are very intricate, but that is the initial first step that should be taken together with such other steps as may be necessary. And our directions to our representatives there are, therefore, to put this withdrawal of foreign forces ia the forefront.

In regard to Indo-Pakistan relations, there is nothing more I can say. Some hon. Members said that they do not appreciate the idea of my meeting the Prime Minister of Pakistan; some others said nothing would come out of it. I do not know whether anything will come out of it or not. We are always in favour of such approaches, such meetings and I shall gladly meet him, not with exaggerated hopes, but nevertheless with some hope. I always have some hope of achieving some result. But apart from any hope that I may have about this meeting, or any other meeting, there is one particular policy to which I should like our Government and our country to adhere firmly, whatever happens, and that policy is, now, tomorrow, a year later or I do not know how long it may take, but ultimately, to have friendly

relations with Pakistan. We are with the people of Pakistan and I do not want this bitterness which has subsisted in governmental circles more than among the people, to go down to the people. Apart from past history, apart from innumerable associations, we cannot get rid of geography; we cannot get rid of the fact that we are neighbours and will remain neighbours now, tomorrow and as long after as you can think of. Therefore, it is to our interest and their interest to cooperate, to live our individual lives, independent lives and to cooperate.

It is true as Acharya Kripalani reminded us--I think Machiavelli said it, may be Chanakya also said it--of the theory that a country is inimical to its neighbour and is friendly to the country on the other side of the neighbour. That is the old doctrine of statecraft. You are inevitably supposed to be hostile to the neighbour country, but with the farther country you have to be friends, because it might help you against your neighbour country. That, if it applied at all in its bad way, applied at a time when the

## <Pg-149>

world moved slowly. Now every country is the neighbour of the other country. There is no distance left in the world.

Anyhow our basic policy in regard to Pakistan has to be to win the friendship of Pakistan. I say so deliberately. Obviously, you do not win friendship at the sacrifice of our own country's interests. That is not friendship; that is only submission; that is only degradation, which does not bring friendship at all. So we have to protect and preserve our interests, but keeping in view this long-term perspective which we hope may become a short-term one. Otherwise our energies will suffer, will be wasted in this type of conflict. And what is worse, this kind of thing affects even our internal work and internal thinking, as it must affect that of the people of Pakistan.

I said yesterday that it amazes me when I read in Pakistan newspapers reports about these border troubles in our eastern border. Hon. Members who often ask questions about these matters in this House might read some Pakistan papers for a while to find out how they are feeling about it. They feel just the reverse of how you feel, how we feel—that India is constantly creating trouble, India is committing aggression, India is firing all the time.

Quite apart from the facts, this is the picture that is put to the Pakistani people in their Press and in the statements of some of their leaders. Now people of Pakistan are affected by it, we cannot be surprised. But I do not want to say anything to encourage this false picture in the minds of the Pakistani people. We are repeatedly asked: "What are you doing in the eastern border? People are demoralised." I do not like that kind of thing. Our people are not demoralised, must not be demoralised and it is wrong to have demoralisation if a few shots are fired. It is a hard world and if people get fired, get demoralised, get frightened because of a little

firing, the sooner we get used to it the better. It is true people are inconvenienced; it is true people are sometimes hit by the shots and die. But it is also true that we are adequately protecting our borders. Nothing is happening to infringe our sovereignty. There may be a disputed land of two hundred yards this way or that way and for a moment a police force comes in and is pushed out. This kind of thing has been happening. Let us not exaggerate this. It is a nuisance: it is annoying; it should be stopped. But let us not think that our territory is being conquered, or taken away by anybody, or that we cannot protect it adequately.

At this stage replying to an interruption: can the Prime Minister hold out hope of any reasonable time by which these border disputes will be settled, Shri Nehru said: I quite appreciate what the hon. Member has said. How can I give a date? I do hope that this kind of trouble will cease.

But at the background of it all is a deeper disease as between India and Pakistan which breaks out in these various ways. I hope that will also become gradually less. But certainly I do hope that the troubles in the eastern border and western border are somewhat of different types, because on the western border there are armies facing each other, broadly speaking. On the eastern border there are police pickets. There is no question of army movement. ? Sometimes press reports indicate army movements, etc., in Eastern Pakistan; or if you read the Pakistan newspapers, Indian army movements on our side, Assam and West Bengal.

All these movements are small. A small company of troops goes there, and often enough, one movement takes place because news comes that from the other side there is a movement. But they are petty movements. Here on the western side, armies face each other. It is a different type of thing. But I hope that anyhow these eastern troubles would cease.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA KOREA GERMANY PAKISTAN

**Date**: Aug 20, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Foreign Policy Debate: Prime Minister's Speech

Initiating a debate on India's foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on Aug 26, 1958 August, the Prime Minister said: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg

### to move:

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

Sir, since this House considered the international situation and debated the question of foreign affairs, the world has gone through a number of stresses and strains, and indeed has been sometimes on the blink of war and catastrophe. Fortunately that particular episode, bad as it was, is more or less past history now. I am referring, as hon. Members will realise, to developments in Western Asia where, for about five or six weeks, the situation was very tense and on one or two occasions during those six

### <Pg-150>

weeks there was the actual danger of war breaking out on a big scale but recently, only a few days ago, the United Nations General Assembly passed a Resolution sponsored by the Arab representatives there, and passed it unanimously. Now after the great tension of the previous weeks this came as a tremendous relief, and I must congratulate with respect the United Nations Assembly for this unanimous decision, and the Arab countries who sponsored that Resolution. Now that Resolution indicated two things--I am not going into the details of it, the actual contents of the Resolution; it indicated that the Arab countries are progressively coming together; Arab nationalism is becoming welded together. In this Resolution even those Arab countries which were opposed to each other functioned in co-operation. That, I think, is a good and healthy sign and secondly, as a consequence of that, this fact is more and more realised now by other countries which had consistently tried to ignore this fact of the importance of this tremendous upsurge of Arab nationalism.

In other words we are coming or some other countries are coming nearer to reality as it exists in Asia. One difficulty has been that this adjustment to reality has been a very slow process, slow for all of us, but it does not make very much differences to the world. If a weak country takes an unrealistic view, it is the weak country that suffers, but if a strong and mighty power takes an unrealistic view, then the world suffers; that is the difference, and unfortunately this kind of thing has been happening. All the revolutionary changes in Asia and in Africa have only been grudgingly recognised by the countries in Europe and America. I am not criticising anyone because it is always difficult to adjust oneself to a changing situation, and the fact of the matter is that the situation in the world to-day from any and every point of view is one which changes rapidly and basically. Now I cannot say what will happen in Western Asia. For the moment things have calmed down, and I believe all the countries concerned, more especially the Arab countries concerned if I may use a colloquial expression, want to have a quiet time; nobody wants trouble there. Therefore, we may perhaps have a relatively quiet time though it must always be remembered that the major problems of that area have not been solved and they may give rise to another new

upsurge and tension at any time.

Then the other subject which no doubt interests hon. Members a great deal and which comes up repeatedly in question after question is that of our relations with Pakistan. As the House knows, I expect to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan in about two weeks' time here in Delhi. We are supposed to discuss more particularly the frontier incidents, the border incidents that have been happening chiefly on our eastern border with Pakistan, and I hope at any rate that that problem which in reality is not at all a difficult problem would be solved.

Now this problem of our border may be divided up into three parts. One is what might be called the international border, about which there is no doubt. Then is the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir State, which at any rate is precise; we know where it is. The third part of the border is what was decided by Mr. Radcliffe and Mr. Justice Bagge on two different occasions, and this has not been demarcated with the result that sometimes disputes arise as to the interpretation of what Mr. Radcliffe or Mr. Justice Bagge said.

It is obviously a matter for friendly settlement--minor disputes about a village or about a mile here or there or whether the middle of a river is the frontier or the side of the river--and it seems to me really most deplorable that in matters of this kind there should be these border conflicts and intermittent firing all the time. However, I shall not go into this matter further. I hope that our meeting--the meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan--would at any rate lead to the ending of this border trouble. I am not optimistic enough to suggest that it would lead to the solution of our major problems but I have always felt that even the solution of the major problems is helped by this solving of minor problems and creating some kind of an atmosphere of friendship and not this continuous tension. Our difficulty in regard to Pakistan has been, as I have said previously, an unfortunate legacy, partly the legacy we have and Pakistan has, the legacy of partition and what happened after partition and what has happened to some extent before. That is a thing which was inevitable and which I believe we have lived down largely on both sides, in both countries, so far as the people are concerned. But a much more dangerous thing and a much more harmful thing has been the legacy in Pakistan of what they inherited from the old Muslim League, the legacy of hatred, the legacy of denying everything that we might assert just for the sake of denial, the legacy of separation of the two nations and all that. And that is the real trouble; not if I may say so, even major questions like Kashmir or canal waters or rehabilitation and all that, big as they are, because you cannot approach these questions or go anywhere towards the solution when you have to come up against this solid wall

<Pg-151>

of violent hatred which is nurtured and kept up in the Press and speeches of their leading men. I do not know whether it is quite

justified but still to indicate just how this thing is kept up I should like to read to this House a report of a speech delivered by a very prominent member of the Muslim League of Pakistan. He is not in the Cabinet, that is true, but he is a leader of one of the major parties there; in fact, the party that played such a big part in bringing about Pakistan and which has for a long time controlled the governments there and a party which may still control the governments again. This is the background we have to deal with. This was a speech delivered, I believe, in the Assembly there of West Pakistan by Mian Mumtaz Daultana, the Muslim League leader. The question before the Assembly was that the House do set up a Business Advisory Committee on the model of the Committee in the Indian Lok Sabha. It was a very businesslike proposition, a very simple proposition. Mr. Daultana opposed this. He said that it was a shameful attitude to refer to the Indian practice as an example to be followed in Pakistan. Pakistan was achieved by the opposition of the Muslims to the traditions of the majority of the people of India. "We must stick to it and even if any good thing comes from India we should not accept it. There are people who go to India and bring back articles from India and feel proud of it. Even if my sister goes to India and brings back some Banarsi saree, I will be ashamed to call her my sister," Somewhere else he said that it was their duty to hate everything Indian. Now, it is no laughing matter when a great party is governed by this outlook and one can understand the difficulties that arise in coming to an agreement with a country, the leaders of which approach these Indo-Pakistan questions in this light. I do not mean to say that every leader does so but there is no doubt that one of the governing attitudes in Pakistan has been this which a very prominent authority of the Muslim League has stated in his speech,--just sheer hatred and animosity against everything Indian. And as I said on a previous occasion, because of this I have had often enough a feeling of frustration as to how to get over these difficulties. Hon. Members, I realise, by putting questions and supplementaries and otherwise themselves express their anger and irritation at the various things that happen. We all of us share that occasionally but the fact of the matter is that there can be only one thing that can reasonably, logically and sensibly be aimed at by us and that is some solution of these problems ultimately and friendly and co-operative relations with Pakistan, because of a variety of reasons, because we cannot do away with geography--we and they are neighbours--because we cannot do away with history with all our past traditions and other things. We have to aim at that. That does not mean that we give up any principle that we stand for or any vital interest that we stand for. That is not the way to gain anyone's friendship by showing weakness and surrendering on a vital point, but holding to everything vital and important, nevertheless, never going anywhere near this attitude of hatred that is exhibited in Pakistan towards India. I hope that the recent occurrences in West Asia which have had lesson for many Western countries will also have a lesson for our neighbour country in the sense that it is not by negative policies that one can achieve anything whether in foreign affairs or in anything.

The Baghdad Pact is supposed to continue without Baghdad. I do not

quite know what it is but the whole inception and conception of the Baghdad Pact was based on unreality, based on forgetting and ignoring the great forces, the great ferments in Asia today and merely thinking in terms of a certain sub-stratum of rulers and a small group at the top and coming to agreements with them. And so suddenly you find that the very basis of the Baghdad Pact is gone; that is, Baghdad and Iraq dropped out of it more or less and as I said, I hope that all those concerned with the Baghdad Pact will profit by that not only in the narrow terms of Western Asia but in the larger terms of looking at things as they are and not as they want them to be. It is not much good framing our policies on make-believe, and that has often been done. It is true that when strong and powerful countries make policies, even if they may be based on erroneous assumptions, they have their effect. Now, I referred to the Baghdad Pact just now. In spite of this hard blow to it, there was a meeting of the Pact countries recently in London and faith in respect of that which had ceased to be Baghdad Pact was affirmed with vigour. I can have no grievance in any person or country affirming his or its faith in anything; I am concerned with my country affirming its faith in the right thing but it seems to me extraordinary that this military approach to a problem, whether it is through the Baghdad Pact or through the SEATO, should be persisted in. I am not saying for a moment that the military approach can be given up in this world completely. I am not saying that. I am not speaking like a pacifist. But I do submit that in trying to understand the world's problems in terms of military power and trying to solve them only in terms of military power has failed and is doomed to failure and a weak country in Asia will stand up, and India will stand up, and has shown that it can stand up, to military might and has not

## <Pg-152>

surrendered, and that lesson is learnt by others. And against this rising tide of nationalism and all those forces that had been suppressed for a century or more, it is not a wise thing or a profitable thing merely to put up military powers and military solutions. Now, one thing I may mention in connection with the Baghdad Pact, something that has not been made quite clear, but it appeared from various announcements that additional assurances have been given by those members of the Baghdad Pact about coming to each other's rescue in case something happened. It is not quite clear what that something is. Previously it was said that the Baghdad Pact, as the SEATO, was meant to face the challenge of what is called international communism or any communist attack from the north. How far it succeeded in doing that, I do not know. My own reading of events in the past few years is that the Baghdad Pact was remarkably successful in encouraging and helping the very forces that it was trying to suppress and restrain. However, I am interested naturally to know that the present position of these assurances is, not from the point of view of communism and anti-communism, but because it has been our misfortune to have to deal with this question in another aspect; that is, Pakistan, our neighbour country with whom we want to be friendly is not only a part of the Baghdad Pact and gets thereby

the help and assurance and backing of some of the most powerful nations in the world and thereby Pakistan itself perhaps is prevented from adopting that friendly attitude to us or that attitude to come to terms with us which it otherwise might, but also there is the other question of the supply of large quantities of military equipment. A question was put here a little while ago about any foreign bases in Pakistan, and the Pakistan Government has denied that. Whether they are foreign bases or not, and even if we accept the 'Pakistan Government's denial, the fact is that the military equipment of Pakistan has grown and grown, that vast airfields have been built all over. Whether you call them foreign or domestic--you call them what you like--they are there. They are built there. And all this arming of Pakistan is a matter of some concern to us. Why? Pakistan is an independent country. We have no right to interfere with what it chooses to do, but it becomes a matter of concern to us, and that arming is accompanied with this background, which was exhibited in the speech of Mr. Daultana, which I have just read to this House. Because the quintessence of hatred for India plus accumulation of arms may lead to bad results; that is a matter of concern to us.

Now, while in Western Asia politically and militarily the position is somewhat cooler; in Eastern Asia we have signs of fresh activity and in the last few days it appears that the islands of Quemoy and Matsu off the coast of China had been heavily bombarded from the Chinese mainland. The House will remember these islands are very near the coast of China. You can see them, I believe, from the coast and naturally the occupation of these islands by the Formosa authorities is a constant matter of friction.

So, this is the position in so far as the major events in the world are concerned. We have no particular solution to offer to those problems. When they affect us, we take some action; when they affect others, wherever possible we try to help to find a solution. For instance, in this matter, in the United Nations General Assembly we were helpful, I am glad to say, in the final solution being found in the way it was found. We have felt all along that a loud and aggressive attitude is not helpful, nor is it dignified and normally we function therefore, quietly and rather modestly. I believe we have achieved some success from that and I believe that the world has come to recognize not only the virtue of the basic policies in regard to international affairs that we pursue--which we sometimes call the "Panch Sheel", but also the manner of pursuing it. I do not mean to say that we have not made mistakes or we do not sometimes err. We do that. But we want to strive at least to think on those principles and act up to them. It is obvious that a country's authority and influence is largely conditioned by that country's internal strength domestic strength. If that domestic strength is considerable, well, it can speak with a firm voice. Otherwise, its voice is not listened to. When I said domestic strength, I was not thinking merely in terms of arms or financial strength, because we have neither. But strength means other things too. And it is because to some extent people in other countries have realised that we do possess some kind of

strength, in spite of our numerous weaknesses, and some kind of integrity of policy, that some credit has come to us from other countries and our voice is sometimes listened to with a measure of respect.

Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House at this stage much because we have not too much time and I should like to hear hon. Members on this question and profit by what they say, and finally, if necessary, to have my say again. I beg to move this Resolution.

<Pg-153>

## INDIA USA PAKISTAN IRAQ UNITED KINGDOM CHINA

**Date**: Aug 26, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Foreign Policy Debate: Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to a two-day debate on India's foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on 27 August, the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Chairman, I do not quite know to what I should render a reply. Some information I was asked for, I shall gladly give. In the main, in spite of seeming criticism of our policy, there appeared to be a very wide appreciation of it from all sides of the House. Some hon. Members perhaps do not wholly agree. Then there was the question whether Government's attention has been drawn to a report in which Miss Patricia Hornsby Smith, Parliamentary Secretary to the Home Office, was reported to have referred in the House of Commons to emigrants to Great Britain from India as British subjects. This was the question. Now, the actual facts are, I found out, that a question was raised in the British House of Commons and she was asked how many coloured people are emigrating to Britain from the British Commonwealth. And it was stated, I believe, that about 40,000 a year are going there. Then, it was stated after some discussion in reply to a debate that, 25,000 of these persons came from the West Indies, Jamaica, etc. and 12,000 from India and Pakistan, both together. They did not give the exact figure for India. I imagine it is probably less than half of that, may be five or six thousand, probably much less. Then, thereupon she went on to say that the British Government welcomed British subjects to that country, but could not ignore the rising potential of this emigration and the very grave burden it might put on the country in future. That is, she referred in a broad

way, welcoming British subjects. She was not correct, of course, if she referred to India. Obviously so. But in dealing with that most of these people who go there, as the figures will show, are from Jamaica, West Indies, and other places. It is true she did not use precise enough language to say that. But it was not a matter for us, because the Parliamentary Secretary had used vague language in connection with another issue, to make a song and dance of it and object to it and call upon the lady Parliamentary Secretary to correct or vary it. It made no difference to us even if somebody had made a more positive statement. It would not affect facts. But if he had done so, we would have drawn his attention to his error. So, I submit that so far as this question is concerned, the mailer to which Mr, Rajah drew attention really has no relevance to our situation. Nobody in the wide world who has any knowledge of the facts considers any Indian as a British subject. Of course, he is not. I have never heard anybody saying that. This kind of vague statement about emigrants, in which they were largely Jamaicans, does not alter that fact.

Now, Sir, an hon. Member stoutly denied that he stood for India changing its foreign policy in the sense of lining up with any particular group of nations, because some hon. Member had, I think, probably hinted that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wanted that done. He stoutly denied that. I am very glad to have his denial and I hope he will act up to it in the future. That may be true occasionally, but then, sometimes the ordinary dictionary meanings of words are not attached by the hon. Member. Some other meanings are attached. Therefore, there may be a difference of opinion as to whether you have understood the matter in the same way. However, the point I was venturing to say is this. Hon. Members here, specially in the opposition, accuse us sometimes of rushing in where angles fear to tread, sometimes of remaining silent when we ought to be shouting, and different charges are made why we have not protested immediately when, let us say, the United States Navy is moving about in the Indian Ocean and some of them have landed at Singapore, why we have not raised our voice in protest. Another group in the opposition wants to know why we have not protested against Russia's campaign against Yugoslavia, why we have not protested against the presence of Soviet troops in some East European countries, and so on. We are accused of not protesting against this or that happening elsewhere in other parts of the world. Then, one hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, says that we have a habit--even though we might have toned down-later of jumping always to the forefront of a crisis and throwing our weight about. Well, these of course are contradictory statements and accusations; they cannot all be true.

The fact of the matter is that it is our definite and deliberate policy not to go about accusing nations even though we disapprove of their activities, unless an occasion arises when we have to express our opinion in the United Nations or elsewhere or unless some deep crisis arises when we feel that such an expression of opinion will be helpful; that is to say, we express our opinions when we feel that such an expression will be helpful in some way or other, not merely

to unburden ourselves of feelings of indignation or anger. There is much happening in this country which we do not approve of. But we feel that while in our own country we can take liberties in the expression of opinion, on other countries we have to be more cautious because it is very easy to

### <Pg-154>

criticise others, it is much more difficult to criticise oneself. If we criticise others, we invite criticisms from others, by people who do not know facts in India, and we do not presume to be experts in the knowledge of everything that happens in other countries. Even though we may know some facts which we like or dislike, we do not know the full context of them, and in any event if we are asked to convince them in any way, it is not by way of condemnation that we can convince anybody. We will simply make the situation probably a little worse. That is why in our general policy, when we say, as we have said, that foreign forces should not stay on in the Middle Eastern countries, we have always said, laid stress, repeated the broad principle that foreign forces should not go to any country, Middle Eastern country or other, although I limited this once in the other House. The hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani, asked me, "Is that a fixed rule that it should never happen?" I said I could not say that. There may be conceivably occasions when at the invitation of a country perhaps they may go; I cannot lay that down as a fixed rule. Broadly speaking, it is not right or desirable for foreign forces to occupy another country, whatever the foreign forces may be and whatever the other country might be.

Then, one hon. Member, said, why not apply Panch Sheel to the home front, and why only use it for international affairs? It was not quite clear to me what he meant by that. Certainly it should be applied to the home front, indeed to our domestic affairs, to our home life, I would say. But then an example he gave of where it should be applied was apparently in? Ahmedabad where at the present moment some agitation is going on about the planting of a memorial in the crossroads, in the middle of he road, and he referred also to the firing etc. there. I do not quite know the relevance of all this to this matter. I would gladly of course deal with this question if occasion arises, but I mention this just to indicate the confusion in the mind of the hon. Member who brought in this thing. It is very difficult to think straight or clear if you mix up everything, but I entirely accept his suggestion that the ideal of Panch Sheel should be applied to the home front, and I carry it further to the family front, to the husband and wife front, everywhere.

Another remarkable statement which one hon. Member made was to the effect flint I had offended against the ideal of Panch Sheel by supporting the Punjab Chief Minister on some occasion or other. I am afraid my mind is not agile enough to follow this extension of Panch Sheel. Why I should not, if I think it right, support the Punjab Chief Minister on an occasion when I think he is acting rightly and support him to the hilt. I propose to do so always when a person acts

rightly. I do not know how that ideal of Panch Sheel is offended.

Continuing the Prime Minister said: There was the question again of Algeria and Gen. de Gaulle. While I am not in a position to say much as to what is going to happen in Algeria or in France, the situation, as everyone knows, has undergone a great change in France and France is, at the present moment, considering or going to consider a new Constitution and probably vote upon it. I do not know how the French people will vote and there is not much point in my expressing views to the French people as to how to vote and how not to vote. That would be presumption, whatever it might be or might not be on the subject. Everyone knows that we stand for the full freedom and independence of Algeria and we have stood for it. We have expressed ourselves quite clearly. That does not mean that we should go about condemning in a loud voice the French Government of the day. It may be that we express our views positively about the freedom of Algeria, not negatively in condemnation of other countries except that we have to criticise them in a moderate language in the United Nations or elsewhere. Then there was the question whether the integration of Pondicherry will be complete before the new Constitution is brought into effect in France.

I cannot say. So far as we are concerned, we have done everything. We do not control the French parliamentary system or the French National Assembly as to when it can do it and we cannot act as an hon. Member in the other House suggested, "Why don't you act unilaterally?". What exactly you do unilaterally, I do not know. We are in possession of Pondicherry. There, we are functioning. Nobody is interfering; nobody can interfere. But some parliamentary process has to be gone through by the French National Assembly. We cannot do it. And if we tell them, "We do not care for your doing or not doing," it does not make any difference to us. It does not give more possession than we have got. The fact of the matter is that, during the last two or three years ever since this question of the de facto transfer of Pondicherry took place and indeed before that, there have been a succession of Governments in France and a great deal of ferment and trouble politically. We may not like it, we may not approve of this delay as we do not. But the reason for the delay is obvious because Governments have not lasted long enough to do positively and there had been different Governments. Now, the latest information given to

### <Pg-155>

on behalf of the French Government is that, first of all, they stand by their past commitments and they will certainly go ahead with this matter of de jure transfer. They cannot do so except when the National Assembly meets. Under their law, they cannot do it so.

Recently, certain very wide transfer of powers was made in favour of Gen. de Gaulle, the Prime Minister. But that transfer of power did not include the right to ratify a treaty of this kind. So, although he would have no objection to doing so, he is legally and

constitutionally unable to do so till the French National Assembly meets next and it may take it up. That is not likely to meet, I think, for another six months from the time these powers were given. Probably, it may be in another month or so. But we have been assured by the present authorities in France that they stand by their old commitments and they want to give effect to them as soon as they can. That is the position.

Some hon. Member asked why we have not been more strenuous in our advocacy of the People's Republic of China being admitted to the United Nations. Well, I do not know what more is required of us. Year after year, we have brought this matter in the United Nations. Year after year, we have spoken there about it and not only there, but elsewhere also and even this year we are bringing it forward.

Then there is the question of disarmament. It is a very vital and important issue in the world today. But every approach to it some how has foundered because of the suspicions of the major Powers concerned. I may mention here that I am happy that the United States and the United Kingdom have decided and proclaimed that they will stop nuclear tests for a year from the end of October. One may ask, why have this rather long period of two months? To have more tests? Yes, that is so. The less we have the better, because it has been shown by a very responsible body of scientists appointed by the United Nations that these tests--every single one of them--are harmful to some extent. But to what extent, of course, opinion may differ, and the piling of tests is really and ultimately a crime against the future and against humanity. So, we are happy, as we were happy when the Soviet Union stopped their tests, that the United States and the United Kingdom have also stopped their nuclear tests. And I hope that the stoppage by all these countries is for good and no other country will undertake them, because we are really on the verge of other countries also developing the power to manufacture atom bombs and if atomic and nuclear weapons are spread out among a number of countries, it will become almost physically impossible then to have any system of control. Therefore, unless this suspension leads to some actual solid achievements in regard to disarmament, the position will remain insecure and rather dangerous.

One hon. Member talked about the last Commission in Indo-China. We have had a great deal of difficulty in these Commissions because as always, we were trying to achieve something, not merely to oppose and denounce. It is quite easy to oppose and express one's opinions strongly about things one dislikes. But where you are trying to hold a thing together which tends to crack up where you are trying to convince people not to take up extreme attitudes, it is always a difficult position. I think that the record of the last few years, whatever the policy has been of these various Commissions in Indo-China, has been a good one. 'All the Commissions' I say, not India alone, but all the Commissions generally and more particularly, the record of India has been certainly, I think, a creditable one and one which has avoided crisis repeatedly. So far as the last Commission is concerned and so far as any Commission there is concerned, we have

been of opinion that they are connected together in a sense by the agreement in Geneva and that they should continue till they are all wound up simultaneously having finished their work. They may continue at the lower scale, if you like, just formally, but they cannot be wound up. That is our interpretation of the agreement made at Geneva.

Now in Cambodia, the work of the Commission is very largely over. In Laos it was also largely over and we wanted therefore to reduce these Commissions to the very minimum. Some people however were of opinion that the Laos Commission should be wound up. Ultimately we arrived at a compromise decision that the Commission should be postponed or should adjourn indefinitely. That is, we withdraw all our people from there but it can be summoned afterwards and meanwhile, for form's sake one of our officers in the neighbouring countries may represent us even in Laos if necessity arises. I don't think it is a 100 per cent. desirable decision but I do think broadly it meets the situation because their functions had almost, not quite 100 per cent but almost ended and in theory therefore their functions continue though not in practice. Of course they are not there but they can go back and take them up if necessity arises so that the letter of the law has, been followed and in practice, no harm done, though I would have

### <Pg-156>

liked of course for someone to be there even in a small way. The real difficulty, of course as everyone knows, is in regard to Viet-Nam Commission. Laos and Cambodia offered difficulties, offered problems. True--but not that type of more intractable problems which North and South Viet-Nam offered and I don't know when this Viet-Nam problem will be nearer solution.

The hon. Member Dr. Kunzru asked questions about Indonesia. Well, broadly speaking, one may say that most of the rebel areas in Indonesia are under the control of the Government. There may be small pockets here and there. A great deal was said about the foreign interference in Indonesia. There was interference but we have no indication, no proof, that the interference was what might be called official or Governmental. There was interference by certain freelancers, American free-lancers, who have theft headquarters in Formosa, specially some air-men of note, who have been carrying on some kind of traffic, legitimate and may be sometimes illegitimate, in the air. They have got air-companies stationed there and some American air-men certainly lent their services or were hired by the Rebels in Indonesia and they did some damage in Indonesia against the Government. It was a bad thing and in fact one of them was actually captured by the Indonesian Government and many of these facts came out then because it is very difficult to find out unless you capture the man, as to who is bombing you from the air. It was only when the plane crashed and he was captured, then of course it was known that he was so and so, belonging to this private air company functioning from Formosa. But apart from this we have had no evidence of the U.S. Government interfering in any way in this civil war.

For some time past, the U.S. policy has been definitely favourable to the Indonesian Government and in fact they have actually been carrying out some old contract decision about supplying them or selling them some arms etc.

About the movement of the U.S. Fleet in the Indian Ocean, naturally a movement of this major type attracts attention and may be considered possibly, prima facie, as some kind of hostile move, potentially hostile but so far as we know, this is one of their normal cruisings. It is a very big fleet and wherever it goes, it attracts attention. The mere fact of its presence in the Indian Ocean may be objected to by some countries as some kind of threat. That is a different matter. But there it is. The fact of its going to Singapore, as far as I know, has no particular significance because it moves about. If the fleet is there, it has to move about from time to time and sometimes land people and take them away later.

Some hon. Members asked us why did we delay the recognition of the Republic of Iraq. I don't know what is meant by delay. We function with certain dignity. We do not rush in upsetting all rules and regulations and even decorous procedure. The revolution occurred on the 14th July. Immediately from that day onwards, we were in touch informally through our representative there with what was happening there, even with the new revolutionist regime in Iraq. From the very next day we were in touch with them informally. So far as formal recognition goes, we waited for a formal approach to us, for that recognition. The formal approach came to us exactly a week after-that is on the 21st July. It is not surprising. No doubt the people were busy there and as I said, actually we were dealing with them through our people and were in touch with them. The formal approach came on the 21st July and we took the necessary steps involved in recognition which means some formal steps, formal consideration or reference to our President. His agreement to there is formal but it has to be taken and on the 23rd, that is two days after the approach was made to us, we sent them our reply containing our recognition and on the 24th, I think this was published. So I don't see where the delay comes in.

So far as I can remember, I have dealt with the various points raised. In finishing up, I would again like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that many of our phrases, many of our postures, whether of defiance or whether even in terms of peaceful approaches, get out of date very soon. Our thinking gets out of date and if I may say so with all respect, our speeches also get out of date in a rapidly changing situation. Nothing is more obvious today than that the world is different, very different, from what it was, let us say, even ten years ago; and it changes rapidly. And because of that change, all the old poses and postures that we adopted some how are out of place. It is amazingly difficult today to keep pace with the changing times, whether it is in the international field or, if I may say so, even in the national or economic fields. And, therefore, Positive assertions as to what must be done and what must not be done

become rather out of place, more especially with regard to foreign countries. With regard to our own country, we have to carry the burden and we have to decide this way or that way, and we have to criticise wherever necessary. But one has to be cautious in these

<Pg-157>

circumstances and when the world is in such a state of flux of mind and other conditions, for us to go about running down and condemning other countries easily, does not help the process of reconciliation that we aim at.

Yesterday I said something about my meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan next month. Probably hon. Members have seen in the newspapers that a cease-fire has been proclaimed on the eastern front, if I may use the word. It was really about five days ago before I left Delhi--I was going to south--that I sent a note, I think, on the 22nd, to the Prime Minister of Pakistan saying that it was bad enough to have this intermittant firing taking place on both sides of the border; but it was even worse that this should continue after we had agreed to meet. Therefore, I suggested that this should stop and we should, both countries, order the stoppage of this and I hoped that when we met we would be able to decide this problem more effectively and permanently. He sent his reply, but unfortunately I was not here and I came back a day later, and ultimately we agreed to the cease-fire at 12 o'clock yesterday, mid-day. The hon. Member reminds me and it appears from the papers that after the cease fire there was some firing. I do not think we need attach importance to that, that is to say, from the point of view of a breach of the ceasefire. In fact, we got a message from our High Commissioner in Karachi to say that the Pakistan Government had informed him that owing to various difficulties in communications and difference in times etc. between the two countries, there might be here and there perhaps, somebody firing, but they will stop that. That was not intentional but because of these difficulties. So we need not attach much importance to this incidental firing here and there. I hope that at least in these relatively minor matters, my meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan will yield good results. Thank you, Sir.

INDIA USA JAMAICA PAKISTAN REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE RUSSIA YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA FRANCE CHINA SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA LAOS INDONESIA IRAQ

**Date**: Aug 26, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

## Indian Observers Plane Forced Down at Damascus

The Prime Minister in a written statement in the Lok Sabha on 14 August replied in the affirmative to a question whether it was a fact that the Indian Viscount carrying Indian military observers to Beirut was forced to land at Damascus airport on Jun 20, 1958.

Replying to another part of the question, the Prime Minister added that when the aircraft was nearing Damascus airport for the purpose of landing, two Syrian MIG fighters came close to it in formation and broke off finally when the plane was about to land.

The incident was brought to the notice of the Government of the United Arab Republic. They attributed it to the ignorance of the Syrian officers on the spot and to the high tension under which they had been living for months. They expressed the hope that the incident would not be allowed to affect the friendly feelings between the two countries.

INDIA SYRIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LEBANON

**Date**: Jun 20, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Nuclear Tests in Trust Territories

Shri Sadath Ali Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, replied in writing in the affirmative in the Lok Sabha on Aug 14, 1958 August to a question whether it was a fact that the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations had considered the question of suspension of nuclear test in the Trusteeship areas.

Asked if it was so, what was the stand taken by India, Parliamentary Secretary said that India tabled a resolution urging the Trusteeship Council to request the Administering Authorities of Trust Territories not to conduct Nuclear and Thermo-Nuclear tests in or near any Trust Territory.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Aug 14, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

**NEPAL** 

Indian Military Mission

In a written reply to a question whether Government of India's attention had been drawn to the reports in the Nepalese newspapers that the Indian Military Mission had imported explosives and ammunitions into Nepal and that a consignment had been intercepted and if so, what were

<Pg-158>

the facts of the case, Shri Sadath Ali Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, told the Lok Sabha on 14 August that certain press reports in local newspapers of Kathmandu, which appeared in June, 1958, stated that explosives and ammunitions had been imported on behalf of the Indian Aid Mission (not the Indian Military Mission) and that these had been intercepted on suspicion by the customs authorities.

A press note was issued by the Embassy of India, Kathmandu, the Parliamentary Secretary added, contradicting the news and explaining that the Indian Aid Mission in Nepal which had been entrusted by the Government of Nepal with the task of constructing the Kathmandu-Trisuli road, had with the permission of the Government of Nepal imported explosives for blasting purposes. The attention of the Government of Nepal was drawn to the Press reports by the Embassy and the Government of Nepal also issued a Press Note clarifying the position.

NEPAL INDIA USA

**Date**: Aug 14, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

**PAKISTAN** 

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Rajya Sabha on Aug 18, 1958 on the recent Indo-Pakistan border incident:

Mr. Chairman, Members of this House have been much concerned about recent happenings on our eastern border with Pakistan and many questions have been addressed to me on the subject. This anxiety is natural. Continuous firing across the border should not be a normal occurrence; indeed it should not be even an abnormal occurrence between the countries concerned. Even if there are some border disputes, it is the usual practice of civilised countries to settle them in a peaceful way by negotiation. Aggressive action and repeated firings across the border cannot settle the dispute; these can only create bitterness and upset the life of the people living in the border areas. Occasionally people are hit and killed or get wounded, villages of the border have to be evacuated and economic life in the area is completely disorganised. Apart from the actual damage caused, such action naturally leads to apprehensions as to what the aim of the action is.

So far as the Government of India are concerned, we are anxious to settle all these disputes by peaceful negotiation. These are not what might be called major political disputes and usually the argument is about small areas. If the approach is co-operative, there should be no difficulty in settling them and in having the border clearly demarcated to avoid any controversy in the future. A part of this border has been demarcated but there has been delay in continuing this process. We have not been responsible for this delay.

When this process of demarcation started, it was agreed that whatever changes of territory have to be made, as a result of the demarcation, these exchanges should take place on an agreed date. Till then the status quo should continue. Pakistan has repeatedly violated this agreement.

While we are anxious and eager to settle the border disputes peacefully, it is obvious that we cannot permit forcible attempts on the part of Pakistan to change the status quo. Where, therefore, there has been any aggression or firing across the border, we have had to give orders for that place to be defended.

There are four areas in this eastern border where there has been trouble:

The Surma Sector. This extends twelve to thirteen miles between the Cachar District of Assam and the Sylhet District of East Pakistan. On the night of 6/7 August, Pakistani forces began firing towards Indian posts and villages across the Surma river on a fairly wide scale. At first, our police forces stationed there did not retaliate, but, as the firing continued, they returned the fire. Ever since then, there has been intermittent firing over this stretch of the Surma Sector. The casualties on our side, to the best of our knowledge, have been

two killed and some person, wounded. We do not know what the casualties on the Pakistan side have been. The people living over this stretch of territory on our side of the border have not only suffered damage, but have had their life disorganised. Some villages have had to be evacuated.

According to our understanding, the boundary falls on the left bank of the river Surma, the whole river lying within India. Pakistan dispute

<Pg-159>

this. ??? a settlement of the dispute, certain be facie arrangements were agreed to by the Deputy Commissioners of Cachar and Sylhet in 1954. Under these arrangements, Pakistani civilians, but not officials or armed personnel, were allowed certain transit facilities on the river which, ??? to us, is Indian territory. Pakistan has repudiated these arrangements.

In this sector there is a village called Tukergram of Harigram belonging to India in the loop of the ??? river. On the night of 6/7 August, Pakistani forces, taking advantage of their over-land connection, entered this village and occupied it. There has never been any dispute about this village in the past.

Tripura Border. On the same night, that is, 6/7 August, Pakistani forces surprised a small Indian police, picket situated in the Indian part of the Lakhimpur village on the border and killed two, injured two and captured three of our policemen. This part of the Lakhimpur village has been in Indian possession, although, as a result of recent demarcation of the boundary in the area, it will ultimately go to Pakistan.

It will be noticed that the action taken both in the Surma Sector and on the Tripura border was co-ordinated and took place in the course of the same night, 6/7 August.

Two day, earlier, on 4 August, the East Pakistan Government sealed the Tripura-East Pakistan border without consulting Indian authorities. This was a breach of the agreement made by Pakistan with India according to which Pakistan agreed to allow goods and passengers to proceed from India to Tripura. This sudden closure, without previous intimation, led to great inconvenience and loss to the people of Tripura. We consider this a serious violation of the agreement between India and Pakistan.

Khasi Jainti Hills Border. A few days ago I made a statement in the Lok Sabha giving an account of these eastern border troubles. Since then a fresh development has taken place. From 11 August onwards, we received information that Pakistani forces were being moved towards our border opposite our small town of Dawki. On 12 August, Pakistan closed the Khasi Jainti Hills border with Sylhet, presumably to cover these troop movements. We drew the attention of the Pakistan

Government to these developments and hoped that they were not part of any aggressive design. On 13 August, Pakistani forces started firing on Dawki town. This was entirely unprovoked and, it must be remembered, that there has been no dispute about Dawki. The status quo in this area is governed by agreements concluded in November 1951 and January 1952,

According to these agreements, forces on one side could not go across the river to the other side, but both sides could ply freely on the river. The Pakistan Government have recently repudiated these agreements and Pakistani forces have been from time to time firing on Indian boats plying on the river.

Our Government have been in correspondence with the Pakistan Government about these border troubles. I have also been in correspondence directly with the Prime Minister of Pakistan. I am afraid this correspondence has not thus far led to any helpful result. What appears to me self-evident, is not accepted by the Prime Minister of Pakistan, and his version of what took place seems to me incorrect.

It had been proposed to have a meeting at Secretaries' level in Karachi on 23 August to consider these border problems. We have now been informed that this meeting will have to be postponed for about a week as the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan is still in New York.

Day before yesterday I received a letter from the Prime Minister of Pakistan, who has been in London and is expected to reach Karachi today. In this letter, the Prime Minister informed me that he had issued orders to open the East Pakistan-Tripura border.

I had said in the Lok Sabha last week that I would be prepared to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan to discuss the border disputes, should he so wish. He has now informed me that he would like to meet me at a time and place mutually convenient, in order to discuss these border problems. He has suggested that this meeting should precede the meeting of the Secretaries.

I have sent him a reply expressing my readiness to meet him for this purpose and suggesting Delhi as the venue of such a meeting. I have, however, pointed out that it would be more helpful if the Secretaries met at the first instance and discussed these problems thoroughly. Later the Prime Minister could meet. But I have added that, should he still wish that the Prime Ministers' meeting takes place before the Secretaries meeting, I would agree to that also.

<Pg-160>

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

**Date**: Aug 18, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

## Indo-Pakistan Canal Water Dispute

Replying to a question on the Indo-Pakistan canal water dispute, Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation and Power, said in the Lok Sabha on 12 August that at the talks held in Rome during Apr 12, 1958, it was decided that Pakistan would present at the next meeting in London a plan of engineering works designed to replace from the western rivers the supplies received by Pakistan canals from the eastern rivers.

The Minister added that a plan was put up at the recent meeting in London. After a preliminary examination of this plan, the Indian delegation obtained certain clarifications and asked for some additional information which the Pakistan representative had promised to supply.

The talks, the Minister continued, were then adjourned to enable the Indian delegation to study the Pakistan plan and prepare its detailed comments on the Pakistan proposals.

Replying to another question regarding the present position of canal waters dues from Pakistan Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim said that the amounts outstanding against Pakistan up to the quarter ending 30 September 1958, were: Undisputed--Rs. 27,81,631, and disputed--Rs. 97,19,980.

The Minister added that the Government of Pakistan. had paid the 'undisputed' charges, almost in full, up to the period ending 30 September 1957. The arrears under 'undisputed' charges referred mainly to the subsequent period.

The question of payment of these arrears as well as the outstanding 'disputed' charges, the Minister said, had been taken up with the Government of Pakistan.

PAKISTAN LATVIA ITALY USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA

**Date**: Apr 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## **PAKISTAN**

# Manhandling of Indian Officials

In a written reply to a question whether Government had received any explanation from the Government of Pakistan in connection with manhandling and hand-cuffing of five Indians at Gowalmandi in Lahore by Pakistan Police in May last year and if so, the nature of explanation given and whether Government had accepted it, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Sadath Ali Khan said in the Lok Sabha on 14 August: "The Pakistan Government did reply. Their explanation was that the Indian Officers did not disclose their identity in time. As this is not true, we have not accepted this explanation. The Pakistan Government has been approached again to reconsider their attitude and to make proper redress for the grievous wrong done to the Indian Officers."

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Apr 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## **PAKISTAN**

## Indian Killed at Bolapara

The Prime Minister in a written statement in the Lok Sabha on 22 August replied in the affirmative to a question whether an Indian national, by name Asharaf Ali, was killed by a party of nine Pakistanis in the Indian enclave of Bolapara on May 30, 1958, and if so, whether compensation had been demanded from East Pakistan Government.

The Pakistani party which included policemen and civilians, the Prime Minister added, trespassed into the Indian enclave of Bolapara Khagrabari in District Cooch Behar and shot Asharaf Ali and looted his cash amounting to Rs. 320/-.

The Government of West Bengal and the Indian High Commission at Karachi have lodged strong protests with the Government of East Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan respectively and have asked for the punishment of the culprits and for payment of adequate

compensation to the family of the deceased Indian national.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date**: May 30, 1958

# Volume No

1995

## PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Indian Nationals in China

Large amounts were due to Indian nationals who were in the employmen of Shanghai Municipal

<Pg-161>

Council (which included Municipal Police) only and in no other place in China.

This information was given by Shri Sadath All Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, in reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on 14 August.

In reply to another part of the question whether they had approached the Government of India for use of diplomatic channel to help them for the realisation of their dues; whether any steps had been taken in this connection, Shri Sadath Ali Khan replied in the affirmative and said: "Government of India have been making representations to the People's Republic of China and the matter is still under consideration by them."

CHINA INDIA USA

**Date**: May 30, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Repatriation of Chinese Students from U.S.A.

In a written reply to a question on the number of Chinese students wanting to leave for Chinese mainland from the U. S. A. who have been repatriated through the assistance of Indian Consulates during 1958 so far, Shri Sadath Ali Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on 14 August: "Upto Jul 15, 1958, six Chinese students and research workers with six members of their families, and one Chinese housewife with her daughter, were repatriated from the U. S. A. with financial assistance from the Indian Embassy."

CHINA USA INDIA **Date**: Jul 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## **POLAND**

## Cultural Agreement Ratified

Instruments of ratification of the Indo-Polish Cultural Agreement were exchanged between Polish and Indian representatives in Warsaw on 12 August. The Vice-Minister, Foreign Affairs, Mr. Winiewicz, and Director, Eastern Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Rodzinski, and Press Director, Mr. Poleszczuk, represented Poland, while Mr. S. K. Roy, Charge d' Affaires, Indian Embassy, Poland, represented India.

POLAND INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

**Date**: Jul 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Assistance for C.D. and N.E.S. Schemes

In a statement laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 18 August,

Shri S. K. Dey, Union Minister for Community Development, said that the Technical Cooperation Mission had given a loan amounting to \$ 2.00 m. during 1957-58. Grants from Ford Foundation amounted to Rs. 8,36,500 and Rs. 3,37,937 during 1956-57 and 1957-58 respectively.

Shri Dey said this in a written reply to a question as to the amount received for the Community Development and National Extension Service Schemes under the Technical Cooperation Mission Programme and from other foreign countries during the years 1956-57 and 1957-58.

<Pg-162>

USA

**Date**: Jul 15, 1958

# September

# Volume No 1995 CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

1958

September

Volume IV No. 9

**CONTENTS** 

ASIAN COMMON MARKET

Minister's Reply in Lok Sabha ... 163

**BURMA** 

Trade Agreement Protocol Signed ... ... 163

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement on Quemoy and Matsu ... 163

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS  Emergency Force in Suez Area 164 Indians in South Africa 164 Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of China 166
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIETNAM Statement on Expenditure 178
JAPAN President's Speech at State Banquet in Tokyo 178
NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha 179
PAKISTAN Canal Water Dispute 179 Distribution of Indus Waters 180 Indo-Pakistan Agreement of May 4, 1948 182 Prime Ministers' Conference on Border Problems 182 Secretaries' Conference on Border Problems 183 Shri Nehru's Statement on Border Problems 184
PONDICHERRY Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha 186
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC Cultural Accord Signed 187
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Food Aid 188
<pg-i></pg-i>

# BURMA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA CHINA VIETNAM JAPAN PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Sep 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

# ASIAN COMMON MARKET

Minister's Reply in Lok Sabha

Replying to a question in the Lok sabha on Sep 12, 1958 , the Deupty Minister for Commerce and Industry, Shri Satish Chandra, said

that there was no proposal to set up a Common Market for Asia along the lines of the customs and tariff union in Western Europe. The question of Government of India's reactions to any such proposal did not, therefore, arise.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Sep 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **BURMA**

## Trade Agreement Protocol Signed

A Protocol to the Agreement of Trade and Commerce between the Government of the Union of Burma and the Government of the Republic of India was signed today in Rangoon. Thiripyanchi U Ba San, Secretary, Ministry of Trade Development, signed on behalf of the Government of the Union of Burma and His Excellency Shri Lalji Mehrotra, Indian Ambassador, on behalf of his Government.

This Protocol is an outcome of the review undertaken by the two Governments on the progress of their Five-Year Agreement of Trade and Commerce signed on September Nov 05, 1958. Under this Protocol the two Governments will facilitate the export and import of potatoes, teak scantlings and other commodities, listed, in the schedules, from Burma and sewing machines, bicycles and electrical goods and other commodities listed in the schedules from India

**BURMA INDIA** 

**Date**: Nov 05, 1958

# Volume No

1995

# INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement on Quemoy and Matsu

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on Nov 15, 1958, speaking on a motion Calling attention to the statement by the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, in a radio interview in Washington "in defiance of the Bandung principles and the declared policy of the Government of India in regard to the Chinese Peoples Republic's inalienable rights to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu."

I really wonder if what the hon. Member has said has any relation to the facts, and if so how much. He used the words "Bandung declaration" several times. I would really like to know where Bandung comes in (interruption).

Not in the remotest degree, neither directly nor indirectly. I don't just understand because I have read through the whole of the Bandung papers. This is neither here nor there.

It is, of course, true that in Bandung we have a clear, defined, precise and often declared policy with regard to the People's Republic of China, Formosa and the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That is true. But let us forget the Bandung declaration and let us only confine ourselves to this. Has the Finance Minister said something in opposition to our well declared policy which the hon. Member opposite approves with regard to the Far East? Now our policy is that we recognise only one government of China, that is, the People's Republic of China. We do not recognise any other government. We don't although we know that as a matter of fact, the island of Formosa and some offshore islands are held by the Kuomintang regime. But we do not recognise that regime. Therefore, we think that Formosa and these islands should go to China. We have always said and hoped that this change-over will take place peacefully, not only because we are opposed to and we do not like the idea of war--apart from any moral scruples, it is not a question of moral scruples--but if a war starts even in that corner of the world, it may spread all over. But with regard to the rights and wrongs of it, we have had no difficulty whatsoever. I would go a step further

## <Pg-163>

with regard to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu and others. These islands are situated right in front of the port of Amoy, off the mainland. As I was saying in the other House, it is as if the island of Elephanta in front of the city of Bombay was occupied by a hostile power, with big guns. It is like that. The circumstance is an intolerable one, quite apart from wider question of rights and wrongs. And we think it would be an amazing thing, from any standpoint or viewpoint, a totally indefensible thing, quite apart from our point of view, if war took place with regard to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That is our policy.

Now, if the hon. Member will read carefully what the Finance Minister is reported to have said, he will see that his mind was constantly

thinking of--and he was repeating it--about the necessity for a peaceful decision. In another speech, on another occasion, he said quite clearly our basic position and he was referring here to Formosa and not even to Quemoy and Matsu, and Formosa, of course, is the basic question. The Finance Minister said we, that is India, consider the island to be Chinese, but we have stated our view that the matter should be settled peacefully. There in a sentence he has stated our position quite correctly. We consider Formosa to belong to the Chinese, the People's Republic of China. And it should go to them, but we want the matter to be settled peacefully. Even the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China has often said that he would like to settle it peacefully, though, of course, he has not given any assurance of renouncing any other way of obtaining it. The interview that the Finance Minister gave should be looked at in this context. He is all the time laying stress on this peaceful solution of this problem and answering questions; that is to say, a question is put and he says, "Yes" or "No". And as is the habit sometimes with reporters, in the whole thing, slightly the emphasis goes one way. I am quite sure, reading it quite carefully, in what he has said he has stressed what I may call the non-violent approach to the problem. He has said another thing which shows exactly the way in which his mind is working. Regarding Formosa, as I said previously, he has said that it belongs-to China. And he compares its position to that of Goa. Well, Goa is part of India. Goa, we think, belongs to us. It is part of India. Yet, in spite of our strong feelings in this matter, we have never taken military measures to recover it. He has tried to explain that also. So that will explain and make clear to this House how his mind was working. There was no question of encouraging or discouraging anybody. He was only laying stress on certain peaceful methods. Whether these peaceful methods can be followed in the present moment in the Far East or not is another question and dependent on so many factors. But our policy with regard to this is perfectly clear and I do not think the Finance Minister has said anything against that policy.

INDONESIA INDIA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Emergency Force in Suez Area

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, stated in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 11, 1958 that 1,177 was the

present strength of the Indian contingent in the United Nations Emergency Force.

Shrimati Menon stated this in answer to a question by Shri Maheswar Nayak. She added in reply to another part of the question that the United Nations Emergency Force was not used in the Suez area but along the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Demarcation Line and the frontier to the South of the Gaza strip.

INDIA USA EGYPT ISRAEL

**Date**: Nov 11, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Indians in South Africa

Shri Arthur Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, made the following statement on Sep. 22, 1958 on the treatment of Indians in South Africa at a meeting of the 13th Session of the United Nations General Assembly:

I come to the rostrum on behalf of the delegation of India to support the inscription on the agenda of items 62 and 67, as contained in document A/3926.

First, may I say that the delegation of India fully supports the submission which this house has just heard from the representatives of Ghana and Haiti. As they have pointed out, there can be

<Pg-164>

no doubt that, unfortunately, the matter covered by item 67, appearing on page 10 of the report, raises an issue in which a Member State, in our view, is regrettably in conflict with the charter of the United Nations. to which that Member State has subscribed.

It is because of that fact and also because this Assembly has repeatedly put this item on its agenda that it is unnecessary for us at this stage on that matter to argue the question of the relevance to this item of Article 2 (7) of the Charter. Indeed, numerous past decisions of the Assembly and the fact that one Member State perhaps alone of all countries in the world deliberately follows a policy of racial discrimination, make it quite clear to us, and has made it clear, time and again to a vast majority of the memories of this

Organization. that the policies of that Member State are in direct contradiction of the Articles of the Charter of the United Nations.

We feel therefore, that this Assembly will again wish to give attention to this very serious problem which does involve a violation of the Charter.

I turn now briefly to item 62 of the report before us (A/3926). "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa". In this particular case we are not putting new Item before the General Assembly. This is the twelfth occasion on which this item has been before the Assembly. This year. as has been the case in so many past years, its place on the agenda arises out of a direct request by last year resolution to us and to Pakistan to report to the General Assembly on our efforts to negotiate on this matter with the Government of the Union of South Africa.

Before I inform the Assembly of what steps we have taken in the past year to achieve those peaceful negotiations which were enjoined upon us by a General Assembly resolution, may I say that the question of domestic jurisdiction does not at all even arise in any form in this case. Apart from the general fact that the policies of the Government of the Union of south Africa in the matter of racial discrimination are regrettably a deliberate violation of the Charter, as members of this Organization are aware there is an Inter- national agreement covering this particular matter, namely the Capetown Agreement of 1927. which was a solemn agreement signed by the Government of the Union of South Africa and the then Government meat of India. May I draw attention to the announcement which was made simultaneously on 21 February 1927 on the occasion of the signing of the Agreement in Which both Governments said that the "difficulties w4th which the Union Government has been con-fronted will be materially lessened by the Agreement now happily reached between the two Governments". On that occasion an agreement was reached after negotiations and even the Government of the Union of South Africa referred to the Agreement as one "happily reached" between the two Governments.

In view of that, it is totally understand. able to us that the Government of the Union of South Africa should refuse to reopen negotiations with the Government of India and with the Government of Pakistan on this important issue.

I said that I would inform the Assembly briefly of the steps we have taken. The permanent representative of Pakistan and the permanent representative of India to the United Nations both addressed a very friendly and courteous letter lo the permanent representative of the Union of South Africa. We drew attention to the resolution which had been adopted by General Assembly and we requested that negotiations should be entered into by the three Governments regarding this issue. We also went so far as to say that we realized that the Union Government took a different stand from the stand which we took on the question of domestic jurisdiction, and we said in the letter that we should keep that issue aside. that we did not want to argue that

point and that all three parties should retain then stand on that issue. We stated that we should in conformity with the general provision of the Charter and with the resolution of the General Assembly, open peaceful negotiations.

I regret to inform the General Assembly that there has been no acknowledgement of this letter and no substantive reply, so that the efforts which our colleagues from Pakistan and we made to bring this matter again to a table where peaceful negotiations could be pursued have been frustrated by this extraordinary policy what is opposed not only to the Charter but also as I have said, to the international agreement which has been entered into in the past by the Union Government and the Government of India.

For all these reason we are sure that the members of the General Assembly will agree with us that it is the duty of this Assembly again to give con to these two items.

<Pg-165>

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA GHANA HAITI PAKISTAN

**Date**: Nov 22, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

# INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of China

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement on admission of China at a meeting of the Thirteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Sep. 22, 1958:

Before I address myself to the substance of the procedural matter that is before us I should like, with permission, to state my understanding of the procedural position so that there may be no conflict of view or, if there is one, in order that we may understand it from the beginning.

We have before us a report (A/3926) of the General Committee. It is open to any one to move that report be referred back--that is to say, to move that the report be not accepted and that the contrary be accepted--in which case, according to our understanding of the position laiddown by previous Presidents of the General Assembly, it would not be subject to rule 23 of the rules of procedure. But from

all that one has been able to gather there is some doubt in this matter about the distinction between an adverse ruling and something else.

I was a little perturbed at the proceedings of the General Committee, of which I believe I have a copy somewhere. There are no verbatim records of the General Committee's meetings, but the President seems, according to this press release for which I do not vouch, to have put it in such a way that inclusion and non-inclusion are in the same category. It may be so philosophically--not only the request for the inclusion of an additional item but also the non-inclusion of an additional item. So, in order to put all doubts at rest, and also in order that the debate might come into some sort of order as far as we are concerned, the delegation of India, jointly with some others, has put down these amendments to which the President has referred.

I am sorry for the delay in putting these amendments in. It has been caused partly by the hope that this procedure would not be necessary and partly. because the draft resolution to which these amendments have been moved was itself put before the General Committee during the course of the meeting. So it all belongs to one way of looking at things. However, Mr. President, since you have not ruled this out, which you could have done, and since you have been gracious to permit this, my delegation is extremely grateful to you.

So far as my delegation is concerned, we now have the opportunity before this Assembly of simply saying that this report should not be accepted. We also have the opportunity of moving these amendments. If it is the position that in moving that the report be not accepted we may not touch upon any other substance of it, then, of course, we come to the second position--the substantive draft resolution before the Assembly and the number of amendments to it. This draft resolution is like any other draft resolution that comes before us.

However, I propose at this stage of the discussion to place some limitations upon myself and confine my observations to the question of the placing of this item on the agenda as a matter very largely of procedure by the Assembly. It is not my intention at this moment to go into the very grave implications of the subject that we are at present discussing, implications far graver than perhaps some of the delegations have been able to ascertain. I, however, reserve to myself and to my delegation my right of reply in this debate, which arises from the fact that, Mr. President, you have before you now a substantive proposition to which amendments have been moved and that, under your ruling, the amendments come first. So that when I have submitted these observations and the large number of speakers who have been inscribed on the list have spoken--and I have no doubt that others will follow--I hope that you will allow me the right of reply in that debate. That position I reserve. If it is necessary then to go into the substance of this matter and to place before the Assembly such of the facts which contribute to the gravity of the situation and of which we may be aware, I will do so at that time within the limits that are imposed upon me as the representative of the

## Government of India.

Your position in this matter, Mr. President, is also supported by the rulings of previous Presidents who have said that rule 23 does not apply in this case.

There are two legs to these amendments. The draft resolution recommended by the General Committee for adoption by the General Assembly is a unique procedure which has never been applied in any case in the history of the United Nations since the second part of the first session. At that time, there were no rules of procedure. Anyway, this is before us. I will deal with the draft resolution in parts because I believe that here two different draft resolutions have been put together as one. The first part is merely a rejection of the request that the Government of India has made. It reads, in part, "Decides to reject the request of India " With great respect, I submit that this

<Pg-166>

did not require a clause; it only required an adverse vote. But it is before us, and therefore I propose to deal with it.

I submit, as I did before the General Committee, that the Committee was not entitled to submit this part of the draft resolution because the previous resolution of the General Assembly, 396(V), definitely laid down certain procedures in this regard. I agree with anyone that a previous Assembly cannot bind Assemblies for all time. But our rule is that once an Assembly has adopted a resolution, it has to be rescinded if it is to be disregarded.

To understand the situation best, it will be necessary to go into some of the background of the whole of this problem. It would be quite unusual, vexatious, impertinent and entirely out of form and procedure to come here to request the representation of any particular Member State to be considered. That would be wrong. If all of us started to do that, there would be eighty-one draft resolutions and the Assembly could not proceed. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a prima facie case for doing this.

In October 1949, the present Government of China made application to the Security Council in regard to representation. On 18 November 1949 a letter was sent by the Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, who is now the Prime Minister. This letter can be found in United Nations document A/1123 of that year. No action was taken, however. Subsequently, the Security Council was asked to consider the matter by one of the permanent members of the Council. But it so happened that in the Chair was Mr. Tsiang who was the representative of the other side. It was ruled that the document might be circulated, so no discussion took place at that time.

The matter came back to the Security Council at its 461st meeting on 13 January. The draft resolution for the recognition of the new

China, in sum and substance, was rejected by six votes against cast by Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, France, the United States of America and China on the Security Council. Against that were three votes in favour cast by India, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and there were two abstentions, which are significant today, by the United Kingdom and Norway.

The debate went on. The then Secretary-General, at the end of the next meeting or some subsequent time, decide to examine this proposition and he submitted a memorandum to the United Nations on the principle; of representation. I have no desire to go into detail on this because it enters into the merits of the question of who shall come to the United Nations.

The problem before us is whether this item shall be discussed and not who should come in. But this document of Mr. Trygvie Lie is a matter of great importance because it deals not only with China or Timbuktu, but it deals with the general problem of who is entitled to represent a country.

That was in 1949. In 1950 the Security Council was again convened. This time the President was a representative of the Soviet Union. Equally, he was on the other side. After some preliminary discussion the provisional agenda circulated by the President was discussed and on that provisional agenda was the recognition of the representation of the Central People's Government of China. As a result of the procedural debate which lasted three full days, this item on Chinese representation was removed from the agenda. But how? By a vote of five in favour of removal, five against removal, and Egypt alone, at that time, abstaining.

I go into all these details, first of all to show the antiquity of this problem, that there has been some doubt about it for a very long time. Otherwise, it would be quite improper for a representative to come here and say that as regards someone among us, his credentials should be examined. There is a long history behind it.

That is one reason. The second is, from all that I have read out to you, that each time there was a vote on it, it has not been quite even--in this case it was even, five to five, with one abstention. There has never been an overwhelming decision either way.

Before this item came before the General Assembly, an adhoc Committee was set up to examine what should be done in the event of two parties claiming the same seat. That can often happen. Normally, it was to be decided by the Credentials Committee. But when political questions are involved, the Credentials Committee --which really examines the technicalities of representation, whether the signatures are right, whether the identities are the same, and so on--may not be adequate. Therefore, whatever the reason. an adhoc Committee was appointed and on 14 December 1950 the General Assembly adopted resolution 396 (V).

There are two or three paragraphs in the preamble which, if

necessary, I can read out. But I do not think it is essential for the consideration

<Pg-167>

of the matter. The preamble simply refers to the importance of looking at these matters. Then comes the two operative clauses:

- 1. Recommends that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations"--which is the present case--"the question should be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case;
- 2. Recommends that, when any such question arises, it should be considered by the General Assembly"--not "it may be,--"or by the Interim Committee of the General Assembly if the General Assembly is not in session; (A/175, page 24).

It is my submission, therefore, that what has happened in the last two or three years here is ultra vires, not only of the Charter, as I shall point out later, but of this decision of the Assembly. The Assembly has decided and unless we rescind that decision by proper procedures, any problem of this kind where two parties contest the same seat and come to this position, must first of all be decided in the light of the Charter. But the second paragraph, which governs the whole thing, is that it should be considered by the General Assembly. That is all we are asking you to do.

In casting a vote for the position I am putting forward, no one is committing himself to endorsement of the present regime in China or any of its actions. No one is saying that as a result of that, the representation should be changed. The plain issue before us at the present time--I am not going into the merits of it--is whether the Assembly, on an issue of this character, the gravity of which I shall point out to the extent that is necessary later, should have the right of free discussion. By covering up this matter, by evading an issue, do we really solve anything? What is more, whether it is not the right of the members of the Assembly, and of the world's public and the parties concerned on either side, that there should be open and free discussion of this matter.

Even at the risk of being regarded as repeating myself, I would like to say, again and again, that the item before us is merely the question of the representation China, and what we are now discussing as a result of the General Committee's report, is the inclusion of that item on the agenda. There is no reason whatsoever why those who want to argue against it should not place it on the agenda in order that their case may be established.

So far as the Government of India is concerned, its position is very clear. It does not want to include this item for academic discussion.

It wants this matter to be considered because it is a matter that concerns gravely the peace of the world, the stability and order in the Far East, the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. What is more, it is merely taking into account the realities of the situation. It is part of the Charter that those who come in as Member States should be able to fulfil Charter obligations, and it is only a Government who, in the classical ostinian definition is able to command the habitual obedience of the citizens of that State, that is able to deliver the goods. If Charter obligations are to be carried out—and this has been pointed out many times in the disarmament debates and elsewhere—and if any decision in regard to that vast land of 630 million people is to be implemented, it requires the consent, co-operation and implementation of the Government that can carry it out.

Therefore, as far as the Government of India is concerned, while the issue before the Assembly is the admission of the item, when that item is admitted we shall point out why it is necessary to effect an alteration of representation. There is no question here of the admission of a new Member State. If that were so, it would go to the Security Council first. China is a member of the United Nations. China is a founder Member of the United Nations. China carries with it the obligation of a permanent Member of the United Nations responsible for world security. Those who vote on behalf of China can veto a resolution, can hold up the proceedings of the Security Council. They are among the five great statesmen who are responsible for the business of this Organization.

China is a founder Member. When I say that China is a founder Member, it does not mean that this or that Government of China is a founder Member. It is laid down in Article 3 of the Charter that Members of the United Nations are States, not Governments, and the State of China in our humble submission, is not represented here. Therefore, we seek to establish a prima facie case in that way, because the objection to discussing this matter, to which I shall briefly refer, is that it is a controversial issue. I do not think that there are many issues before this Assembly that are not controversial. I do

# <Pg-168>

not think that it is right for us to avoid an issue because it is controversial. Today it is not only controversial. The serious consideration of this matter is integral to the maintenance of peace in the world. The issues will not disappear just because we refuse to look at them.

Secondly, if those Member States who think as we do, that the present Government of China and its composition and political and economic policies are not the concern of this Organization, if they are in the position of being able to command habitual obedience of their citizens, and if, it is recognized by large numbers of people in the world, then the question arises as to whether it is right and ethical to exclude them. Here I would like to give some figures.

Of the Member States of this Organization, twenty-nine recognize the People's Republic of China. The Government of the People's Republic of China has trade relations with at least sixty-eight other countries. The countries which recognize the People's Republic of China have a population of 1,040 million. If one adds to that figure the population of the People's Republic of China itself, which today is 639 million one arrives at a figure of 1,679 million people, of a total world population of 2,737 million, who are on one side as against a minority on the other.

We cannot, of course, come here and argue in terms of population, because the United Nations is based upon the conception of one State having one voice and one vote, which we do not challenge. But in deciding these matters one has to refer to their impacts and to the great causes which lie behind them.

Therefore, I want to submit that in ignoring these views we are really ignoring the views of a large majority of the populations of the world. But suppose we dismiss that argument and say that it is only a minority which takes this view. Well, there were twenty-nine countries last year, twenty-five countries the year before that, and a fewer number before that. There has been an increasing number every year which has asked for the consideration of this problem. I wish to ask you Mr. President, can an Organization such as ours survive in prestige, survive in conformity with the principles of the Charter or in accordance with the ideas of free discussion and the protection of minority views, when a large group of countries, twenty-nine of them, want a question debated, some abstain and the remainder do not want the question debated, and the issue is not discussed? I submit that the suppression of a very large and, if may say so, a significant minority point of view is not good. No one expects a minority view to be carried, and no one expects a minority to convert a majority, but the minority does have the right to put forward its views. It is largely in the hands of the President and of the General Assembly to see to it that these minority views are expressed.

I am very surprised not to hear some of those Member States which have long been wedded to liberal traditions and which have long traditions of parliamentary governments, such as the United Kingdom, come forward today and say, "Right or wrong, let us look into this matter because a large number of Member States here have a point of view which should be heard."

The purpose of not allowing this question to be discussed is that talking about it might create some difficulties. Well, that is no longer true. I believe that there are some twenty-two or twenty-five speakers inscribed on the list already. If it is the idea that we should keep the People's Republic of China out of United Nations because of the resolution on the Korean War or because of its form of government or because of the behaviour with which it has been charged, the fact is that it is one of the great Powers of the world with an enormous population and with considerable economic weight. We

cannot put a country of that type out of bounds. To put China out of bounds is really to put India out of bounds, for we are its close neighbour. We do not agree with everything which the Chinese Government does, and I do not suppose that they agree with everything that we do. We have a common frontier with them and it is our hope that the common frontier will be maintained without any war. We practically have common seas. It is our desire, and I am sure that it is the desire of our neighbours, to maintain these peaceful relations, and it is up to the United Nations to assist us and not to allow present tensions to continue.

I submit this item with a very grave sense of responsibility. The Government of India submitted this item to the United Nations in June of this year and there has been sufficient opportunity to review it. I think it is only fair to say that we reviewed it just before the Assembly was to begin following the recent events which have taken place. It is our very considered view that the discussion of this problem is necessary and can do nothing but good. It will enable some progress to be made towards resolving difficulties that are at present unresolved.

These are my remarks with regard to the first part of the General Committee's recommendation;

<Pg-169>

it is not within the competence of the General Committee to make that recommendation. It is certainly within the competence of the General Assembly to adopt a resolution. However, it is for you, Mr. President, and for the General Assembly to consider whether a resolution can be adopted which really cancels a previous resolution without rescinding that resolution first. If that could be done, it would be difficult for us to convey to the world that the decisions of our Organization have any binding force at all. We may pass a resolution one year and then next year pass another one. As regards the General Committee, it acted beyond its powers and in disregard of the mandate of the General Assembly. The General Committee is an organ of the General Assembly. It has no power in itself; it is merely a steering committee. It is not supposed to study questions of policy and it should not go into the merits of questions. If it is not right for the representatives to go into the merits, how can it be right for the General Committee to submit a proposal?

Therefore I submit again that the first part of the recommendation of the General Committee is ultra vires of its own powers, contrary to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, contrary to the Charter, inimical to the interests of the maintenance of peace and decreasing tension, prevents the expression of minority views and is an unfortunate exhibition of the power of the majority to prevent discussion. If this fully succeeded, it might have some value. However, what now happens is this: there is discussion, but it is not a full discussion because we are limited by not being able to go into the merits of the question. We, therefore, have a discussion which is

half-baked. We have all the evils of discussion without any of its merits. That is the result of the present approach to this problem.

I now come to the second part of the recommendation, which reads:

2. Decides not to consider, at its thirteenth regular session, any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the Peoples Republic of China.

So far as I am aware, this matter has been before the General Assembly seven times, and it does not speak much for the Assembly's prestige to say each year that we shall not consider this question for one whole year. This is not a procedure that redounds to our credit; at least that is my humble submission.

However, over and above that, I submit that this anticipates the findings of the Credentials Committee. After all the Credentials Committee is to say procedurally who should represent a particular group of people. In this case there are political issues. However, to say that this question should not be considered for twelve months means that we have already decided what the Credentials Committee should or should not do. While this may be appropriate in this case because of the political implications, it is a very bad example to set for us to come here and pass a resolution that we shall not consider someone's right to sit here even before the Credentials Committee has looked at their papers.

Secondly, I would say on the merits which I only want to touch upon at the moments that even if there was justification last year--and I should like my friends, particularly those opposed to my point of view, to take note of this--even if there was justification last year and the year before for saying we should not do anything for twelve months, does it redound to our sense of responsibility, does it correspond to reality at this time, when the gravest crisis in the world is in relation to this problem, to say that the United Nations will not discuss this matter while that is going on? To bind our hands in this way, in my submission, would be the wrong thing to do.

My delegation, therefore, asks for the deletion of this clause fully and completely.

Even if this item does not go on the agenda that is bad enough: but to pass a positive resolution tying our hands behind ourselves, to anticipate the findings of the Credentials Committee, to proclaim to the world that we shall not consider during our lifetime an issue which is connected with one of the gravest problems in the world-that seems to me to be an abdication of our functions which it is not right for us to do. That is my submission.

I have said before that I reserve to my delegation the right of reply, because I am the mover of this amendment. I have no desire to go into matters further than one should, but I would just mention

this. All the news from that part of the world, until about six hours ago, calls upon us to take a view of this matter different from the one that the General Committee has asked us to take.

## <Pg-170>

We have made mistakes in the past on situations of this kind. My Government, with a great sense of responsibility and with deliberation, submits this request to this Assembly composed of people drawn from different parts of the world--and the largest number of people who support the point of view I am putting forward are the neighbours of China, are people who are, if nothing else, perhaps in a better position to sense physically and emotionally what is going on. I request this Assembly not to ignore the appeals they have made time after time, and today for the eighth time. I, therefore, request that these amendments be considered, that they be accepted, that the item be placed on the agenda and that the second paragraph, recommending that the item be not considered, be deleted.

As I said before, when I return to this rostrum I propose to go into the merits of the question, if during the debate the merits are raised. In any case it will be my duty to come and place before the Assembly such factors of the gravity of the situation as it sits on us--I am not saying that other people are not conscious of it, but it makes a terrific impact upon us--the Assembly may realize, as it must, the gravity of the situation, --so that we may submit to the Assembly that we are dealing with a question that may well drift into a question of conflict.

The Assembly will remember that only two or three days ago the Secretary of State of the United States, in his address to the Assembly, said that the United States would bring before the Assembly the issue of China. All the more reason why they should be here to be castigated or to appear in their own defense. If there is a crisis of a very grave character, it is more likely to be put off, more likely to be postponed, more likely to be alleviated, by this procedure. I submit this, and I reserve the, right to take the rostrum again later.

## On 23 September 1958, Shri Menon said:

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, and fellow representatives, I am grateful to you for the opportunity you have given me to exercise my right of reply in this debate.

The time devoted to this problem before the General Assembly in the last few days, amounting to some three hours before the General Committee and something like eight hours of debate in the opening session, with eight speakers participating in the general debate and thirty-two speakers participating during the plenary sessions--that is, excluding the President's non-controversial intervention--is a proclamation of the importance of this item and contradicts the view that we may not discuss this problem. Since the Assembly now has the

opportunity of considering this subject, even though it came in by the back door, as it were, it is taking full advantage of this opportunity; and if one adds to this the concern that is in the minds of Members, sometimes expressed in One way, sometimes in another way, we come to the conclusion that it would be a violation of the wishes to the majority of the peoples of the world to ignore the best prevailing sentiments and to exclude this subject from full and mature consideration by the Assembly. There are some who have expressed themselves in this way. But it is only fair to look at the objections.

The main objection is that this is not timely. Now, that is merely a matter of opinion. Not even those who have said that is not timely have denied the urgency of this problem. I think the foremost exponent of this view, though his speech was very brief, is Sir Pierson Dixon of the United Kingdom, who said "The deep division of opinion on this subject in the United Nations would embitter the Assembly's proceedings". This might have been true three days ago, but we have had an expression of the alignments of people and of their strong feelings in this matter, and therefore a proper discussion would only assist in bringing the subject into proportion, whereby the cases could be put on either side.

My delegation has repeatedly said here and in the General Committee that we are not asking at this moment for an expression of views on what might come out of the discussion on this item. I should like to say again that if this item were on the agenda it would enable those who are so sure of the untimeliness of this matter, who have been throwing dark and sometimes not-so-dark hints about all the implications of this problem, to air their views much better. Now, my friend, the representative of the United States, said that if we really wanted to argue this matter, "There are very persuasive arguments which would make the Assembly reject this item or reject the whole proportion when the time came". If those arguments are so persuasive--and the representative of the United States is not without influence or without the power of voice, or the power of persuasion--why does he not come and try to persuade? Is this not a place for persuasion? It is a place for asking people over whom you may have influence, with whom you may argue, to shut their minds to a problem that is so hard, that is so full of grave implications. It is not as if the representative of the United States thinks he has a weak case. He

## < Pg-171 >

thinks he has a strong case, and what is more, a case which will persuade the Assembly. I do not say in what way. He says he can persuade. Then why not try persuasion?

But the best answer to my colleague from the United Kingdom has come from other representatives who have spoken here. The representative of Finland, who made a brief observation, said "His delegation fails to see how the successful activity of the United Nations could be

furthered by not considering the matter here". Here is a country which is far away from China and which, so far as I know, has no political affiliations with the present Chinese Government, one which in no way stands in a position of fear or favour concerning the People's Republic of China, and usually does not intervene in every proposition in this Assembly, but which now comes here and tells us that we are not going to lose anything, that the successful activity of the United Nations will not be hindered by considering this matter. The same thing comes from another area, far away from China, that is, from the representative of Sweden, who said that an opportunity should be given for discussing this matter.

But I think the strongest argument in favour of free speech is in the words of Voltaire:

I disagree with everything that he says but I insist on his right to be heard.

She tells us that this is a question of major importance. There can be no doubt that the situation in the Far East not only affects the interest of China in Korea, but immediately affects local peace and world peace. Indeed, I wonder whether the refusal to discuss it in previous years may not have contributed to the present dangerous situation in the Far East.

I submit that this is not only a rebuttal of the position put forward by those who argue untimeliness, but it further points to the fact that by this postponement, by this prevarication, by this refusal to face issues, by this ostrich-like policy in regard to a grave problem, we are really contributing to the very tension which it is in our interest to lower.

I should also like to refer to some other statements made recently which are of very great importance because they come from sources which will rally respect in this Assembly.

The Prime Minister of Norway, not so long ago, on 21 September, I believe, after this problem was before the General Committee, said in an interview:

It is an absurd situation that the world's most heavily populated country is not represented in the United Nations.

It is hard to imagine that any easing of relations in the Far East can be achieved unless a reasonable solution of the question of China's membership of the United Nations is found.

Of course, he is dealing with the main problem. But you cannot find a solution to this problem if you refuse to discuss it. This is the same position taken by the Foreign Minister of Sweden, who said:

It becomes more and more absurd that Chiang Kai-shek's Government which, with its army, has got asylum on Formosa, should be regarded

by the United Nations as the legal representative of the biggest country in Asia.

I do not know what commentary history will pass on this. There have been many comic opera scenes in the march ot history, but this would be perhaps one of the biggest of them where here, as a permanent member of the Security Council, as I said the other day, as one of the five stewards of the security of the world so far as the United Nations is concerned, are seated individuals who do not represent their country; and, what is more, those who represent that country are excluded from that seat.

I have no desire to speak at length in order to controvert the arguments. In fact, there are no arguments to controvert. I have been in this Hall for most of the time of this debate and I have looked at all the speeches. The only real arguments that have come up are, first, the untimeliness of this matter; secondly, it may add to tension; and, thirdly, China has disqualified itself by its conduct. These are the three main arguments that have been brought forward.

On the other hand they have also to look at the sentiments of people who are very near to China, who, for the last few years--some of them, like us, from 1949 onwards and others more recently--have established diplomatic, trade and other relations with China. It is not right for the Assembly to disregard those sentiments because the holders speak from first-hand experience.

## <Pg-172>

I hope that other representatives will not think I am making an invidious comparison when I say that none of these statements were more emphatic than that made by the representative of Cambodia, His Royal Highness Prince Norodum Sihanouk this morning, when he gave his experiences What is more, he pointed out to this Assembly an argument which some of you will not accept, namely, that if there was a so-called Communist menace in that country, it was before there was the friendship with his people and his relations with the People's Republic of China. The sentiments of Cambodia have been promoted by understanding and by good neighbourliness.

My colleague from Indonesia, who has reason in recent times to be concerned about the security of his own country, a vast land where the possession of coastal islands may become a problem which will be very onerous for his Government, where if any country were to claim passage through the islands saying they were open seas, the integrity of that land would, be threatened, tells us:

But is not the United Nations, by continuously postponing consideration of this question, in fact, inviting the People's Republic of China to find its way into silencing the United Nations and incapacitating its potentialities for promoting tranquillity and understanding in international relations? This is indeed a sad development. For us, an Asian country, it may well be catastrophic.

We are not thousands of miles removed from China. China is our neighbour and the establishment of peace and tranquillity in the Far East is naturally a matter of immediate concern to my Government and people.

I would like for half a minute to dwell on the last part of this statement. I would particularly like Western representatives to ponder for a moment that to us, it is not an academic question. We are not wedded to any compartmentalisms. But neighbourhood, distance, geography and cultural affinity have impacts upon our relationship. Our security, our future and our capacity to develop very largely depends upon the stability in the Far East, and we would like representatives of Europe and of the American continent at least to carry away with them the impression that in taking the attitude they are taking they are isolating themselves from the large continents of Asia and Africa to a very considerable extent.

Then we had an expression of views which we were asked to imagine were the views of the United States. Here I want to say that while it is true that every country has one vote, that we are all equal, sovereign States in this Assembly and that our status may be equal, in, political affairs equality of status does not always mean equality of function. It would be unrealistic to ignore the economic or the political importance or the moral power of great States. Therefore, my country has great respect for the views of the United States and, if I may say so, even for some of its predelictions. We are prepared to understand their difficulties.

But I think it would be wrong for this Assembly to think that public opinion in the United States is not equally exercised by this problem. We have here statements of people who have been in important positions. The former Secretary of State of the United States, Dean Acheson, whom history will not accuse as being a partisan of China and whose friends cannot welcome him as a partisan of pacification in the Far East, because it was at that time that great trouble began, said:

The important fact is that always, until the present civil war, the offshore islands--Quemoy, Little Quemoy and Matsu--have been controlled by the same power which controlled the adjacent coast.

I thought that after these recent Middle Eastern developments the idea of a vacuum had been rejected. Apparently it has not. This is not a no-man's land which does not belong to anyone. The United States has never claimed it and has no territorial ambitions there. My Government does not take the view that the United States has territorial ambitions in the Far East. But however that may be, these islands are part of China. I will deal with this matter when I go back slightly into the historical aspect of this question. Mr. Acheson stated further:

These, whatever may be said of Formosa, are the coastal islands, as are Long Island, Staten Island and Martha's Vineyard. Their

population is minimal. The only purpose of their being held by a force hostile to the mainland Government is to block the mainland harbour of Amoy and to offer a threat as an invasion base.

Coming from such a source, the characterization that the occupation of these islands by those who now occupy them is a threat to the integrity

< Pg-173 >

of China must carry some weight with this Assembly. I will not read the rest of the statement because it intrudes into American politics.

Then we are told that a new situation has arisen because there is a "hot war" or- a near "hot war" or shelling or trouble in the Quemoy area. May I say that we must be strictly accurate about these matters. The region near Quemoy and Matsu cannot be regarded as the Taiwan Straits area. It is the Chinese Mainland area. There must be a difference between the Gulf of Formosa, as we knew it before we began to call it the Taiwan area, which surrounds the Island of Taiwan and those areas in the territorial Sea of China which lies along its coast; otherwise the position of every country would be very difficult.

We have been treated to many observations in regard to the new position which has arisen on account of the shooting and shelling in Quemoy. As I have said, I think we must be accurate about these matters. The shelling of Quemoy has been going on for the last eight years, with intermissions, and that is why it is necessary for us to look back into the history from which the present situation in China has emerged. Some twenty-five or thirty years ago, the regime which is now ruling China, and which alone is competent to represent the Chinese State, was the occupant of only a very small part of China, in the south. At that time, while they had a Government, and while even the United States at that time had some kind of de facto dealings with that Government--at the time of General Marshall--they were not recognized as State. But, as has happened in all revolutionary situations--and the United States last of all can object to a revolution, because otherwise there would be no United States--they moved on and they gradually obtained the hegemony of the whole mainland. And Formosa, Quemoy and all the coastal islands are part of the unfinished business. It would be no more correct to talk about Quemoy as not being part of that than it would have been to talk in the same way, if the revolution had not been completed and if the Chiang Kai-shek people were hanging on to some part of Shanghai or some other place where they were not allowed.

What happened in that period? Having been defeated in a revolutionary war, the greater part of the Nationalist force surrendered, and Chiang Kai-shek, with a few people, crossed the straits and went over to Formosa and lived thereafter under the protection not of the power of the Chinese people but of foreign forces. It cannot be said then that these places are outside Chinese

territory.

Then we are told that a war of aggression has begun and that China is trying to shoot its way into the United Nations. Whatever we may think of the Chinese, we should not think that they are so foolish as to believe that you can shoot your way into an Organization of this kind. But here, I think, a statement by a former Senator of the United States, Senator Lehman, is important. He said;

One-third of General Chiang's total military forces are now stationed on these islands. Indeed, the very presence of this preponderant portion of Chiang's fighting forces on Quemoy and Matsu, as open provocation to Red China, has been cited by President Eisenhower as a justification for our defense of the islands.

We cannot oppose the use of force by Red China and at the same time support the threat of force by Chiang Kai-shek.

These islands have no strategic value except possibly for aggressive purposes against the mainland of China.

Is this Assembly to be geared into the war intentions of a group of people who are erroneously regarded as the representatives of China in this Assembly? That is the issue we have to face.

Having said all this, I should also like to deal with some other aspects of this matter and, so far as possible, put them factually straight. My delegation is not concerned with the views expressed either by the United States or the Soviet Union on matters that are not relevant to this purpose. If there has been any bandying of words between them, with one side probably using harsher language than the other--whichever it is--that does not alter the question. If that were so, any good argument could be spoiled by someone's making a speech not approved by the other side. We must therefore look at this question very objectively.

Some of the observations that have been made are likely to give the impression that there is a terrific attack going on and that the Chinese Government wantonly started a war in the hope that it would develop into a larger war in which they might gain some strength or get other Powers behind them. And here we have a statement by Mr. Lodge, who said, no doubt on authority, no doubt on the basis of information which he has:

They have fired some 300,000 rounds of high explosive shells at the Island of

< Pg-174 >

Quemoy. That is in the neighbourhood of three rounds of high explosives for every man, woman and child on the island. This barrage against Quemoy, which was started less than a month ago, recalls the attempted invasion in October 1949 and the attack against Quemoy in

September 1954. In this latest barrage 1,000 civilians have already been killed.

Incidentally, that date of 1954 is important, and I shall return to it. Mr. Lodge goes on:

"We think that this is not only a further disqualification to be added to the already long list in so far as United Nations membership is concerned, but we think...", and so on and so forth.

Now, what are the facts? There is no evidence that this amount of warfare is going on except in the propagandist minds and pages of certain newspapers, On the other hand, we have certain evidence from one of the American magazines which, I am told, is very closely associated with what is called the China Lobby. I usually do not quote from Time magazine--but, since it comes from an adverse source, it may have some value, because, if it could have said the reverse, it would have. This article from Time reads:

Peking's ultimatum was backed up by the thunder of the heaviest sustained artillery barrage the world has seen since the Korean war.

That is not a long time; if they had said "since 1914", I could have understood it

Day after day, Red Chinese batteries rained 152-mm and 122-mm shells on Quemoy... It was a heavy shelling, but hardly the 122,000 rounds estimated by Nationalist headquarters in Taipei. Nationalists reported about 700 civilian and military casualties killed and wounded.

Then, a week later, on 15 September, Time reported:

The Quemoy we saw in the three days and nights before the Chinese Nationalist plane flew us out did not look as though it had been plastered with 140,000 rounds of artillery. Only four shells have hit Quemoy City, where by day life goes on as usual in narrow streets lined by two-storey houses...

In those parts of the island lying nearest to the Communist guns, every other house has been hit. Yet, surprisingly few have been demolished. Officially, 6,000 houses hate been damaged, 600 totally destroyed. Civilian dead since August 23--and this report is dated 15 September--now approaches 40.

I looked for evidence of this, because one had reason to know the facts and one had to find the evidence that could be placed before the Assembly with some chance of acceptance.

Therefore, what I should like to say is this: What goes on in the offshore islands is part of the revolutionary war that has gone on for the last thirty years. There is nothing new in this. As I say, it has been going on for a long time, even though it has been slowed

down at times in the hope of negotiations.

I now want to offer one or two other quotations because they come from different parts of the world. I should like to read, first, part of an editorial from El Tiempo, of Bogota, Colombia. No one can say that that part-of the world is either pro-Communist or pro-Chinese Government, or anything of that sort. The editorial is headed "The Madness of Formosa", and it reads:

In the case of Formosa, the West has committed the error of ignoring reality, which is inexcusable in politics. The United States insists on not recognizing any Chinese Government except that represented by General Chiang Kai-shek, head of a defeated army and authentic representative of a feudal, corrupt and inept administration, which was not only rejected by the Communist revolution but also by the people of China without any political distinctions, and those people would not like once again to see a similar Government installed......

The facts of political life do not always correspond to our desires and prejudices. But this does not make them any the less important facts.

In Canada also there are very strong expressions of opinion, from which I have many excerpts which I do not propose to read. I should like to go a little into the present situation. I would want to remind the Assembly, as I did the other

$$<$$
Pg-175 $>$ 

day, that this situation is in all conscience very serious. At the time of the Korean war my Government--and we claim no credit for it and have riot cast ourselves in the position of a general intelligence bureau for the world or as mediators-- in similar situations conveyed information to the relevant quarters which perhaps, if it had been heeded, might have had the result of preventing the extension of the sphere of that war.

In connexion with Quemoy reference has been made to 1954. In 1955, when Chou En-lai came to Bandung, he proclaimed to the world, after various conversations had taken place, that China desired to settle all these problems by peaceful negotiations, and he also suggested direct negotiations with the parties concerned, by which he meant Chiang Kai-shek, on the one hand, and the United States on the other. Helpful developments took place, although they did not go as far as they might have done. A first instalment of prisoners was released, and some attempt was made to set up negotiations. Unfortunately, those negotiations were not stepped up to the level where they could have yielded full results. But it is interesting to note that all the time those negotiations were going on there was quiet on Quemoy.

In the early part of this year, I believe, the Geneva conversations terminated. At the same time the troubles in Quemoy began all over again, and somewhere in the early part of August troubles began in

the Straits. We hold no brief for the conduct of the Chinese Government--it is a sovereign Government and does not require our special pleading--but it is our duty, especially since that Government is absent from this Assembly, to place before you such information as we in good faith believe to be true. It is that in the early part of August intervention in the inland waters of China began, and that on the 23rd of that month artillery responses began from the Chinese mainland on the part of the Government there. It has to be remembered that at the beginning of this period the Formosan authorities had 30,000 persons on Quemoy. At the present time they have 80,000 persons on Quemoy and 115,000 on all the offshore islands.

Now, where did the aggression lie? Here was a vast country, with a Government that regards itself as the proper authority, threatened on its own territory, and so near its mainland, by very nearly one-third or one-half of the army of the Nationalist forces on Formosa and the augmentation of those troops from 30,000 to 115,000. I suppose that in the normal context of things a Government would take--I do not say should take--some steps of self-protection.

That is the genesis of the present trouble. What I would point out to this Assembly is that it did not begin because this item was coming here. It did not begin because there was any particular other development in the world. All that took place was the breakdown of certain negotiations which were going on between the Chinese. After all, this is a Chinese business. There are two Chinese parties, and it is the continuation of a great civil war. I am sure that the United States cannot object to civil war, because without a civil war there would have been no United States historically.

Therefore, when those negotiations in Geneva broke down and it appeared, therefore, that there was no possibility of negotiated settlements, those who were likely to benefit from war took to other methods. There was intervention in the inland waters of China and a vast augmentation of the troops there. It would have been improper for me to read out the strength of forces in other places. All that led to the present situation, and that situation is one of great implications. Our information is that at the present time it is the wisdom and the strength of the United States that restrains the Nationalist forces from any adventurous exploits by air on the mainland. We hope that that influence will continue. But in a situation of this kind, and especially when one is fighting a losing battle and, what is more, fighting for a cause which has no moral backing, it is not always possible to rely on restraint in that way. If some forces should be let loose then, given the fact that various sides are armed with weapons of diabolic character, the world itself would face a very ominous situation. That is why, in spite of various appeals and in spite of our hearing all the arguments about untimeliness, we have thought it necessary to place before the United Nations the fact that we are facing a situation which, if not handled wisely, can lead to a catastrophe.

On the other hand, the position with regard to Quemoy is not different from that which arose when the Chinese Government took the Taschen Islands some time ago. That was not regarded as a war of aggression, but the Taschen Islands were taken. We are firmly convinced at the present time that the position taken up at Bandung by the Chinese Prime Minister still holds and that a peaceful settlement of this problem is possible provided there is a peaceful approach on all sides. And no other solution of the problem is possible because after a war there would be no more problems to settle. If the correct approach is made it is possible to bring about a degree of understanding on this question. And if the talks in Warsaw do not proceed on the basis of

### <Pg-176>

preconditions that neither side can accept then it is possible that there could be understanding, and the so-called Taiwan problem and the tension in the Taiwan Strait, as was suggested in 1955 to the parties concerned, could be settled by negotiation.

But negotiating in relation to the integral territory of a country is a very different problem. Therefore, I have no desire to drag out this discussion any further. I do not know whether it is proper for me to go into it in any greater detail, but the information up to date from China is of a character to indicate that if those parties which think that the danger of war would benefit them are restrained, and if we accept the fact that this is very largely a matter of two Chinese parties, it is possible for the Chinese Government and the Formosan authorities to come to agreement with regard to themselves and their own motherland in their own way, and we should leave them to it. This does not mean that the world is not concerned about any acts of cruelty that takes place on either side, but there are ways and means which are not beyond the political powers of men for dealing with such things.

When Quemoy was harassed, and the adjoining island of Amoy, it was not only Chinese shipping which suffered. In the last few years United Kingdom shipping has been subjected to bombing by the Nationalist forces. And on 19 August, as I have said, coinciding with certain military events that took place in that area, Amoy was frequently bombarded, causing much damage, and Chinese shipping was interfered with. China began the artillery bombardment on 23 August, with the results that we know.

We are not, as a Government, in favour of settling any problem by the use of force, even when there are legitimate rights, but we have no right to expect that every government will take that view. When China expresses its peaceful intention it must be accepted at its word. That would be the best part of wisdom, and I think that in the agreement to renew ambassadorial talks at Warsaw we have an earnest of that intention. It is up to all parties concerned to make those ambassadorial talks as fruitful as possible and not leave it at the ambassadorial stage.

My Government, while it has no role in this matter of mediation, has always been at the disposal of any party, and would be prepared to use its good offices, for what it is worth, in order to assist in the lowering of tensions. There are, of course, problems in relation to the large forces that are now in occupation of Quemoy Island and as to their future. I can only say that these problems are not insoluble. While the situation continues to be grave and, what is more, may well lead to larger conflict which may degenerate into war of a widespread character and all attempts at localizing it may fail—I do not say it will fail, it may fail—there is also in the situation every reason to have hope, because the history of the past three years has shown us that it is possible for us to obtain the adherence of the Chinese Government to the statement made at Bandung that these problems will be settled by peaceful negotiation.

That peaceful negotiation would be assisted if the General Assembly were to let the Chinese people think that the attitude we are taking is one of looking at this problem rather than ignoring it. We have brought this item before the Assembly year after year. It is a sort of very hardy annual, and this year it is more important than any other. The speeches that have been made here have shown the concern of many people, and I would ask those who are wavering not to east their vote so as to make the Chinese people think that there is no response to this attitude of peaceful negotiation from our side. I am not here either to plead as to whether actions are all right or all wrong. That would be very improper for me to do. But my Government is convinced that given the right approach, given an attitude on the part of this Assembly to the effect that they are not ignoring this problem--in fact the world cannot settle down, nor any of its problems be faced by ignoring the 639 million Chinese people--we can find a way of settlement.

I am sure that this is the desire of those who will vote for or against this amendment, those who take one view or the other. In the course of this debate it is also interesting to note that not only have two points of view been exposed, but many points of view. That is again another reason for the Assembly to consider this problem. We have had, as I said, nearly twelve hours of discussion, but a discussion that did not go into the real merits of the problem. It did not enable the Chinese people to be brought into the context of thought that this is a problem that we are actually considering in terms of solution rather than in terms of shelving.

It is no use our ignoring the fact that sooner or later--sooner if we are wise, and the sooner the better for us--this problem will have to be solved in terms of historic realities, in the same way that the problems of large numbers of South American States were handled at the time of the after-math of the revolutions that happened in that continent.

With these observations, I submit our amendments to the General Assembly in the earnest hope that those who feel that their Governments are in the position, can support the point of view put forward and allow this item to be discussed. That is all we ask. We do not say that it should be discussed tomorrow. But if it were on the agenda of the Assembly, it would give us enough time, it would give us the facility, it would open a new chapter, a newer page, which would make it possible for all of us to bring the parties into negotiation. On the other hand, I hope that no one--I say, no one-will cast their vote in such a way as to show a shutting of doors and saying "we cannot discuss it". Saying that it is untimely is to say that we will not discuss it. It may be another word, but it means the same thing and we cannot ignore that fact.

I appeal to all the Member States of the General Assembly to cast their votes in favour of a discussion of this item by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

INDIA CHINA USA CUBA ECUADOR EGYPT FRANCE YUGOSLAVIA NORWAY UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC KOREA FINLAND SWEDEN CAMBODIA INDONESIA TAIWAN OMAN COLOMBIA CANADA SWITZERLAND POLAND

**Date**: Sep 22, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIETNAM

Statement on Expenditure

In an answer to a question on the expenditure so far incurred by India on the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, in a written reply stated in Lok Sabha on Sep 04, 1958 that the total expenditure incurreb dy India on the Commission since its inception up to May 1958, was Rs. 61,80,248.83.

Out of this amount, Rs. 39,65,437.62 is recoverable from the Geneva Powers, being the expenditure incurred on their behalf.

VIETNAM INDIA SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Nov 04, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **JAPAN**

President's Speech at State Banquet in Tokyo

The President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, made the following speech at the State Banquet given in his honour during his visit to Japan:

I take this opportunity to thank Your Imperial Majesty for your kind invitation to me to visit your great and beautiful country. I feel grateful to Your Majesty's Government and the citizens of Tokyo for the cordial welcome accorded to me since my arrival here yesterday. Though this is my first visit to this part of the world and much that I am seeing here looks new to me, yet thanks to the spirit of goodwill and all-round cordiality in the atmosphere I feel as if I am moving among friends of long standing.

It may sound platitudinous but it is a fact which our past history confirms and which the peoples of our two countries cherish in their memories that Japan and India have had close cultural relationship and contacts which have led to many useful exchanges in several spheres of human activity. We naturally feel happy that the old relationship has once again been reinforced in modern times by the friendliest ties of understanding, mutual regard and the desire to be of help to each other in the wider interests of our peoples and the world at large.

Today we are living in a world where advancement of science and technology has changed the entire perspective not only of the individual but of human society as a whole. This changed perspective has challenged many an old concept. It is imperative for human progress as also for human happiness that we consider the situation calmly and decide whether the newly acquired knowledge should prove to be a boon or a curse to humanity. The latest discoveries about the atomic power pose a big question which must be answered. Shall we allow these discoveries to work for the utter destruction of mankind or shall we use them for the removal of human want and misery? It is a question which concerns everyone, every nation, big or small, and in the interest of the survival of the human race we must strive hard so that the power, which the scientific discoveries have brought within our reach, is used to improve the lot of men and nations and not as a means of total annihilation.

<Pg-178>

This constitutes, in my opinion, a good enough explanation for the

universal desire for peace which is so much in evidence today. Let me hope that it will be realised that the time has come for reckoning the new factors and boldly recognizing the necessity of adjusting human relations accordingly. It may mean, in a sense, a break with the past. It certainly means turning a new corner.

Let every nation strive for peace by abjuring aggression and subscribing to the view that all international disputes should be settled amicably in a spirit of tolerance and accommodation.

I would also like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratification at the general awakening and resurgence that has lately been taking place in what are known as eastern countries. It is in no narrow spirit that we welcome the strides that Asian and African countries have been making. Judged from any point of view this development augurs well for the future of the human race. Underdeveloped countries constitute a potential threat to human progress and happiness. Let us hope that the march of progress which has begun in these countries will continue unhindered and their peoples will not only be able to improve their own lot but also contribute their due share to the happiness and prosperity of the world at large.

It is a matter of sincere gratification that Your Majesty's Government subscribes to the ideal of peace and international amity. May I say that India is also wedded to the same ideal and tries to make such contribution as it can towards its attainment in its own humble way? This sharing of a common ideal has strengthened the bonds of age-old friendship between India and Japan and I feel sure that these bonds will continue to grow stronger and stronger as time passes.

Once again I would like to thank Your Majesty for your invitation to me to visit your great country. It has given me an opportunity to see and learn many things which I shall value and cherish. May I convey through Your Majesty the best wishes of the Government and the people of India for the happiness and prosperity of Your Majesty's Government and the Japanese people.

JAPAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 04, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

In a written reply to a question regarding the main features of the recent report on Committee of Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories and whether this report had been considered by the General Assembly, the Prime Minister stated in the Lok Sabha on Nov 12, 1958 that the latest report of this Committee dealt with various aspects of social, economic and educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories. It noted some advances made in certain Territories in the extension of community development, the growth of trade unions and co-operatives etc. In the economic field the report mentioned the progress made in planning and research in the economic development of most of the Territories. On education, the report noted that there had been little change in the rates of illiteracy since 1956 and drew the attention of the Administering Authorities to earlier recommendations for the setting up of universal and free schooling systems. The report was expected to be considered by the General Assembly at its session opening on 16 September 1958.

**USA** 

**Date**: Nov 12, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

### Canal Water Dispute

As far as the Government of India were concerned, the Inter-Dominion Agreement of May 04, 1948 on the canal water dispute between India and Pakistan was in operation. It was the only basis under which Pakistan canals were being supplied with water through works in Indian territory.

The Union Minister of Irrigation & Power, Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, said this in reply to a short notice question in the Lok Sabha on 12 September 1958. The question was whether it

< Pg-179 >

was a fact that Pakistan had repudiated the Canal Water Pact agreed into by India and Pakistan in 1948.

The Minister said that in August 1950, more than two years after the

Inter-Dominion Agreement of 4 May 1948 on the canal water dispute was signed, the Government of Pakistan, for the first time, intimated that Pakistan had accepted this agreement under duress, that if the agreement was ever binding upon Pakistan it had long since expired, and that it should be regarded as "without present effect".

#### The Minister continued:

In our reply we informed the Pakistan Government that there had been no suggestion of compulsion at the time the agreement was reached, nor was any such suggestion made in the note that was submitted three weeks later by the West Punjab Government to the Punjab Partition Committee, or at any time thereafter.

We were, therefore, unable to accept the contention that the Agreement was accepted by Pakistan unwillingly and under compulsion and informed the Pakistan Government that we could not recognise any unilateral repudiation of an international agreement.

After some further correspondence the Government of Pakistan were informed in September 1951 that, in case they had any doubt about the validity of this Agreement, the proper course would be for the Government to seek a judicial decision from an impartial international authority and that, in case it desired to follow this course, the Government of India would be willing to discuss the procedure for such adjudication. No reply to this offer has so far been received.

As far as the Government of India are concerned, the Agreement is in operation. It is the only basis under which Pakistan canals are being supplied with water through works in Indian territory.

#### PAKISTAN INDIA LATVIA USA

**Date**: May 04, 1948

## **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

### Distribution of Indus Waters

The following is the text of a statement on Indo-Pakistan canal wate dispute, which was laid on the table of the Lok Sabha by Shri Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation & Power, on Sep 01, 1958 A similar statement was laid on the table of the Rajya Sabha by Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Deputy Minister of Irrigation &

#### Power.

The House will recall the last two statements made in the House on July 25, 1957 and February 11, 1958, with regard to the negotiations between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan on the distribution of the Indus waters. As stated therein, a Bank team headed by Mr. W.A.B. Iliff, Vice President of the Bank, visited India and Pakistan in June 1957 and held discussions with the representatives of tile two countries.

As a result of these discussions, Mr. Iliff wrote to both sides a letter ill which he set out certain general Heads of Agreement, based on the Bank proposal of February 5, 1954 and on the aide memoire dated May 21, 1956, as a firm starting point from which to proceed to the formulation of the detailed text of an International Water Treaty, and asked for the views in writing, of the two Governments on these Heads of Agreement. The two Governments indicated their views to the Bank and later furnished their comments on the views expressed by the other Government.

It was, thus, for the first time after the Bank proposal had been made in 1954, that the Government of India came to know of the views of the Government of Pakistan with respect to the Bank proposal, which that Government had accepted in 1954 as a basis of discussion.

These views, purporting to be an acceptance, were hedged with such reservations, modifications and "understandings" as to constitute not acceptance, but non-acceptance of both the Bank proposal and the Heads of Agreement.

It then appeared that the Government of Pakistan were prepared to accept the division of the water proposed by the Bank but on terms which were really in the nature of a counter-proposal.

In January this year, Mr. Iliff paid another visit to India and Pakistan and tried to explore the possibility of a settlement of the dispute on the basis of exchange of supplies between the eastern and western rivers. Mr. Iliff's approach envisaged continuity of some supplies to Pakistan from the eastern rivers, allocated to India under the Bank proposal of February 1954; and withdrawal by India of an equivalent quantity from the western rivers allocated to Pakistan. These talks did not, however, lead to any concrete results.

<Pg-180>

On an invitation received from Mr. Iliff, further talks were held in Rome in April-May 1958. These talks were in continuation of the discussions held earlier by Mr. Iliff with the representatives of the two Governments and were intended to further explore the possibilities of various approaches towards a settlement of the canal water dispute.

As a result of these talks the Bank suggested a new approach on the

basis of which the Pakistan representative was asked to put up a replacement plan for all Pakistan uses from the three western rivers, with a storage on the Jhelum.

As decided in the meeting held in Rome, the Pakistan representative submitted a plan to the Bank at the meeting held in London towards the beginning of July this year. The Pakistan Plan was subsequently handed over to the Indian representative who, after a preliminary examination of the plan, obtained certain clarifications and asked for some additional information which the Pakistan representative promised to supply.

The Indian representative has asked for more time to enable him to study the Pakistan Plan in greater detail before giving his comments. The talks in London were accordingly adjourned on July 31, 1958.

The Indian delegation has since returned and the Pakistan Plan is at present under detailed examination.

During recent months, there has been a good deal of propaganda in Pakistan, alleging withdrawal by India of what has been described as "Pakistan's share of the historic supplies" from the Sutlej and Beas. These allegations are completely baseless and without foundation.

The correct position is that in early kharif, the river Beas is the only source of supply for all the Sutlej Valley canals in Pakistan and the eastern and Bikaner canals in India. The supplies. in the river Beas were unusually low this year from about the middle of May; as a matter of fact the quantity of water in the river towards the end of May was hardly half of the average of the previous 10years. The other eastern rivers, the Sutlej and the Ravi, had also been running considerably below normal.

As a consequence, some of the channels in India did not receive any water and in some areas even drinking water was not available.

Nevertheless, during this critical period, the supply to Pakistan channels was continued in accordance with the principles put forward by the World Bank for the transition period.

During the period April 1955 to March 1957 the supply of water to Pakistan from the eastern rivers was regulated by three ad hoc Agreements concluded between the two Governments. India was entitled, under these agreements, to make additional withdrawals from the eastern rivers, equivalent to Pakistan's ability to replace these withdrawals through the link canals.

The additional withdrawals made by India this year during the later part of May and early June, were in fact, less than those provided for in the Agreement for kharif 1956 when Pakistan's ability to replace was less than what it is today.

No such agreement was concluded for any period after March 1957. The

Government of India are, however, continuing to distribute river supplies between the two countries on the basis of the Agreement of the 4 May 1948 and the principles proposed by the Bank for the transition period.

Under the Bank Proposal of February 1954, the transition period for the complete withdrawal of waters of the eastern rivers from Pakistan has been roughly estimated to be about five years. This period would have expired some time in 1959. Notwithstanding our pressing needs, we have, with a view to promoting a settlement, informed the World Bank and Pakistan that we would be prepared to extend the transition period up to 1962 by which time we shall be in a position to utilize the waters for our Rajasthan Canal project and other projects.

On the expiry of the last ad hoc Agreement in March 1957, Pakistan discontinued supply of data relating to river flow and canal withdrawals which was exchanged under the Agreement, on a reciprocal basis, while India continued to supply certain data in accordance with the arrangements existing under the Agreement of 4 May 1948.

On receipt from Pakistan of the ill-founded complaints of stoppage or supplies, the Government of India proposed to the Pakistan authorities that both sides should resume the exchange of data.

Pakistan agreed and the Special Commissioners of India and Pakistan met on 22 July. 1958 at the Wagha border for exchange of data.

<Pg-181>

The World Bank had also sent out a team authorising Mr. Larz H. Bengston, General R. A. Wheeler and Sir K. Guinness to study the situation created by abnormally low supplies in the rivers Beas and Sutlej. The World Bank team visited certain areas in Pakistan and India with the participation of the Indian and Pakistan representatives, during June-July 1958.

The data collected by the Bank team appear to be still under examination and the Government of India are not yet aware of their findings.

Meanwhile, the exchange of data initiated by us is being continued.

PAKISTAN USA LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA ITALY

**Date**: Nov 01, 1958

## **Volume No**

### Indo-Pakistan Agreement of May 4, 1948

Replying to a short notice question regarding repudiation by Pakista of Indo-Pakistan Agreement of May, 1948, Shri Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation & Power, said in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 15, 1958 that the facts were that in August 1950, more than two years after the Inter-Dominion Agreement of 4 May 1948, on the canal water dispute had been signed, the Government of Pakistan, for the first time, intimated that Pakistan had accepted this agreement under duress, that if the agreement was ever binding upon Pakistan it had long since expired and that it should be regarded as "without present effect."

#### The Minister continued:

In our reply, we informed the Pakistan Government that there had been no suggestion of compulsion at the time the agreement was reached, nor was any such suggestion made in the note that was submitted three weeks later by the West Punjab Government to the Punjab Partition Committee, or at any time thereafter. As such we were unable to accept the contention that the Agreement was signed by Pakistan unwillingly and under compulsion. We, therefore, informed the Pakistan Government that we could not recognise any unilateral repudiation of an international agreement.

After some further correspondence the Government of Pakistan were informed in September 1951 that in case they had any doubt about the validity of this Agreement, the proper course would be for that Government to seek a judicial decision from an impartial international authority, and that in case it desired to follow this course, the Government of India would be willing to discuss a procedure for such adjudication. No reply to this offer has so far been received.

In September 1949, the Government of India had transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations a certified copy of the Agreement of May 4, 1948 for ragistration in accordance with Article 102 of the United Nations Charter. This Agreement was registered with the U.N. Secretariat on May 10, 1950. Subsequently, the Pakistan Government transmitted to the U.N. Secretariat a certified statement to the effect that the Agreement of May 4, 1948, had long since ceased to be effective and that the Government of Pakistan had already given formal notice of its termination. Thereupon we transmitted to the U.N. Secretariat a certified statement to the effect that the Government of Pakistan had been informed that the Government of India were unable to accept any unilateral repudiation or notice of termination of the aforesaid Agreement. The certified statements of both Governments were registered by the U.N. Secretariat.

As far as the Government of India are concerned, the Agreement is in operation. It is the only basis under which Pakistan canals are being supplied with water through works in Indian territory.

#### PAKISTAN LATVIA USA INDIA

**Date**: Sep 15, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

### Prime Ministers' Conference on Border Problems

The following Joint Communique, was issued on Sep 11, 1958 at the conclusion of the conference of the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India.

On the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, the Prime Minister of Pakistan visited New Delhi from 9 to 11 September, 1958. During this visit, the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India discussed various Indo-Pakistan border problems with a view to removing causes of tension and establishing peaceful conditions along the Indo-Pakistan border areas.

The Prime Ministers had frank and friendly discussions about these border problems. They arrived at agreed settlements in regard to most of the border disputes in the eastern region. They

<Pg-182>

also agreed to an exchange of enclaves of the former Cooch Behar State in Pakistan and Pakistan enclaves in India.

Some of the border disputes, namely, two regarding the Radcliffe and Bagge Awards in the eastern region, and five in the western region, require further consideration.

The Prime Ministers agreed to issue necessary instructions to their survey staff to expedite demarcation in the light of the settlements arrived at and to consider further methods of settling the disputes that are still unresolved. In regard to the Hussainiwala and Suleimanke disputes, the Foreign Secretary of the Government of Pakistan and the Commonwealth Secretary of the Government of India will, in consultation with their engineers, submit proposals to the Prime Ministers.

The Prime Ministers agreed that when areas are exchanged, on agreed dates, as a result of settlement and demarcation of these disputed areas, an appeal should be made to the people in the areas exchanged to continue staying in their present homes as nationals of the State to which the areas are transferred. The Prime Ministers further agreed that, pending the settlement of unresolved disputes and the demarcation and exchange of territory by mutual agreement, there should be no disturbance of the status quo by force and peaceful conditions must be maintained in the border regions. Necessary instructions in this regard will be issued to the respective States and to the local authorities on the border.

The Prime Ministers agreed to keep in touch with each other with a view to considering various steps to be taken to further their common objective of maintaining and developing friendly and co-operative relations between their two countries.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

**Date**: Sep 11, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

#### Secretaries' Conference on Border Problems

The following Joint Communique was issued on Sep 03, 1958 at the conclusion of the Secretaries' Conference at Karachi on 3 September 1958:

The Indo-Pakistan Conference on border problems was held at Karachi from 30 August to 2 September 1958. The delegations were led respectively by Shri M.J. Desai, Commonwealth Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs (India), and Mr. M.S.A. Baig, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations (Pakistan).

The discussions during the conference were free, frank and cordial and the entire range of border problems were reviewed by the two delegations.

Both the delegations deplored the recent border incidents involving as they did the loss of valuable and gallant lives and the disruption of the social and economic life of the border populations. Both delegations emphasized the full determination of their Governments to maintain peaceful conditions on the border and to issue necessary instructions to take steps that there was no tension or conflict on

the border either by criminals across the border or by attempts at forcible disturbance of the status quo pending completion of demarcation and exchange of areas.

It was decided that prisoners taken by either side during the course of border incidents should be released. Lists of such prisoners were exchanged and it was agreed that prisoners whose names appeared in both the lists should be released at specified places at 11.30 a.m. (local time) on 9 September 1958. With regard to names of prisoners not common to the lists exchanged it was agreed that verification and release should be effected as early as possible. The two delegations were unanimous that this was a human problem and further cases of this type, if any, should be dealt with on the basis of expeditious releases, if possible within 24 hours.

Both delegations agreed that border tension and conflict have a serious deleterious effect on public opinion in both countries and prejudicial to the relations between the two Governments. A clearly defined and clearly recognisable international boundary was a primary requirement of establishing peaceful conditions in the border regions. To this end it was decided that instructions should be issued to the State Governments and the Survey Authorities concerned to take all steps that would help in expediting demarcation.

The following principles were accepted with a view to expediting demarcation and early settlement of disputes:

(a) The entire boundary between India and Pakistan has been divided into certain sectors for purposes of demarcation and exchange of

<Pg-183>

possession. This arrangement is open to revision by mutual agreement.

- (b) Survey Authorities should select the sectors to be taken up each field season and start demarcating simultaneously from both ends of the sector.
- (c) If any disputes arise these should be presented cartographically as far as possible and in writing to the two Central Governments for settlement and decision. The demarcation work should be carried on uninterruptedly from the agreed point, the disputed areas being demarcated later in accordance with the settlement or decision reached.

Several proposals for the settlement of a number of existing territorial disputes were examined during the discussions and some progress has been made. The delegations will in the light of these discussions put up their respective Prime Ministers' constructive proposals for settlement of the various disputes. The delegations hope that as many border disputes as possible will be resolved during the meeting of the two Prime Ministers next week. Unsolved disputes will be settled in accordance with the procedure accepted by the two

Governments viz. by reference to impartial tribunal in terms of the decision of the Indo-Pakistan Steering Committee of March 1955.

### PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Sep 03, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### **PAKISTAN**

Shri Nehru's Statement on Border Problems

The following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's statement in the Lok Sabha on Sep 12, 1958 in reply to Sarvashri S.M. Banerjee and K.T.K. Tangamani's motion calling attention to the results of the talks held between Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan on September 9 and 10, 1958, on Indo-Pak border problems.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House knows the Prime Minister of Pakistan visited Delhi at our invitation. He came here on the 9th of this month and left yesterday morning.

In the course of his stay here, we had talks with each other in regard to border problems principally. At the end of his stay here, a statement, a brief statement, was issued which has already appeared in the daily press this morning. If you wish I can lay a copy of that Statement on the Table.

That statement states that a number of border problems relating to the eastern region have been solved, or agreements have been arrived at. Some other matters still remain for further consideration, and some procedures have been laid down.

I am not quite sure if it will be easy for me to explain, and for the House to understand, the specific border problems of villages here and there. Nevertheless, I shall endeavour to refer to them.

In the eastern region there was a boundary dispute between West Bengal and Pakistan, between the districts of Murshidabad and the districts of Rajshahi including the thanas of Nawabganj, Pakistan, Shivganj, which was earlier, in the pre-partition days, in Malda District. This was No. 1 of the Bagge Award.

I might mention here that just before the actual partition took place, Mr. Justice Radcliffe was appointed to determine the exact

line of partition of the frontier. He did so, and that was very largely accepted, but some disputes arose as to the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. Some time thereafter, another tribunal was appointed presided over by Mr. Justice Bagge and having a Judge from India and a Judge from Pakistan. This Bagge Tribunal considered the disputes in the eastern region, and made certain recommendations or awards rather. Again, most of these were accepted and acted upon. But, unfortunately, some doubts still persisted, and some arguments and controversies went on in regard to some areas, and that has continued all these years. So, on this occasion, we considered some of these disputes still persisting. And one of the decisions arrived at was in regard to this, what is called Bagge Award No. 1, which I have just related, and another one, Bagge Award No. 2 between West Bengal and Pakistan, concerning the common boundary between a point on the River Ganges where the channel of the river Matabhanga takes off according to the Radcliffe Award and the northernmost point where the channel meets the boundary between the thanas of Daulatpur and Karimpur; this has been decided previously; it has been settled that exchange of these territories should take place by the 15th January.

Then, there was a dispute called tile Hilli

<Pg-184>

dispute, also between West Bengal and Pakistan. Pakistan gave up or dropped this dispute, and, therefore, the position has been decided and remains in favour of India.

The fourth was the Berubari Union No. 12. That is also between West Bengal and Pakistan. It was decided to divide the area under dispute by half and half, half going to India and half going to Pakistan.

The next one is about two Cooch-Behar chitlands, on the border of West Bengal which, it has been decided, should go to West Bengal.

The next was some disputes about that border between the 24-Parganas in Khulna and the 24-Parganas in Jessore. It was decided again here that the mean position should be adopted in both these, taking the river Ichamati as a guide, that is, as far as possible, pursuing this river. These are in regard to the border disputes between West Bengal and Eastern Pakistan.

Then comes the dispute between Assam and Eastern Pakistan. There was the Bholaganj dispute. In regard to this, Pakistan gave up its claim.

Then, there are the two rivers, the Piyain river and the Surma river. It has been decided to have a demarcation made according to notifications made, that is, previous notifications; therefore, we cannot be sure where this demarcation will be, but it has been decided that wherever the demarcation may be, full facility of navigation should be given to both sides. That is in regard to navigation in these rivers.

Then, we go to the Tripura-Pakistan border. There was a small bit of territory, a few acres, near the railway, where the railway passes. We have agreed to give this small territory to Pakistan because it is near their railway.

Another Tripura dispute is about the Feny river. This has been decided to be dealt with separately. The course is being laid down.

There is one thing more, which has been long causing us, and I believe, Pakistan, a great deal of trouble. These are the Cooch-Behar enclaves. The Cooch-Behar State had little bits of territory all over, and some of those fell in Pakistan and some in India oil partition, as Cooch-Behar State itself. Therefore, the result is that we have some territory in Pakistan, little enclaves, little islands, and they have some here, which is very awkward. They cannot deal with their territory inside India, and we cannot deal with our territory inside Pakistan. In fact, nobody deals with those territories. In law, we cannot, in practice, we cannot, and they are just odd bits, usually the home of smugglers and other fugitives from the law. So, it has been decided ultimately that we should just exchange them, that is, our Cooch-Behar territory in Pakistan goes to Pakistan, and their enclaves in India come to India.

All these changes involve some exchanges of territory; in some cases, India gains a little territory, and in others, they gain it. These are more or less the decisions arrived at.

Then I might mention those problems that are left over for decision. One is the Patharia hill reserve forest in the eastern region. According to us, of course, that belongs to us. But there has, nevertheless, been some dispute there. We have decided that we should ask the two conservators of forests, that is, of Assam and of East Pakistan, together with the two Chief Secretaries, to meet to draw up provisionally some line there, even previous to a settlement of that dispute, so that there might not be friction. As a matter of fact, nobody lives in this forest. Disputes arise because of timber; people go over and cut timber in the other area. So, in order to avoid this overlapping, some temporary line may be drawn till such time as we can settle that matter.

Then, there is another matter, and probably one of the more important ones in Assam, on the Assam-East Pakistan border. This was also referred like the Patharia reserve forest to the Bagge Tribunal. This is in regard to the course of the Kushiyara river. The Bagge Tribunal decided about the course of the Kushiyara river, but, according to us, some points have not been cleared up and they were due to some confusion about maps etc. And this point has remained. It is an area, containing I believe, or consisting of, about 30 villages. That is in our possession at present, and has-been, in fact, all along in our possession. These will have to be decided, that is, both these matters which pertain to the eastern region. In fact, these are the only matters pertaining to the eastern region that have to be decided still, apart from one of the small ones.

On the western side, the points to be determined are these; in effect we did not decide anything about the west. There are the Suleimanki and Hussainiwala areas. Both deal with headworks, canal headworks. It is not a question of any large area, but nevertheless, dealing with

<Pg-185>

how the headworks are to be worked and who should have the bunds. And they are of certain importance not in area but otherwise. In regard to these two, we have suggested that the two Secretaries should consult their respective engineers, the two Secretaries meaning the Commonwealth Secretary of India and the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, and after joint consultation with engineers, should report to us.

Then, there is a small area of three villages in the Lahore-Amritsar border, Sarja Marja etc. And another matter which we had not considered was in dispute. But, nevertheless, Pakistan has referred to that. It is ......I beg your pardon, the matter which concerns Chak Ladheke, a small tongue of land there in the Punjab area. Then there is Chadbet in Kutch; and Pakistan raised this question two or three years ago, and we did not say anything; we thought that there was no dispute about it, and we sent them a rather lengthy reply to which their answer really came about ten days ago, after two years. Anyhow, because they claimed something, this is also a matter to be considered.

Therefore, the position is this. Quite a number of matters which were leading to irrigation between the two countries have been disposed of. Naturally, that is a matter for satisfaction, for each little thing creates confusion on the border and people there suffer.

In regard to one--which might be called somewhat--bigger matter, of Assam, that is, following from the course of the river Kushiyara, that is yet to be considered by us. The Patharia Forest question is really not a difficult one, but because the one to which I have just referred, the 'Kushiyara' has not yet been settled, Pakistan wanted to attach that also for consideration in future. On the western side, there are these head-works etc. and some bits of land.

We thought, and we still think, that the best course to decide any remaining matter, which cannot be decided by talks between ourselves, is to refer it to some independent party--tribunal--to decide, because there is no other way. Either we come to an agreement ourselves or ask somebody else to advise and we will accept whatever decision is arrived at, whether it is in our favour or against us. For the present the Pakistan Prime Minister was not agreeable to this being done in regard to one particular matter. But the matter is open for consideration. In our statement that has appeared in the Press, it is said that these matters are reserved for future consideration between us.

There are two other things. One is that we have said in regard to the exchange of small territories that we do not want migration from them, as far as possible, and we advise the people to continue living there ...... (interruption).

An Hon. Member: It is impossible.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ..... and accept the country to which they will now belong. In any event, it is not a question of large numbers. But we see no reason why this idea of people migrating should be encouraged there.

Further, we have said that we hope to keep in touch with each other and try to reduce the areas of difference in this way and find out some way of deciding the points that remain.

On the whole, therefore, I think that the result of our meeting has been satisfactory.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA BANGLADESH CHAD LATVIA

**Date** : Sep 12, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

### **PONDICHERRY**

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement on the situation in Pondicherry in the Lok Sabha on Sep 01, 1958 while speaking on an adjournment motion:

I am not aware of any constitutional machinery having broken down or there being any danger of its breaking down. The Council, to which reference has been made, acts in an advisory capacity to the Chief Commissioner in regard to subjects delegated to it by the Chief Commissioner. Naturally, we have preferred the Council to function for a variety of reasons. Sometimes it has not functioned in the past for some time.

The Council came into existence by a French decree passed, I think, a few days before our independence. According to that, the Council is formed, of which three members at least should

<Pg-186>

be elected and three nominated. But as a matter of fact, our Chief Commissioner has normally asked them to suggest six names, that is, the full number, although he need not have done so. This is the broad background.

Certain rather odd things have happened recently, to which reference was made by the hon. Members. I think the Council consists of 39 members and it was divided up between two groups. Lately, a number of members of group one, which was in a big majority, left it and sort of hung in the air between the two groups-- dissidents. So there were three groups, not one of the groups having a majority. I think the numbers were 16, 9 and 11---or some like that (interruption). It was 16, 11, 11, but two of them have again shifted.

So the members of the Assembly in Pondicherry apparently for the sake of exercise go from one side to the other frequently, with the result that the poor Chief Commissioner does not quite know what the position is.

In fact, another odd thing happened here. A meeting was held for election of the President of the Assembly. I am not going into details, but the Chairman of that meeting, who is supposed to be the oldest member, for some reason which he thought adequate, adjourned the meeting for three or four days for further consideration. Having adjourned it, he and some others left the meeting. Thereafter, however, the meeting was continued by others and they elected a new President altogether, not a new Chairman. I cannot, for the moment, say whether they were right or wrong. Normally, speaking, when a meeting is adjourned by the Chairman, it is adjourned. Whether he has done so rightly or wrongly--it may be challenged later--the remaining people cannot carry on. It is a matter of law in which we are consulting our legal officers about the situation that has arisen. I am not, for the moment, prepared to say what the correct position would be.

Then comes this question of Councillors. The old Councillors having resigned, a request was made by this dissident group plus another group that they should supply the names of the six Councillors. The Chief Commissioner enquired of them--naturally he wanted to know-whether this group was a cohesive group, whether it was a party or not, because he knew two parties and a third which had arisen, which had shifted its allegiance this way and that. He wanted to be assured about its cohesiveness--was it a party, with a majority or not? To that, all that they said was 'We have agreed to put forward these six names'. Further, as a matter of arrangement between them, the six names were really put forward by the ten persons who were dissidents. The Chief Commissioner thought it odd that ten persons should choose six of themselves for the Council, presumably as a matter of bargain with the others. He said that he would like to think over this, about which is the majority and which is not. As a matter of fact, he referred the matter to us and we are taking legal advice in the matter as to what the proper procedure should be.

Apart from this, just at this period, in the last few days, there has been a change of the Chief Commissioner. The old Chief Commissioner has retired after his full term of service and the new man has just taken charge. Because of all this, the matter was referred to us, and it is being considered.

There is no constitutional breakdown at all. When we have got legal advice, we shall take such steps as are within the Constitution and the law and are considered fit and proper.

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

**Date**: Sep 01, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

### Cultural Accord Signed

A Cultural Agreement between India and the United Arab Republic was signed in Cairo on Sep 25, 1958. The ceremony took place at the Foreign Affairs Ministry.

Dr. Mohmoud Fawzy, Foreign Minister, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Republic and India's Ambassador, Shri R. K. Nehru, signed on behalf of the Government of India.

Dr. Fawzy, in the course of a brief statement said that the United Arab Republic had hitherto signed many such agreements but this Agreement with India was one of the most important.

The Ambassador, Shri Nehru, in his reply said that the signing of this agreement revived and

<Pg-187>

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### Food Aid

In a written answer to a question in the Lok Sabha on Sep 23, 1958 1958 enquiring about whether it is a fact that the U.S.A. had agreed to give \$200 million food aid to India, the Minister of Food and Agriculture, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, said that the matter was still under consideration with the Government of U.S.A.

### INDIA EGYPT

**Date** : Sep 25, 1958

# October

	Volume No
1995	
CONTENTS	
Foreign Affairs Record	1050
	1958 October
Volume IV	No. 10
CONTENTS	
CANADA	
Indo-Canadian Wheat Agreement	189
FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC	D : 4 100
Agreement Signed for Small Industrie	es Project 189
INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FU	ND
Prime Minister's Address	189
NIDIA DI THE INITED NATIONO	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS  Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in th	o Canaral Assambly 102
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in the	
	207
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on S	South West Africa 222
Shri Arthur LaWs Speech in the Gene	eral Assembly 233
Shri Arthur Lall's Speech in the Politi	ical Committee 235
Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the Presid	ent of the Security
	237
Shri G. S. Pathak's Statement on Apa	
Shri G. S. Pathak's Statement on Rep	ort of the International

Law Commission	243
Shri Chalapathi Rau's Statement	on Report of the Economic and
Social Council	247
Shri R. Venkataraman's Stateme	nt on Report of the Advisory
Committee	250
Shri Akbar All Khan's Statemen	t on Arbitral Procedure 254
Shrimati L. Dutt's Statement on	Advisory Services in the Field
of Human Rights	255
PONDICHERRY	
Fresh Elections	255
RUMANIA	
Indo-Rumanian Oil Agreement	256
<pg-i></pg-i>	

reinforced the age-old cultural ties between the two countries and he was confident that it would lead to promotion of greater friendship and understanding between the two countries with their common problems and interests.

The Agreement, which will remain in force for ten years, provides for the exchange of scholars, teachers, scientific workers and trainees in scientific, technical and cultural fields, the establishment of cultural institutions in each other's territory, promotion of cultural and intellectual exchange through lectures, exhibitions, concerts, sports, tours, etc., and the establishment of chairs in universities and other institutions.

The Agreement also provides that at the intervals of not less than once in three years and by rotation at New Delhi and Cairo, the two Governments will hold joint consultations to coordinate the working of the Agreement in the two countries.

The Agreement will come into force 15 days after the exchange of Instruments of Ratification which will take place in New Delhi.

CANADA USA INDIA EGYPT

**Date**: Oct 01, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### **USA INDIA**

**Date**: Sep 23, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

### **CANADA**

### Indo-Canadian Wheat Agreement

An Indo-Canadian Agreement for an 8.8 million dollar loan to finance Indian purchases of Canadian wheat was signed in Ottawa on Oct 22, 1958 by Acting Canadian Finance Minister, Mr. Macdonnell and Indian High Commissioner, Shri C. S. Venkatachar.

This is the second Canadian loan to India made this year bringing the total to 33 million dollars. The first agreement signed in February provided for 25 million dollar loan of which a sum of 24.2 million dollars was advanced.

CANADA INDIA

Date : Oct 22, 1958

# Volume No

1995

### FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC

Agreement Signed for Small Industries Project

An Agreement between India and the Federal German Republic for the establishment of a Prototype Production and Training Centre for Small Scale Industries at Okhla, New Delhi, was signed in New Delhi on Oct 25, 1958. Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India and H. E. Dr. W. Melchers, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in New Delhi, on behalf of his Government.

The main objectives of the Centre are manufacture of prototypes of machines which could be produced by small scale industrialists, provision of training to technicians drawn from small industrial units and imparting of both theoretical and practical training to workers of different grades in the private sector and to the technical staff of the Small Scale Industries Organisation.

The Federal German Government will provide free of cost the plant and machinery for the Centre, valued at about DM 3.15 million, and also provide about 25 technical experts for a period of three years, which is estimated to cost about DM 2 million. The Government of India are expected to spend an equal amount in Rupees towards the cost of land, buildings, Indian technicians, raw materials and stipends for trainees.

USA INDIA GERMANY RUSSIA

**Date**: Oct 25, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

#### Prime Minister's Address

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following speech at the opening joint session of the Boards of Governors of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and the International Financial Corporation at New Delhi on Oct 06, 1958.

It is an honour and privilege for me to welcome you on this occasion, to welcome all of you who have come here to this great gathering but more especially those who have come from distant countries. We are happy that you decided to hold this Conference of these great international financial agencies in Delhi. We are happy for various reasons. One is because this would enable us to know you better and to learn much from you. This would further enable us to express our gratitude for the help that these agencies have given us in the past and in the present but also because I think it might be somewhat profitable for many of you, distinguished delegates, who have come here to have an opportunity to have a glimpse into our minds in our own environment.

I am not referring to this particular conference, important as it is, because conferences, more or less, are the same in any part of the world and more or less the same people gather there but it is the environment that counts and normally you are surrounded—you have been in the past surrounded, by Europe or America. It is good, therefore, that for a change you should feel the sun of Asia and,

well, all the other things also that pertain to that part of Asia.

<Pg-189>

I do not mean to say that Asia is one solid whole, thinking alike and acting alike--of course not. And yet, there may be certain common features in it. Even now you have the problems of Western Asia which are peculiar to it. You have the great tensions and dangers at present in the Far East of Asia and you have the problems of Southern Asia. They are different. But the main connecting link is that there is tremendous ferment and change in Asia, whether East or West or South.

It is an important factor to remember further that Asia is not a country which has only recently come into the light, if I may say so. Not too long ago, let us say 300 years ago, if such a conference could have met in those days, it would probably have found that apart from other spheres of thought, even in the technological sphere, Asia was rather ahead of the rest of the world. It is well to remember that. Something happened then and very probably it was the fault of Asia which stopped its future progress--became static, rather even stagnant if you like--and the countries of Western Europe and America went fast ahead and brought about what is called the industrial revolution, which again had powerful reactions on the way of life and even on the way of thinking of those peoples who underwent that change, that industrial revolution, and gradually the position as it existed round about 300 years ago was changed vitally.

Europeans--the Westerners--came to India because India was a producer not of raw materials but of manufactured goods which went to Europe and everywhere. It had as high a standard of living as in most other countries--sometimes higher.

Now changes took place and with an ever- increasing, rapidity which made the industrialized communities of the West wealthier and their resources also grew accordingly, while in countries of Asia we actually went backwards. We did not even stay where we were. We went backwards, for a variety of reasons into which I need not go and the fact that some big cities arose and some other faint reflections of industrialization were evident in the countries of the East did not at all affect this major premise that these countries of Asia went backwards in general welfare, in general living conditions, per capita income, partly because the population was growing and production was not keeping pace with it, while in the industrialized communities of the West the advance was rapid. It is well to remember this and this process really, possibly even you might say in the last 150 years, it has been marked--or 170 years if you like.

Up to the end of the 18th Century, India was still considered to be a fairly big manufacturing country. All that has changed, of course. Now, while this happened in India or elsewhere--I say India repeatedly as an example more than as a specific country because what I say, I think, applies to most countries in Asia, perhaps some in

Africa too--there may be many reasons for that but the fact remains that in the final analysis, we arrived at a stage when there is a vast difference in living standards, and all that goes with it, of the highly industrialized countries and communities and the non-industrialized ones.

And what is even more significant is that that gap is ever increasing. It is not being bridged. It is increasing. The pace of progress through the development of science and technology is tremendous where they have been developed through industrial means; whereas other countries like India struggle hard just to keep themselves going. They have this struggle for survival, not for shows. It is a life and death struggle for the nation as a whole, not for a group here or a group there, but for the 400 million people that live here. So I want you to feel this human element in our thinking, in our continual strain and struggle with which we have to face this problem.

No doubt we have to look upon it from the point of view of resources, money and all that. That is important. One cannot function in the air. But even more important is the human element in it. Even more important are the tremendous ferments going on in the minds of millions, hundreds of millions of people, which cannot easily be controlled by resolutions of conferences, this conference or any conference that we may hold anywhere.

Asia is and will continue to be in an explosive state, because the recent changes of the last few years or so have unleashed a giant. The political changes and the rest, they have unleashed a giant which had been kept out politically, economically and other ways, for an age, for 150 years or more. But now it has been unleashed, not entirely, but considerably. And naturally it does not propose to behave as when it was in leash, either in the political domain or in the economic domain, but prefers to make mistakes and stumble and fall and rise up, rather than be pulled and pushed hither and thither. And above all, it wants to make good. It does not want to continue as a starving continent or a starving country which is living on the verge of subsistence or existence. Whether it will be possible for them to do so or not, the

### <Pg-190>

future will show. But there are these tremendous and vast urges, and often these urges make them act wrongly, in wrong directions. Let us try to restrain them from acting in the wrong direction. But let us try to understand these long suppressed urges coming up. These needs are there and the needs are justified. Who are we to criticize, if people want better food, better clothing and better living conditions? We are of the view that they should have them. All of you want them to have these. So this is the position which has to be understood.

And we are inevitably tied up in political problems of the world. We

try on the one side to build up the world, and on the other there are constant tensions, the cold war, the war scare and the like, pulling the world back, and keeping it on the verge of danger and almost of utter disaster. The two do not fit in. One comes in the way of the other. At any rate, I hope that in considering these methods, these political aspects should be kept out of the considerations of problems of this nature. It cannot be wholly kept out, I know. But one should try to keep it out, because the more we get tied up with these political problems connected with the cold war, the more I think we miss the opportunity of serving the objectives we seek to serve; and the more our motives begin to be questioned, as if they are not motives to help but rather to serve a political objective. Again, if that questioning comes in, doubt creeps in and much of the good we seek to do goes out.

The world is in a political sense divided in various ways today, the communist world, the anti-communist and some other countries which may be called non-communist, though not supposed to be ranged in any anti group. But I think that is there. And yet the major division of the world today, I think the real division is the division of the industrialized communities or the developed communities, and the undeveloped communities. That is the real division of the world today. And whether you talk of a communist state like the Soviet Union which has become an industrialized state or the many noncommunist states that are highly industrialized, though they may differ in their politics, though they may differ in their economic theories, in the final analysis they worship in the same goods--the god of industrialization, the god of the machine, the god of higher production and the utilization of nature's power and resources for the greatest advantage. In how they do it, they may differ, but they follow the same path, more or less; while the underdeveloped countries struggle hard for a bare subsistence and the realization is increasing that if they do not increase their productive capacity substantially more than their population increases, well, they remain where they are, or they go down and down. And that is the basic problem.

Some people may say, talking about our Plan, that our Second Five Year Plan is beyond our resources, or too ambitious. Well, it depends on how we look at these things. Perhaps there is justification in some saying that, if one looks from a strictly cautious point of view, about resources alone. But these resources themselves depend on so many factors, including that tremendous uncertain factor--the human factor. If you look at the needs of the situation, the urgent, vital and essential needs of the situation, then our Plan is a feeble plan, and I should say, far from being big. These are the needs of the situation. So one has to meet these needs if we have to solve these problems, and one should find some way of doing it. And if we do not, somebody else will find a way, for you cannot ignore the problem by merely shutting your eyes to it.

That is the real difficulty for us. It is the difficulty--again I repeat it--not before us only, but before any country engaged in this

tremendous adventure of pulling oneself up from this undeveloped, backward state to a state when development comes rapidly, industrialization, etc. and progress is much more rapid than population increase or anything else.

The key to progress today in the final analysis is through science and technology, the key to material progress--let me correct myself--is that. I do not say there are no other aspects of human life; there are, certainly, which are very important. But the key to material progress is through science and technology and their application. And when these are applied, there are social consequences of these which change the social climate of the people undergoing these changes just as the mental climate of Europe and America has changed. So these things also change.

These are some of the considerations which I ventured to place before this distinguished audience because they are important considerations which trouble us.

We have always to be alive and we have to think always of facing this major problem and not by-passing it or ignoring it. It is a problem of nearly four hundred million people passionately wanting better conditions, and we have always to think of how to distribute the small surplus we have, are we to give it to them and give them contentment or, are we to keep a part of it for

### <Pg-191>

investment in the future? All these difficult problems we have, but the point is this. All these hundreds of millions of people in Asia, who may be rightly or wrongly directed, have to be considered and developments have to be made on the right lines. A superficial remedy would not do any good. As I just said, only three hundred years ago, Asia was even technologically very advanced but something happened in the last few years. The fact is that there are the natural resources and there are the human resources of Asia, human resources not merely in numbers but in ability. I have no doubt that, given a chance, it produced and would produce scientists and technologists as good as any. It is the chance that is wanting, this chance to pull itself out. It is not merely the question of Asia or Africa but the rest of the world. The rest of the world cannot be happy, without imbalance, unless it pulls up the undeveloped countries also. The world is too closely knit now to live its life apart from each other. Therefore, it becomes a problem for all of us, whether we are more fortunately situated or not, to see that these imbalances go and that, particularly speaking, a feeling of contentment spreads among those people today who are in such utter need of the primary necessities of

I hope you will forgive me for giving expression to some ideas that I have in my mind. I dare not speak to you about the specific subjects that you will no doubt consider because you are or most of you are high experts in international finance. I dare not talk to you about

subjects about which I do not know very much but I do know something about humanity in Asia, in India. I know that moves and disturbs continuously the millions of minds. I referred to it and I wanted to say something about it to you so that in thinking about your monetary or financial problems, you may have this background somewhere at the back of your mind, of these vast millions who are no longer quiet and who ought not to be guiet. They have no reason to be guiet. Nobody must keep quiet; it is quite wrong. They have kept quiet long enough and they have suffered long enough for their needs of life. It is true that we cannot produce them by talk. They have to be worked for. I know today that no country can progress just by outside help. If a country or people want to make good, they have to share the burden themselves. It is true that in such cases it is very difficult to make good progress without help, without some initial help to push them forward and most countries have that initial help. Therefore, we think that these underdeveloped countries deserve, not only for their good but for the good of the world, help so that they may be pulled out from this difficult state of backwardness, underdevelopment and poverty, but I realize, nevertheless, that the main effort must come from their own people. If the people do not make that effort, nobody else's effort is going to pull them out. I am quite sure that effort is going to be made, is being made and will be made still more, so far as this country is concerned. Naturally, it will make it easier at this time for us to have the cooperation and help of others, but for the good of the individual countries concerned and for the larger group of humanity.

On behalf of my Government, I bid you a cordial welcome again.

USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

Date: Oct 06, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in the General Assembly

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon Leader of the Indian Delegation to the U.N., made the following statement at the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly on Oct 07, 1958:

My delegation wishes to add its voice, Mr. President, to the many that have been heard from this rostrum conveying to you their felicitations on your election to the high office of the presidency of the General Assembly. We should also like to take this occasion to

recall the services rendered by your predecessor, Sir Leslie Munro.

The general debate is usually an occasion for surveying the events of the last year and dealing with the many problems which may strike a delegation as being particularly important. Some seventy-two speakers have preceded me, and they have taken fifty hours of the time of the Assembly. It is therefore not to be expected that I shall have very much new to say. My delegation has had the benefit of a survey of world affairs from the different points of view of different continents and different so-called ideologies and of those who prefer to remain outside the conflict of ideologies. In all these speeches, in addition to the expression of great concern about the present state of the world, which is not unusual in expressions

### <Pg-192>

of opinion from this platform, there has been an emphasis on the outstanding importance of the problem of disarmament, concern about the exclusion of China from the United Nations, and an unusual but welcome stress on economic affairs.

It has been our privilege to benefit from these speeches that have preceded ours, and we should like to take this opportunity of echoing what has been said here by many delegations to the way of an affirmation of our loyalty to the United Nations and to the Charter and its principles and the determination of our Government to implement those principles to the best of our ability and understanding.

It is usual on these occasions to refer to conditions prevailing in one's own country, and that is not done because of any nation egoism. In the case of a country like ours, in part representing the new resurgent Asia, we do so not in the sense of having any priority of representation over anyone else but merely by way of providing a fair example of that new Asia. Therefore, if I take the time of the Assembly for a few matters of detail, I feel sure that the Assembly will forgive me.

In this connexion, the statement made by our Prime Minister a few hours ago in New Delhi, at a meeting of delegates of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, appears to us to be relevant, because in this Assembly, especially having regard to the incidents of the last two or three years, it would not be out of place at all to quote these words which, in our humble view, are an expression of the sentiments of the peoples of Asia.

Our Prime Minister asked delegates to bear in mind the fact that millions in Asia and other under-developed countries "are no longer going to keep quiet, and they want the better things of life". He went on to say:

You have been surrounded in the past by Europe or America. It is

good, therefore, that for a change you should feel, in its environment, Asia and all other things that pertain to a part of Asia.

Mr. Nehru said that he did not mean to argue that Asia was one solid bloc. He said that there were differences; that there were problems of West Asia, that there was great tension and danger at present in the Far East of Asia, and that there were also the problems of South Asia. "They are different", he said, "but the main connecting link is that there is tremendous ferment in Asia, whether West, East or South. It is an important factor to remember."

He said that there is now a vast difference in living standards, and all that goes with it, between the highly industrialized countries and communities and the non-industrialized ones. He went on to say:

What is even more significant is that the gap is ever increasing--it is not being bridged but it is ever increasing. The pace of progress, through development of science and technology, is tremendous where they have been developed, while other countries, like India, struggled hard just to keep themselves going. For them "--for all Asia and for Africa in part--" it is a struggle for survival, not for show. It is a life and death struggle for the nation as a whole, not for some groups and individuals here and there but for 400 million people who live here.

I want you to feel this human element in your thinking on our continuous strain and struggle. No doubt you have to look at these problems from the point of view of resources and money and all that. That is important. One cannot function in air. But even more important is the human element, and more important is the tremendous ferment going on in the minds of hundreds of millions of people in the Asia and Africa.

For Asia is and will continue to be in an explosive state because the recent changes during the last few years have unleashed a giant, political changes and the like have unleashed a giant kept tied up for 150 years or more. It has been unleashed not entirely, but considerably, and naturally it does not propose to behave as if it were leashed either in a political domain or in an economic domain.

The Prime Minister pointed out that, if the conference had met in New Delhi 300 years ago, perhaps the terms of trade might have been different. Therefore, the thoughts of that vast continent are rooted in the conditions of the people, and it is not easy for those who live outside or who do not have intimate contact with it to realize the reactions and responses to various appeals that are made here or to realize generally

<Pg-193>

??? we function in the context of newly-liberated ???

Therefore, as I said a while ago, if one may ??? to conditions that exist, we represent in many ways the conflicts of ideas and ideologies that take place here. To us, it is not the conflict of ??? that seems to be real; it is the conflict ??? those who have and those who have not. ??? economic divisions that tend to drive the world into conflict, even though the day of ??? imperialism is proclaimed to have ???

We live in conditions of a planned economy, and we make no apologies for it. Without that ???, it would not have been possible for us ??? our energies and our meagre resources and to keep our head above water in this world. In that economy, a degree of balance between the ??? country, with its hundreds and thousands of ??? and the needs of modern production, ??? our defence, becomes important.

??? we are attached to a way of thinking ??? we like to make experiments for ourselves ??? not take orders hereafter from any people, and the method of trial and error becomes ??? Added to that is the necessity of ??? to keep pace with changes in the ??? of a parliamentary democracy and by ??? All this added together makes ??? country a set of circumstances which ??? for the world a great deal of opportunity ??? study and observation.

??? you we have drawn attention to the ??? that occur in the villages of India. ??? are some 600,000 of these, and today ??? of them have come under village self-??? under what is called the community ???, which has attracted the technical ??? of the United Nations. By these small-scale ??? of villages somewhere about 2.72 million ??? of land have been reclaimed and another ??? million acres brought under small irrigation ???. These figures do not refer to the larger ??? at all. I mention this in particular ??? like ours, however much one ??? about great industrial advances and ???, the bulk of our people lives in ??? villages and is dependent upon agriculture. ??? in the conditions of planned economy, ??? we are trying to avoid the dangers and the ??? of a ??? for property and power ??? at the same time attempting to beat ??? all into the same pattern, there lies a ??? that has become very important. ??? we are rather late in the field in this particular matter, in the last few months and years some 60,000 co-operative societies--of which several, thousands are of the industrial type--have come into existence. Over and above that, it is not possible in modern conditions, if we are to maintain stability in our country, to do without the maintenance of democracy to the lowest level.

For that reason a whole civil service has come into existence--and I use this word advisedly--because otherwise administration policies could not be implemented. So the Government of India today has in training 400,000 of these men, who are functionaries in the villages, and they hope to reach the target of one million at the end of next year.

These planned efforts have to a certain extent required a great deal of sacrifice from our people, and the main resources have come from our country itself. But we could not have carried through without assistance from other countries--or, at least, it would have taken us more time and necessitated other methods. therefore, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of our country to countries large and small that have come to our assistance, either technically or with other resources. It is not necessary for me to go into the details because they are always published in the Press and are available.

There has been a considerable amount of talk to the effect that a country like ours, attempting to industrialize itself and to spread and implement democratic institutions on a large scale, may fall by the wayside, and there have been demands everywhere that India's Five-Year Plan should be cut down. This is of more than national concern because if we, with our modest efforts, could not get there it is unlikely that other people could do so, and because our targets have been extremely modest I am glad to be able to say that in the two and a half years that have now passed we have reached 62 per cent of those targets and there is no reason why we should not exceed them.

This refers to the smaller and rural aspect of the Indian revolution. But, at the same time, it is not possible for a country like ours to survive in this world without considerable industrial development, and this industrial development has gone on--although not as fast as we would like it to--and schemes on which the future of our country, the production of food and our ability to survive depend have also gone on apace. Since it is not possible to give a detailed account.

<Pg-194>

I should like just to refer to one or two.

One of the major items in this enterprise has been in relation to the harnessing of the water of our country. The greater part of that water flows into the sea, as is the case everywhere else, but the famous Bhakra Dam, which is 740 feet high and has 650 miles of canals, is nearing completion and should produce for us nearly a million tons of food. In the arid desert of Rajasthan canal irrigation has now reached the position where this desert is going to be irrigated by nearly 200 miles of canals.

Now these facts are not submitted to the Assembly in any sense of national egotism, or with any feeling of satisfaction. But it is one of the main problems in this world where large numbers of us, who but a few years ago were part of colonial empires, where our economic and political processes have either been thwarted or stunted, or at any rate have not made their full development, have now come into other contexts. That development is not possibly isolated from the rest of the world.

From there we come to the United Nations. It is our obligation on these occasions to look both forward and backward. While looking to what has happened in the past should be confined to seeking to avoid errors in the future and, if we have had any successes, to draw inspiration from them, looking in front of us we are faced with many difficulties and obstructions which seem to project themselves from the past. Broadly speaking I think we can only say that the achievements of the last year in the big political matters are largely of a character where we could feel that it might have been worse. In other words, it would have been possible, as I shall point out later on, to avert that could have been a larger conflict by the operation of not necessarily the machinery but the expression of the will of the United Nations.

My country is grateful to the many specialized agencies and organs of the United Nations which--either by propaganda, by the organization of public opinion or by actual aid--have been able to assist Asian, African, and other underdeveloped countries. In this connexion my Government desires to mention particularly the name of UNESCO, as indeed it would like to mention the names of the great countries such as the United States, the Soviet Union, the Colombo Plan countries, Norway and the nations of eastern Europe which have all, either technically or otherwise, come to our assistance in the carrying out of this plan. Further than that, we are also happy to feel that the regional organizations of an economic character have gained strength in the last year, both in Southeast Asia in the newer projects of ECAFE and in the formation of the regional organization in Africa. It is our great pleasure to welcome-this regional organization in

This year, as two years ago, the United Nations once again met the challenge of what we would, without any disrespect to our friends, call the aftermath of imperial power. The first of these occasions was two years ago when we were faced with the situation--now happily concluded--in the Middle East resulting from the entry of troops into Egypt. We are happy to think that the situation has now been resolved, and if we refer to this today it is only for the purpose of pointing out that a great deal of this kind of thing seems to appear as the result of miscalculation and misinterpretation. All of us will remember that two years ago it seemed to be assumed as a truism that the Suez Canal could not function in this, that or the other conditions. Now what are the facts? First of all, the relations between the former Suez Canal company and the present Corporation-created by the Government of Egypt but independent--seem to have been resolved in a way which at that time was a bone of contention. No question of expropriations seems to have arisen, and there appears to be a happy settlement. Equally, it was believed that it would not be possible for the canal to function with the comparative low engineering achievements of the Egyptian people. It is, therefore, interesting to look at reports on the Suez Canal since then. Instead of a decrease in traffic we find that--in spite of the fact that the number of warships going north or south is smaller today--there was a considerable increase of traffic in June last as compared with the previous June. What is more, the Nasser project for improving the canal will, we are told make it navigable for 200 ships in a day.

Therefore, instead of being retarded in either a technical, an economic or a political sense, the new arrangements with regard to the Suez Canal--without any difficulties in connexion with the relations between the users and the others--seem to have settled down.

If it had been possible for all concerned to have appreciated this situation, the tragic developments of two years ago could have been avoided. My delegation does not say this in a manner of "We told you so", but it is necessary for us to draw some lessons from this--and without jumping to conclusions through some newspaper

<Pg-195>

reports, or ambassadorial reports, or some misreading regarding a revolutionary movement such as the one that took place in Iraq recently.

The position of my Government in regard to the recent entry of United Kingdom and United States troops into other areas of the Middle East has been communicated to the General Assembly and has been expressed by the Prime Minister in Parliament as part of Government policy. It is that we do not accept that foreign troops should be used in territory--and we say advisedly "in any territory", whether it be Europe, Asia, Africa or anywhere else--in the Middle East in the circumstances prevailing there. We are convinced that there can be no settlement and no return to normality until foreign troops have been removed. The countries there should live their own free, independent lives without interference from outside, wherever it may be. The foreign troops should be withdrawn. In our view, the United Nations should not send any kind of police or armed force to Lebanon or Jordan, as has been suggested in some places. If it is suggested that the United Nations Observation Group should continue to function for some time, or should be increased in numbers, we would be prepared to consider such proposal favourably; but any such proposal must be a peace measure, and it can have a chance of success only if it is accepted by all countries. This is now part of history.

Similarly, we are always faced with what is called `indirect aggression'. My Prime Minister says:

Indirect aggression is inherently, essentially, inevitably a part of the cold war technique. In fact, there would be no indirect aggression at all if there was no cold war. Therefore, the way to resolve indirect aggression would be, on the one hand, to withdraw foreign interference from other places, and also not to approach world problems on this cold war basis.

We have before us a report submitted by the Secretary-General on the immediate position in the Middle East. My delegation does not intend to debate this at this moment, for two reasons. First of all, the Secretary-General seems to have said, or implied, that this report has the acquiescence, or the co-operation, or the consent of the

parties concerned. We have heard one or two statements from this rostrum from the parties concerned which, in the absence of any other evidence, we must for the time being accept with comfort. We hope that all these troops of foreign origin will be withdrawn from these territories and the people allowed to live their lives in their own way. But my delegation reserves the right to consider the report submitted to the United Nations should world conditions so demand. It is our view that a report of this kind should have been placed on the agenda as an item in the normal way. I shall come hack to this aspect of dealing with United Nations matters in a short time; for the present, however, we do not intend to comment on the substance of this report except to express the hope that this sorry chapter of history will soon be closed.

There are some lessons, however, to be drawn from this: that neither in the Egyptian crisis of two years ago, nor in the Lebanese situation in the present, the policies that have been followed in these areas--either of a system of defensive pacts or of intrusion in other ways, or of reliance on the division between the Arab countries--have been of great use. On the other hand, the solution in regard to the Middle East was found through Arab unity; and we welcome this expression of unity and take the view that when the United Nations Observation Group was in Lebanon, the United Nations should have been able to rely on its presence and on the fact that what really happened was an internal affair which perhaps could have been settled in that Way. At the same time, we are happy to think that no war-like action has taken place, no shots have been fired and no people have been killed; and, what is more, it did not lead to a world crisis. For all this we are thankful, and we are thankful for the restraint exercised from all sides. But that does not alter the basic proposition that, in this area, the time has come for everyone to recognize that these lands are no longer anybody's to exploit: they are the homes of the people to whom they belong and, what is more, their wealth must be exploited in the interests of the populations themselves, with such co-operation as may be forthcoming without sacrifice to their independence.

This takes us to two matters which, although it is not exactly fitting here, by association of ideas, must be spoken of.

Many delegations have spoken one way or the other about the suggestions that have been discussed in the corridors of the United Nations and mentioned by representatives to one another about the establishment of a permanent United Nations Emergency Force. My country does not yield to any in its desire to make contribution to the maintenance of peace--indeed, our record will

<Pg-196>

stand examination--but I am directed by my Government to say that we are irrevocably opposed to the conception of the creation of an international police force unless the world disarms. We are not prepared to subscribe to the idea that there should be a police force

placed at the disposal of any organ over which there is no legal control. It has been mentioned to us by friendly delegations that it would ease the work of the administrators: it would be easier to deal with a crisis if each country could allocate a certain number of officers or men for this purpose.

I should like to submit that it is an entirely impractical proposition. It is not possible for any country to put by a certain number of soldiers and officers and say: "You are there to go out when there is trouble in the world." First of all, what do they do when there is no trouble in the world--which, I hope, will be the longer period of time? Secondly, if they were so kept and did not participate in the general military organization of the country, they would be no longer competent to perform the task for which they were sent out. Over and above that, which country is to be denoted for this purpose? One country may be acceptable in one situation; the same country may not be acceptable in another situation. So, whether it is a permanent standing army of the United Nations, with some generalissimo here, or the forming of an international police force in other countries, my Government, as things are at present in the world, is irrevocably opposed. We could not consent to the taking of troops to the soil of other countries, even though they are United Nations troops--they are still foreign troops, it may be that some delegations may regard this as an excess of nationalism, but the experience of foreign troops on the soil of our land is too fresh for us to forget. The world must disarm; the world must establish world law; there must be some sovereign authority that must be obeyed; it must be possible to exercise sanctions. These are all conditions which may take years to come about. At that time, as in municipal communities, it may be possible for us to consider the establishment of police forces.

At the same time, there is no reason whatsoever why the experience gathered--whether by the peace army that went to Korea, or by the few officers of Canadian, Polish and Indian nationality who are now serving in Indo-China outside strict United Nations Organization, or those in the Gaza Strip, or by the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon--should not be studied and kept for future reference. We have no objection to a proposal of that character; but anything that creates a force on which responsible popular opinion cannot play and, what is more, whose authority and power of sanctions is questionable, is not only impractical, but is fraught with danger. Thus, whenever those propositions come forward, I hope that delegations will appreciate our position and will know that, while we have participated in these groups, we shall in no sense support such proposals.

We need only look at the provisional agenda of the General Assembly to see the unresolved problems of the world. We note that about seventy-two items always appear. They have both a positive and a negative aspect. It is perhaps a good thing that they appear because it is far better to talk at each other than to shoot at each other. However, the fact remains that some of these problems should have

been out of the way a long time ago. Korea is an outstanding example. I shall not go into the origins or the development of that quarrel, but that unhappy land remains divided instead of being represented here with us. My Government does not see any reason whatsoever why the problem of Korean unity should not be resolved if a degree of realism and, if I may say so, a tolerant attitude were adopted towards it. I firmly believe that especially in view of the withdrawal of the Chinese personnel from Northern Korea there should no longer be any objection to the supervision of elections by international authority instead of insisting that they should have a United Nations label. What is more important is that the elections should be fair and impartial and must have the assent of everybody concerned. It is our understanding that the North Korean Government has repeatedly stated that it would be willing to participate in elections which were internationally supervised, but, as the United Nations had involved itself in the war, from their point of view, it would be rather difficult for them. My country would like to see Korea take its place in the United Nations and be able to add its own contribution to our deliberations.

The same thing applies, to a certain extent, to Indo-China. There is in Indo-China an international machinery which is outside the United Nations. It came about as a result of direct negotiations between the participants at Geneva who asked Canada, Poland and India to assist in guarding the peace. There are no troops there, but there are large numbers of officers which have been there for three or four years.

In Cambodia, happily the situation has settled

<Pg-197>

down except for incursions into the territory from South Viet-Nam, whose people are challenging the authority of the Cambodian Government by infiltration. I have no doubt that the Government of Cambodia will be able to deal with this problem. However, the peace in that part of the world is threatened by this particular action.

The same thing applies to Laos, which is a member of our organization and where elections have taken place, but where the complete carrying out of all the conditions under the Geneva Agreement has not taken place. The main difficulty with regard to Indo-China is the presence of the partition line. In the old days it used to be said, "divide and rule". Now the maxim seems to be, "divide and leave". Even though this matter is not on the agenda of the United Nations, I believe that world opinion should exercise its influence on both sides in Viet-Nam to come together as one country so that it may participate here and so that the danger of an eruption in that part of the world will become a thing of the past. The former French authorities have completely withdrawn from this area and there have been no attempts on the part of France to interfere.

We should also like to say that in all these countries, while sovereign nations, as the representative of Cambodia said the other

day, have the right to ask for assistance, and indeed may do so and should not be called aggressors for that reason, it is not in the interests of peace to entangle them in defensive alliances or to have them assist in the spread of large quantities of arms.

We hope that the problem of Indo-China will be resolved in the not too distant future. We have some special national interests in this matter because we would like to withdraw the personnel who have been there for a very long time. I feel sure that the Canadians and the Poles feel the same way, based on what we know of it.

These are some of the unresolved problems which lace us but which seem comparatively easy of solution if we approach them from the point of view of realism and if we exercise a degree of tolerance in seeing the position of the other side.

Before leaving this aspect of matters, we should like to express our appreciation off the fact that in dealing with the problems in the Middle East, the Secretary-General and his staff have played a part which is historic. However, I should like to say that at the same time--and I hope that the observations I am going to make, which arise more or less from the developments of the last two or three years, will be accepted in a more or less philosophic sense--it is all very well in an emergency to produce some sort of machinery and say "deliver the goods", but I think we must think hard and see that we do not get a situation where the United Nations; as at present composed, becomes a kind of superior authority, a kind or super-state with its representatives directing governments, which is not provided for in the Charter, and where the Secretary-General will be pushed away from his Charter functions into other matters. It may have been to our advantage in these immediate situations, and it will therefore be for us to think out how we should face new situations that might arise. We have to see that we do not exceed the cautious balances that have been introduced into the Charter for the preservation of national sovereignty and for the preservation of small nations. If this rather superior power should be at the disposal of a snap vote of a two-thirds majority, the position of small States and of minorities would be far from enviable.

I have great hesitation in dealing with this problem, because it is not possible to deal with it at great length from this rostrum, but, at the same time, it would be both cowardly and, I believe, a disservice to the Charter and to this organization not to mention it.

I want now to addles, myself to the two or three problems which my Government feels should have the attention of the Assembly. There is nothing new about them, but they do concern us very much, First, the maintenance of forces in other parts of the world imposes very considerable burdens upon countries. We ourselves do not subscribe to the view at present that sovereign nations with self-respect would hire out their troops even to the United Nations and, therefore, to a certain extent, the countries contributing carry the burden of somebody else's misdeeds. The problem was put sharply by the

question, "Who will pay for the Suez Canal?". The Secretary-General, with a deftness that is characteristic of him, has passed it on to the shipping companies. But the shipping companies, so far as I know, are composed of people who want to make profits. They are not philanthropic institutions, and therefore I suppose ultimately the consumer will pay. It is quite true that the Indian shipping companies have declared that they will not pass on this burden to the consumer. But the poor consumers are so very many that they probably will not know when it is passed on. Therefore,

## <Pg-198>

I should like the question to be considered whether it is not possible for these great countries who incur very considerable expenditure for their own national defence, and, what is more, for what they consider to be the defence of liberty in the world, and who have the capacity, to make these contributions and to leave poor people like us alone. We have today approximately 303 officers in Indo-China. At one time there were 961. If one removes 961 officers from an army, it is rather a considerable number. The United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza has taken--there is no secrecy about this--a total of 1,166 personnel. Mr. Hammarskjold has recently annexed another 70 officers for Lebanon. We hope they will return as good Indian nationals. Consideration should be given to the problem of the vast burdens that are placed on countries by these actions.

I want to add that we regard this as a great opportunity and we do not in any way resent being called upon to serve in this way, because it is a contribution to the cause of peace in the world. However, the other aspect remains. Those who have contributed in one way or another to the creation of the trouble must carry some more of the responsibility, especially since we are going around looking for aid and loans for reconstruction purposes.

At the same time, I am happy to say that in all these places whether it be in Indo-China, in the Gaza strip or in Lebanon, the nationals who have gone there--and I believe the experience is common to others--have found both from the machinery of the United Nations and the local machinery, as well as otherwise from the Governments concerned, nothing but courtesy and co-operation. Perhaps if they were armed troops trying to assert their authority, the results might have been different.

That brings me to two other problems. One is the problem of colonialism, and there are two or three items with regard to colonies and non-self-governing territories on our agenda. We shall deal with these when we come to them. In 1946 when the United Nations was established, there were some seventy-two non-self-governing territories which were sending in reports on conditions in their areas. We are happy to think that their numbers are diminishing. This is a part of our agenda which we should like to see lightened. Now some ten countries have gone out of this group. They were former dependent territories of Great Britain, France, the United States,

the Netherlands and Denmark. They have become independent countries or countries from which such information is no longer required, since they have control of all those matters on which the metropolitan countries were supposed to report.

Since we are critical of colonial rule, we are only to be happy to pay our tribute to the metropolitan countries, who, for one reason or another, and not the least for liberal and humanitarian reasons, have contributed towards the liberation of those territories. But all the same, there are now sixty-two non-self-governing territories in the world, and in the case of two of these colonial countries, one submits information but lacks the obligation to do so and the other refuses to submit the information. We think that the obligation under Article 73e, whether legally binding or not, is morally obligatory. Those who accept human rights, those who accept the idea of selfgovernment and the idea of equality of races, those who want to see the world rid of the main causes of international disputes--namely. the scramble for colonial powers--those who are Members of the United Nations, should be willing voluntarily to submit this information, and it stands to the credit of the traditional empires like Great Britain and France that they have had no hesitation at any time and that they have volunteered to do this over the years.

There are today twelve colonies with a population of 50 millions under the French rule. There are twelve colonies with a population of 63 million under United Kingdom rule. In each case, the populations are greater than those of the metropolitan countries. There is one colony, one hundred times the size of the metropolitan country, under Belgian rule. There are three colonies with a population of 10 millions-- twenty-one times the size of Portugal--under Portuguese rule. With regard to Portuguese territory, the Portuguese Government has informed the United Nations that they are not colonial territories in the sense that they are part of Portugal and, therefore, no information is required. But, at any rate, it is a state of affairs which is totally inconsistent, both politically and morally, with the principles of the Charter. After all, this information is merely examined and there are no sanctionary powers attaching to the article of the Charter. The information relates to non-political conditions and the metropolitan countries that have submitted information in the past have not found the United Nations making bad use of that information. We hope that where this information has not been forthcoming in the past it will be forthcoming in the future.

## <Pg-199>

We are happy, too, that great parts of former colonial empires are now independent countries and that they have added to the number of nations represented here. The most recent entrants have been Ghana and Malaya and others, and if our information is correct we shall soon have the opportunity of welcoming what was formerly French Guinea as a Member of tire United Nations. I have no right to speak for the French Government, but one can read the news and one can see

that 200,000 people, against 18,000 people, have voted for their independence, and the very fact that the French Government asked for an opinion must be presupposed to mean that they would accept the verdict, and our very confident hope is that they will come here as a member of the United Nations in a very short time. That day will be a very proud one for the French Government.

We are also happy to think that of the Trust Territories today, British Togoland, leading the way, has made with the former colony of the Gold Coast, the new independent country of Ghana, which, in the first year of its existence, has established a fine record of international co-operation, of the economic development of its own territory, of service in the form of leadership--I do not use that word in a bad way--to the peoples of Africa themselves.

We are happy to think that we can hope that the Italian Trust, Territory of Somaliland will become a Member of the United Nations in 1960 and that the same thing will happen in the case of French Togoland, and I hope that my United Kingdom colleagues will not take it amiss if I say that with the attainment of independence by Togoland it will be very difficult for the British Cameroons not to go on at the same time. Western Samoa is to have full cabinet government in 1960.

This is the brighter part of the story and it is one of the triumphs of the United Nations. With the older system of empire, an individual breach was made by the mandatory system and afterwards by the more voluntary system of trusteeship, for the establishment of so many independent countries which today as sovereign nations are making contributions to their own continents and to the world as a whole.

The picture is not nearly so good when we look at some other parts, and I would not like to mention many of them because one hopes that if there is not so much public discussion which may be misinterpreted, some of these problems may be solved. But my delegation cannot but say that where there are conditions which are in total violation of the Charter of Human Rights, which are in total violation of the ethical principles that lie behind the Charter of the United Nations, where forced labour is normal, where human beings can be practically bought or sold and where they are commodities in that way, then the United Nations at least ought to express its opinions very strongly. That brings me to the consideration of the position of the whole of the African continent.

The world has paid too little attention to this most ancient part of the world which has an area of 11,262,000 square miles of which 6.2 million square miles are under colonial occupation. Of the 193,000,000 people in Africa, 103,000,000 are colonial. There are 5 million Europeans in Africa and 600,000 Asians. One would not think there were only 600,000 with the noise they make, but that is all there are. This vast continent of Africa has less than 200,000,000 people, the majority of which are dependent. But that is not all. The continent of Africa has the largest proportion of all the mineral

wealth of the world, whether as tapped resources or otherwise. It has 98 per cent of all the diamonds--not that we can eat them; it has 94 per cent of the columbite; 84 per cent of the cobalt, 55 per cent of the gold, 33 per cent of the manganese and 22 per cent of the copper. The great mineral wealth of the world is now locked up in these territories to which the indigenous populations have little access and from which they derive little benefit.

The problem that faces the world today is the future of this great African continent, and in this we must look to the liberated countries of Africa and, what is more, to those other sovereign States in Africa which are not strictly of African origin, that is to say, the people who went to Africa three, four, five and ten thousand years ago. We must look to them in the main for the liberation of those territories and also to those who belong to the metropolitan countries whose liberalism, whose humanity and whose allegiance to the Charter would be even a surer and sounder weapon of liberation than anything else. If that does not happen, then we shall have a continual quarrel. As my Prime Minister said this morning, "It is not possible to still the voice of these resurgent people anywhere".

We have, as part of this chapter, some other items on our agenda, and none of them are items the discussion of which gives anyone any happiness. There is first of all the problem of Cyprus. My delegation, at that time without support either

### <Pg-200>

from the Greeks, the Turks or the British, has said from this rostrum that the only solution of the Cyprus problem is to regard it as a colonial question-which it is-and recognize that fact. Cyprus is a nation. If Iceland, with a population of 150,000, can be a sovereign country and take its place here, making its contribution, then so can Cyprus with a population of half a million. There is a Cypriot nation which is entitled to its independence, and the only solution is national independence, not internationalized imperialism. Imperialism can no more be internationalized than apartheid can be internationalized.

Therefore, to avoid this question of conferring national independence on the Cypriots is to prolong this problem. In our view, it is for the Cypriots to decide-after the establishment of their independence and when there is no outside restraint-whether they should be allied to one part or the other, or, in the course of the establishment of their independence in the United Kingdom, as they have done with a great many others, and establish cordial relations-I am sure they can-and that would be the way out. That would be our position in this Assembly.

We shall not subscribe to any solution which means the partition of Cyprus. As I said, the older idea was "divide and rule", now it is "divide and leave". We shall not subscribe to the doctrine which makes this part of the international scramble. But at the same time

we shall not subscribe to any counsel which postpones the settlement or adds to violence in the area. There has been a large amount of violence. It is not for me to say how and why. But people die; they are killed; it leaves ill-will, and what is more, the position of Cyprus as a place of turmoil also makes it a place from which troops can easily take off for the Middle East.

For all these reasons, it is better for the Cyprus problem to be settled and for the Assembly to address itself to that as a colonial question and demand the independence-not demand but recommend-to those concerned the independence of the Cypriot people. I have no doubt that if the problem were looked at in that way, our colleagues from Turkey and from Greece and from the United Kingdom would appreciate that they would have friends in this area far more than otherwise.

Then there is the ever-disturbing problem of Algeria. The representative of France, and all those who share his views on this matter, will bear with me when I say that we do not approach this problem with any malice or with any disregard of the practical. My delegation and my Government is the first to recognize that there has been liberation in the French Empire. As I said, we hope Togoland will become a Member of the United Nations very soon, and Guinea perhaps in a few weeks or months.

But in the case of Algeria there has been a very sanguinary war where-and it is not for me to say-a very large number of French troops has been anchored in fighting a population that is, according to them, part of France. We cannot call it a civil war because there is no equality between the sides. There is nothing civil about this war; it is a war of colonial suppression. I cannot pretend to know what is the solution. But it appears to us that violence is not a solution. A solution of the Algerian problem, like in all other things, must lie in not seeking the ways where those on whom selfgovernment must make its impact are sought to be divided, but where encouragement is given to their unity and where compromises are sought on the basis of the recognition of the personality and independence of Algeria, where racial discrimination, whichever side it may come from, is sucked away, and it is recognized, as in the case of Cyprus, that nationalism is territorial, is a territory that makes the nation.

We tell peoples of Indian origin who may be in Malaya or in East Africa, or in South Africa for that matter, that they belong to that country. They are Indians by origin, but they are East Africans or Malayans, or whatever it may be. Similarly we may say of the Algerians, whether they be of French origin, of Arab origin or of African origin, that they are all Algerians, and we think that they qualify in every way for the status of nationhood. It is rather incongruous to think with the greater part of North Africa liberated-Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, the Sudan, Ghana, all these areas liberated, and now the other French territories being added-that this part would remain unreconciled.

This is not to exclude any form of fraternal co-operation. But the solution of this by methods of violence would not be the way.

This year it has been recommended to us by the Economic and Social Council that we should especially celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights. My delegation welcomes this recommendation and will join in efforts to do so. But I think that the best celebration for human rights would be if the Assembly-especially those who abstain in voting, not to speak of those who vote against-would

# <Pg-201>

take a more definite attitude in regard to the violation of human rights, wherever they may take place, and not allow Article 2(7) of the Charter to be pleaded in bar. If the Declaration of Human Rights is to have any meaning, it can only be-at least to those of us who believe in them-to express our belief in very tangible form.

No one says that we will wage war on those who violate human rights, because the remedy may be worse than the disease. When this session of the Assembly began, the Secretary of State of the United States, in opening his address, referred to the problems in the Far East and spoke about China. Now it fell to my delegation, as in previous years, to bring forward this question, not of the admission of China but of the discussion of the representation of China in the United Nations. It is common knowledge that the debate became prolonged, not acrimonious. Very few people spoke against it and there was a considerable amount of support for the idea that it should be discussed. But nevertheless the discussion did not take place.

We pointed out at that time that here was a continent of 639 million people and that they were not represented at the United Nations. There was no question of the admission of China. At that time I imposed upon myself a self-denying ordinance saying that we would not go into the merits of the question. What is the position regarding the representation of China? It is not as though that even Formosanot that we have to contend with that-where a million and a half of Chinese immigrants in Formosa call it "the Republic of China"-takes the seat of China in the United Nations, a permanent member of the Security Council.

That is the basic problem, and whether it be an eruption of trouble in regard to Quemoy, whether it be one speech or the other, or one way or the other, that is not the main Chinese problem. My Government submits that unless China takes its rightful place in the United Nations, it would not be possible to obtain stable conditions in the Far East; it would not be possible for the Security Council to function with any effect. What is more, the Chinese people and their proper representatives will bring an impact to bear upon this Assembly which will be of a healthy character.

It has been argued that Taiwan is part of the Republic of China and that it is not part of the mainland and therefore the solution in some minds lies in the creation of "two Chinas". We do not submit these observations with the desire to add to any controversy, but as time goes on, it will be found that it is far better for us to look at these facts as they are. Taiwan was for many years under Japanese occupation. It was part of the imperial conquest of Japan and it became a Japanese colony, and like all colonial countries passed through those phases of resistance and protest and what not. Then came the Second World War and Japan was defeated and former colonial territories of Japan were not placed this time under trusteeship as before. But Formosa and Manchuria were liberated; they were made part of China. A statement at that time was made by the President of the United States to Dr. T.V. Soong in regard to China. At that time the Government of China was the Republic of China. There was no other Government. But the issue is not which government, but whether this territory is part of China or otherwise. If that is clear, the rest will become clear. In the course of this statement, President Truman said:

The United States is prepared to assist China in the development of armed forces of moderate size for the maintenance of internal peace and security-and this is the important part-and the assumption of adequate control over the liberated areas of China, including Manchuria and Formosa.

There was no doubt at any time that Taiwan was a part of China. The question arose when the Government of China became not acceptable to one side or the other, and then the situation changed. What is more, President Truman said at that time the following:

Having in mind statements by the Generalissimo that China's internal political difficulties will be settled by political methods, it should be clearly understood that military assistance furnished by the United States would not be diverted for use in fratricidal warfare or to support undemocratic administration...

The undemocratic administration, or the administration that did not have the support of the people as the result of thirty years of civil war, left China. The emigres went to Japan. I submit from the rostrum of this platform-and I do not do it in any partisan way-that the whole problem or the remainder of it is the unfinished part of the revolution. There will be no settlement of the Chinese problem, whoever is the Government of China, by the filching away of any of its territories.

### <Pg-202>

The problem can only be looked at from the point of view of the unity of China and not by an alleged conception or the safety of other countries or of any other part of the world because no part of the world's safety is challenged. We would therefore submit, as we have done before, that the Chinese people have a great genius for reaching

agreement. In the last thirty years of Chinese history there have been many instances where often some opposing parties have gone into negotiation. The problem of Taiwan and the coastal islands and all these are really a problem for the Chinese people in the same way that the problem of Lebanon is one for the Lebanese people.

I think that we should not only not hinder but that we should encourage the Chinese parties, so-called, to talk to each other and come to a situation where their entire motherland would be liberated.

So far as international problems are concerned, the problem today concerns only the United States and China-and not anybody elsebecause Chiang Kai-shek is not an international entity except in a legal sense. Therefore, any international negotiations in this matter, as is indeed recognized by the Warsaw conversations, must take place between China and the United States for the purposes which they agree upon. It is not for us to say.

As a Government and people, we would like to see the solution of these problems take place speedily and peacefully. But I do not think we shall get anywhere by seeking to intervene or in any way trying to disregard or ignore the rightful claims of China to be united and to come here. So far as we are aware. China presents no menace to the internal stability of any country. We are their close neighbours. This is not a testimonial meeting, but we express the opinion that it presents no menace to the stability of any country any more than any of the eighty-one nations represented in this Assembly. There is no question of qualification under the Charter that arises because it is a Member of the United Nations.

Then there is the problem that it was declared an aggressor in the Korean war. It is not for me to argue the legality of it one way or the other, but we will have to recognize that there is no war about Korea today. What is more, unless it can be proved to the contrary, the Chinese troops in Korea have been withdrawn and the unity of Korea, given a degree of reality, is possible.

The only restraint against, what I said the other day, untoward incidents in this area is the United States. It is the restraint exercised by the United States on Chiang Kai-shek that very often prevents the precipitation of a crisis. But in a situation of this character, especially when we hear reports of dreadful instruments of war going into this place and feelings running so high, with public opinion worked up in different places, the security of the world demands that we terminate this set of events. And it is not beyond either the power or the imaginative quality of a great country like this to be able to seek ways whereby this can be settled.

The internal ideology of a country is not the concern of the United Nations. As I have said several times on this platform, if we could admit to this Organization only nations which are approved by the other countries, by one other nation or some other nations, then none of us would be here because there would be someone who disapproved of

somebody else. So the problem of China has to be considered in this way.

So far as the immediate position is concerned, as I pointed out, the acts of aggression started in July of this year. This has aroused responses and fighting, and a certain amount of shelling of the Quemoy Islands has been going on. But we cannot separate this problem from the whole question of the unity of China. Happily at the present moment, out of humanitarian considerations, the Government of China has ordered that the shelling cease for a week's time. There is no use trying to determine whether it is a formal cease-fire or otherwise. Whenever there is an opportunity for peace, it is the business of those who believe in United Nations ideas to take advantage of it.

The whole world is convinced that the United States has no imperial ambitions in these areas, that there may be, as in the case of Lebanon, a misinterpretation of ideas and also in the minds of many the fond feeling that there is a solution to this problem on a two-China basis.

The coming of China here would be an advantage to the United Nations. It would assist the forces of peace, it would speed the pace of disarmament, it would give strength and substance to the Security Council and to the security provisions of the United Nations. My Government therefore pleads not for any intervention by the United Nations because, I do not see how that is possible. For one thing, the United Nations has tied its hands, for a year by refusing to discuss it. But over and above that, it is not an international problem.

#### <Pg-203>

So far as Taiwan is concerned, it is the question of two Chinese parties, one of them a small one with an emigre party. I have no doubt there are large numbers of people in the Kuomintang itself who have the common sense and ambition to realize that a greater China, unified and strengthened, is an asset to them as much as to anybody else. The eight million people of Formosa today have no part in the Government of Taiwan. The eight million Formosan people are by and large only members of local bodies. They do not enjoy the advantages of a government of their own. They would come into the larger State with all that goes with it. Then if we had to criticize China, it would be here and would criticize us too. This would be a more realistic position. That is all I wish to say about China, and I hope that the present situation will be taken advantage of in order to arrive at a more peaceful solution recognizing the realities, and also the constitutional position, the position conceded, the position established by the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations, by the statement of the parties mainly concerned and by the willingness shown by the Chinese Government to negotiate at Warsaw-negotiate not on the internal issues of China, but negotiate on issues that are of international concern.

The main problem that faces us in this Assembly is the problem of disarmament. The United Nations has been considering this problem for the last ten years without any appreciable results. Indeed at one time it was given up altogether and the Disarmament Commission reconstructed. Some four years ago my delegation initiated the idea of the establishment of a Sub-Committee, in the hope that discussions in an intimate body, without all the glare of publicity, would lead to some compromises. But, unfortunately, the Sub-Committee also became a very public body and while one solution appeared suitable to one side and was put forward, it was not suitable to the other side. The same solution is advanced the next year by the other side and is not suitable to this side. So it goes on in this way. No one regards that the establishment of disarmament is possible by waving a magic wand. The problem has got to be approached realistically, and the United Nations knows that there has been no abandonment at any time of the fundametal objectives.

I should like to submit with great respect that the passing of resolutions, even by large majorities, has not taken us anywhere nearer disarmament. It is one of those problems where the parties consent, and therefore there can be no settlement without cooperation. Last year the delegation of India moved before the General Assembly that as a first step, not necessarily of disarmament but as a contribution toward disarmament, these explosions should be stopped and that the one alleged impediment in the way, the lack of capacity for discovery, must go into technical investigation. For the last four years our Government has been pressing and has been repeatedly urging in the Assembly the cessation of these explosions, for reasons that we argued and reargued so many times. At last we now have a situation where the scientists of the world, though they have not categorically so stated, at least tell us that the effects of these explosions are harmful to humanity. Since it is a United Nations Commission, one hopes that it will receive greater respect than otherwise.

There has been some progress made in the meetings at Geneva, and they meet again on 31 October. My delegation has submitted a draft resolution on this subject which is before the Assembly, in document A/L 246, which concerns only the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. It would not be appropriate for me to argue this draft resolution before you at present, but I hope that the Assembly will not reject this draft resolution this time as it did the last time. Last time we made this humble suggestion: if what is stopping the cessation of explosions is the fear that they will not be detected, why cannot this be looked into by technical people, with both sides and those who did not take sides joining in?

We submitted this draft resolution because it appeared reasonable, and the arguments, even of those who were against us, were not that it was not reasonable but that it was not opportune.

We are glad to notice that after six months or so, by the initiative

taken by the United States and the Soviet Union, they have had direct talks on this matter, and some moves seem to have taken place. But, again, I do not presume to have understood the whole of the situation. If the idea is that the suspension of explosions can take place only if other things take place, then the whole problem will have to await the conclusion of a disarmament agreement, and it is meaningless because, if there is total disarmament with the banning of weapons, then it is not necessary to say that there should be no explosions.

Therefore, we submit that, pending the reaching of an agreement in Geneva, there should be a cessation of these explosions, that the testing

<Pg-204>

of nuclear weapons should stop, as a preliminary to disarmament.

Last year, by a considerable majority, the United Nations voted for the reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission. We were among the minority that could not subscribe to it because we found that in that composition there was no basis for agreement. In the last twelve months, the Disarmament Commission has not met, that is to say, the whole machinery has not functioned apart from this ad hoc arrangement that was made and was successful. One of the main problems that will come before us is the reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission, and we should like to appeal to the Assembly to recognize the fact that no disarmament is possible except by agreement and, if there must be agreement, there must be give and take on either side, and minorities or majorities-with the uncommitted peoples-cannot be disregarded.

The latest reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission was a step forward, as far as the General Assembly recognized that some new move had to be made but that move either did not go far enough or somehow went in the wrong direction. So when from tomorrow onwards we consider this matter in the First Committee I hope we shall be able to go far along the way of encouraging the Geneva Conference to come to agreement very quickly because, as time passes and more and more countries become capable of either manufacturing or using these weapons, all the dangers of nuclear radiation and of nuclear accidents exist in the world. The dangers arising from nondisarmament are greater. But I beg to submit-and I hope this will not be regarded as a presumption-that we will not get very near disarmament unless there is a certain amount of disarming of ourselves in the Assembly, that is to say, in our approach to problems, if every boat that is put out is to weather the storm of suspicion and reach the shore, it should not be weighed down by mistrust. Therefore, we need more than anything else a new approach to this problem, a degree of common exploration. Unless there is common exploration we shall not be able to deal with this great menace that threatens this world with annihilation. What is more, every small or large problem, every local problem, threatens at least

for some time to present the world with the menace of atomic war.

The outstanding problem before us is this problem of disarmament. My delegation is one of those that thinks it ought to be discussed as soon as possible in order that those who meet in Geneva will have the backing-I would not use the word "pressure"-but would have such influence as Assembly opinion can exercise to make them come to agreement. At the same time to link this question with other problems is to indulge in the exercise of endangering the peace of this globe. It has neither logic nor anything else to defend it, because, if there were disarmament, if there were an abandonment of other weapons, there would be no need to talk about the stopping of explosions. So by definition it is out of court. We want to lay stress on this fact: it is the most important problem before the Assembly.

Last year at the end of the session we adopted a resolution on peaceful and neighbourly relations among States. This is one of those subjects regarded as extremely controversial, and it was controversial. But it may be said to the credit of the Assembly that it was passed as a unanimous resolution. That resolution expressed the urgency 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. [Resolution 1236 (XII)].

If it was urgent then, it is even more urgent today. This is not a resolution that called for an executive action but certainly a resolution which ought to be furthered by implementation. There is nothing in the events of the last twelve months which gives us a great deal of encoragement in thinking that the adoption of this resolution has made a lot of difference. But my delegation welcomes the fact that in speech after speech in this Assembly as we advanced in the general debate, representatives have spoken without being hamstrung by considerations of having to vote one way or another. There is a degree of free speech in the general debate. This resolution that was passed unanimously calls for further consideration by the Assembly, and in the same spirit as prevailed last time, without trying to score a point one way or another. We think, finally, that the work of this Assembly will be much assisted and the United Nations will progress more and more if such independence of opinion continues.

The representative of Cambodia referred to the fact that there was such a rigidity of opinion that it made it impossible for the uncommitted nations either to canvass their views or put them forward in any way. No one suggests

<Pg-205>

that opinions strongly held by the nations that have really great

responsibilities can be easily pushed aside. But if the United Nations is really to become a concert of free nations, if it is to contribute to the promotion of neighbourly relations, is it not possible, by the impact of opinions one upon the other, is it not possible, by the adjustment of different views, to come to common conclusions? But, if every question is riddled by the arrows that come from the "cold war", from either side, then it is not possible, for us to make any progress. Therefore, we hope that the general progress of the Organization, our understanding of each other and the purposes and implications of the resolution we adopted last year with regard to neighbourly relations, and the support that has been forthcoming from large numbers of representatives, speaking on this, who have referred to non-interference in other people's affairs, and things of that character-we hope that there will be more and more of all this.

There are two matters of a more or less domestic character to which I should like to refer. One is the problem of our neighbours in Indonesia.

Indonesia has had a hard time, largely because of the geography of that land of the 3,000 islands, because of the burdens it has to carry in the wake of liberation and because of the fact that its progress is very much held back by the problem of the continuance of colonial rule. The Netherlands is a well respected Member of the United Nations and has a great deal of experience of the Eastern world. We still hope that advantage will be taken of the fact that the Indonesians have not tried to heat up this problem by placing this item on the agenda, and we hope that in conformity with the principles of the Charter, and by means of agreements solemnly entered into, a solution will be found.

These islands, like other islands in other parts of the world, are not worth conflict between nations. West Irian is part of Indonesia by the Act of Cession. We hope that there will be no occasion for this matter to come up before us.

My colleague from Pakistan in his address to this Assembly referred to the problem of Kashmir. Mr. President, I love some familiarity with this problem. I also have some familiarity with the procedures of the United Nations. While nothing can prevent any representative from speaking about anything, in fact, we sometimes have instances when you, Mr. President, adjourn the Assembly and delegates still talk because the speaker requires only the microphone. Therefore, no one can prevent anybody from speaking about anything, but it is usually understood that no problem can be before two organs of the United Nations at the same time. What is called "the question of Jammu and Kashmir" or "India-Pakistan issue" or something of that kind, is before the Security Council.

As I said a while ago, I have some familiarity with this problem. I believe the statements or the misstatements made before the Assembly are capable of being controverted. But the understanding of my

delegation as to the functions and the use of this rostrum is that it is not for propaganda for home consumption. I have, therefore, no desire to enter into a controversy on this matter unless it is forced upon us; then, I think I am not noncontroversial.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, half of which is under external occupation. The matter is before the United Nations, and if fellow-delegates are interested in it, there is a considerable volume of literature on this subject. It came here on the initiative of the Government of India. That in itself is sufficient evidence that we have nothing to hide in this matter. But taking the view that no issue of peace or of neighbourliness is promoted by this casual discussion in the Assembly or using the rostrum of this Assembly for any purpose, I shall not enter into discussion on the Kashmir issue.

Recently, arising from conversations in New Delhi between the Prime Ministers of the two countries, we have tried without external interference to deal with problems-small ones-concerning our frontiers, our borders and difficulties created thereby; and to a small extent we have been successful. I believe it is part of the duty that rests upon one when one is forced into that position, not to be provoked, not to be drawn into discussion that has no particular purpose. This subject is not on the agenda; it is before the Security Council. I cannot object to it being mentioned because we are free to speak.

That is all I have to say. I do hope that I have not detained the Assembly too long.

<Pg-206>

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Discontinuance of Nuclear Tests

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, in the Political Committee of the United Nations on 17 October 1958 on the discontinuance of nuclear tests:

My delegation considers that it is its good fortune to be able to follow in the footsteps of the representative of Ghana, who represents the voice of Africa. This is in no sense to make an invidious distinction between delegations which are present here from that great continent, but here we hear the voice of people who, in the true sense, are only on one side of this great context, that on the side of the victim. The others can be spoken of as being partly victims and partly the other way round.

I would like to ask the indulgence of the Committee to be able to express the views of the Government of India as fully as I can on the three subjects that are before us. My delegation fully subscribed to the view that there should be simultaneous discussion. While it may appear that this was partly in order to save time procedurally, the

fact still does remain that it is not possible to consider even the most proximate-I will not say the most important-problem of the discontinuance of test explosions apart from the general problem of disarmament, which, in itself, is only a preliminary arrangement to the outlawry of war. The doubts that exist in peoples' minds, sometimes often exaggerated for the purpose of argument, about those who are regarded as fanatical on this subject without knowing the implications of it, and, what is more dangerous, to lay emphasis on the discontinuance of tests is in some way to lay less stress on the whole problem of disarmament, is as fallacious as to say that because we argue about disarmament year after year to no main purpose, and an appreciable portion of the United Nations budget is spent in the time and arrangements made for this purpose, one can rightly refuse to discuss it. Because of all that, we cannot abandon the main purpose of the United Nations, namely, to create a world that is peaceful and to outlaw war.

Therefore, the emphasis that we lay on the discontinuance of tests is no more isolated from the problem of disarmament than disarmament itself is isolated from the main objective. I think I should like to clear this away at the beginning because it is one of those doubts which might still persist in the minds of those Member States which still have to make up their minds on the proximate problem. My delegation proposes, therefore, in the first few minutes, to set out the way in which we are going to deal with this matter. We would like to make some preliminary observations on the item as a whole, and then come to the question of tests and deal with the resolutions and other matters.

While it is perhaps not quite proper to say so, because delegations are not represented here as individuals, in view of the personal association. I have had on this subject, and since I have to leave this country in a day or so, perhaps I may be forgiven if I trespass into the resolution stage at this moment before my colleagues take it up later.

Now, we have made some progress, not so much in the twelve months that have preceded our coming here to this session of the General Assembly, but since we came here. The impression that my delegation gathered was that when the General Assembly met it was thought that disarmament had been relegated to the Geneva talks and that all we had to do was to say "Amen" to their efforts, that is, just to give a general blessing. In fact, in some quarters-I will not say responsible quarters-there were impressions created that perhaps we need not discuss the question at all, and that we could wait for the results of Geneva. No one minimizes the importance of talks, not only at Geneva, but anywhere where the Americans and the Russians meet to talk, because they will contribute to the progress of humanity and be one more indication of progress towards a healing of the cleavages that exist in the world. Therefore, no one minimizes the importance of the talks in Geneva, quite apart from their practical aspects.

Therefore, my delegation wants to say, in the first instance, that in

no circumstances can the United Nations, if it is to survive, in any way give an indication to itself or to the world that it is not always and continually seized of this problem. It is its primary responsibility, and it cannot be delegated either to one or two countries, however important they may be, or to one functionary or another however effective or important he might be. Therefore, in dealing with this problem we would first refer to the position that today we are, at long last, in Geneva recording the progress that has been made about ideas that were not put by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd in the Disarmament Sub-Committee last year, but which are contained in the resolutions of the General Assembly from

<Pg-207>

the tenth session onwards.

At the tenth session the General Assembly commissioned the Disarmament Sub-Committee to make technical examinations and to come to agreements. I am not saying this in order to find out who said what and so on, but in order to lay stress on the fact that this progress in this matter has been very slow. The General Assembly has been seized of the idea that while the practicability of the cessation of tests is shown, it is not possible to effect cessation.

In the discussion of the general problem, while we may deal with so many technical details, so many proposals and counter-proposals, we may never lose sight of the fact which has been high-lighted by the last few words of the representative of Ghana, that we are really dealing with a problem of human survival, and once we all keep that in the forefront of our minds, some of the objections will seem less insurmountable than they would otherwise.

The United States representative has told us that this Assembly must give a push to this momentum towards settlement. No words could have been spoken which would have elicited a greater response from my delegation and, I am sure, from the majority of delegations here. The representative of the United Kingdom told us that the picture of disarmament does not look so bad. One can never appreciate a picture very much by looking at it too closely or for not long enough, especially if it is a picture that is worth remembering. One has to look at it for a long time and also, at least imaginatively, have something of the background of this question.

Ten years ago the United Nations ventured on this issue of disarming the world after the great re-armament of the war. What is the picture today? It is very wrong to take a few countries, but whether one takes the United States, the United Kingdom, France or the Soviet Union, military expenditures have reached phenomenal figures, and in order that our imaginations may be impressed by this, let us take, for example, the United States, not always as wealthy as it is today.

In pre-First World War days, in 1913, the United States, spent &64 million-probably less than it would spend for building a large

edifice today. This expenditure rose to æ5,113 million in 1947, and today it is æ15,750 million, that is to say, from the end of the Second World War expenditures have increased by 300 per cent.

The United Kingdom, in spite of its vast far flung empire before the First World War, spent  $\alpha$ 77 million. In 1947 it spent  $\alpha$ 1,653 million. Last year it spent  $\alpha$ 1,525 million. They are a very economical and frugal people, so they must have received from these  $\alpha$ 1,525 million far more than other people received from their greater amounts of money. The United Kingdom has a system of very strict accounting, with Parliament and newspapers constantly checking. They have the very healthy system, as they consider it, of private enterprise which is very strictly controlled by the governmental organization. So they must have received out of this  $\alpha$ 1,525 million far more in potential destruction value than any of the others.

This is the picture which Commander Noble asks us to consider as a hopeful picture.

Let us now see what has been done during the past ten years. Since the first atomic explosion in New Mexico, civilization has gone on from one progress to another. When the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, of 300,000 people, 100,000 were killed; 100,000 more were injured. Even today, 99,000 people are under clinical examination and 6,000 of them receive clinical attention. During the period of the last twelve months, 185 people-more than ten years after the explosion-died as a result of the atomic attack.

I shall not refer to the Nagasaki affair, as the one at Hiroshima is sufficient. I do not do this to single out the United States in this matter, because I am sure that it must have been thought-and I gather this from reading Mr. Truman's memoirs-that the dropping of an atom bomb was not different from that of any other war weapon.

Compared with the weapons of today, the Hiroshima days appear as child's play. Today we have weapons which do not even require a man to guide them. We have progressed to the point of being able to launch weapons under the sea, on the surface, in the air-in fact, we have almost got to the position where, if a politician sits down and thinks somewhere, everything can go off. We have the development in the field of atomic power under water, in the field of long-range missiles,

and so on. What is more, we have come to the stage-and I say this with great respect to my colleague from France, who chided me last time on romancing on scientific fiction-where we now have the possibility of portable atomic weapons. This is not scientific fiction, unless the leaders of the United States Army, or the Russian Army and their statesmen are all writers of fiction. That is a good occupation. My colleague, Mr. Arthur Lall, is engaged in it.

We have come to the stage where we now have what has been called in United States publications by the term portable atomic weapons, which may be carried somewhere to blow up bridges and to carry out sabotage. We know a great deal more of what takes place in the United States than of what takes place in the Soviet Union, but there is enough evidence to believe that the same thing goes on there. What is more, we have been told that these portable weapons, or tactical weapons-I do not know where tact comes into this-which, when we spoken here last time were sixty feet long, can now be carried all over the place and, during the recent Chinese developments, were spoken of as being under use.

The worst side of the picture is this: while my colleague from Ireland states that these weapons should not be given to anybody, there is ample evidence to show that they are being given or are on the way to others. In other words, one can no longer speak-and this is the point I want to make-of three nuclear Powers; one can no longer speak of this exclusive club of "three hydrogen gentlemen". It is now spread all over the world. Its distribution has become so wide that the capacity of destroying the world has become decentralized. Many speak out against authoritarian and monolithic forms of government, but the decentralization of the capacity of destruction in this way presents a far greater danger to the world than otherwise. That is the picture as we look at it.

I am quite prepared to look at the picture even from the short-term point of view. It is quite true that progress was made at Geneva so that we can now say that it is technically possible to detect explosions and to impose degrees of control. With great respect to the representative of the United Kingdom I wish to point out that this is more in the nature of a declaratory act than a creative one. Everybody knew all about this before. It has been repeatedly stated in the Assembly, not only by my delegation but by others as well, that there was no unsurmountability about the obstacles in the way of detection. Now there should be no difficulty about inspection or control. And that enables me to lay stress on another aspect of our approach to this problem.

It is entirely fallacious to think that the Government of India, or anyone else who lays stress on the question of cessation, is unmindful of or places less stress on the question of control. We do not think that any agreement in the present day conditions of the world, with all the imperfections of humanity and, what is more, with all the suspicion and lack of faith in each other, can ever be effective without the machinery of control any more than a municipal

community, in which we are all supposed to be civilized and not wanting to take each other's lives or steal each other's property, can get on without policemen and laws.

Therefore, my Government stands fully for the establishment of the machinery of control and inspection. But where the rub comes in is here: we should never plead control at the bar of disarmament; that is to say, we should not make control anything more than a device for effecting an agreement. We could not say that people should not live free because there are not enough policemen. We must work towards established control, for without control we can have no assurance that the agreements would be kept. Looking through the records and examining all the statements made by both parties to this controversy, there seems to be agreement on the establishment of control. We have the statements here of the Western side from the United States and the United Kingdom, and of the other side from the Soviet Union, that there is no difference with respect to this point.

My delegation wants to make this clear. Since we are not one of the military Powers, and in any case we are not a nuclear Power, people tend to believe that we speak in a vacuum so far as this point is concerned and that we do not take so-called tactical questions into account

In looking back over the resolutions-and for the sake of brevity I shall take those of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth sessions of the General Assembly-I want to say that there has never been a climbing down on anybody's part, and certainly not on the part of my delegation, from the general purposes of the terms of reference of the Disarmament Commission; that is to say, we all stand committed to comprehensive disarmament and to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. We have agreed to an approach by stages, which is sometimes remembered and sometimes forgotten. But in all that has been said and done in this Assembly, I think there has been progress. The sentiment was expressed

# <Pg-209>

by my colleague from the United States, Mr. Cabot Lodge, when he said that these debates have the effect of bringing about flexibility; that is to say, it is not the view that some proposition should be put forward and accepted, and no more.

That, I think, is a great advance on certain positions held in previous years, and it is there that lies the hope, because it springs from the realization not of the effectiveness of argument but of the realization that the most important party in this world is the people of the world as a whole. That is the reason for the expression of this sentiment.

From that, I should like to take these items one by one. You will remember that when we began there seemed to be very hot controversy about the priority of items. Now, is it not a commentary on the whole

of this business that, whether delegations held one view or the other about the priority of importance, practically all the speeches in this Committee have been either fully concerned with the cessation of test explosions or mainly so? Therefore, irrespective of what positions may be politically held, what is uppermost in the minds of delegations, reflecting the sentiments of the world-and that is what is most important, that they reflect the sentiments of the world-is the immediate necessity of regarding test explosions as the proximate issue not unconnected with anything but unrelated in the sense of one hinging upon the other, which I shall come to in a moment. We regard this matter as of great importance, and we make no apology for that.

The situation, as I have said, has deteriorated. In the last ten years, while we have spoken about disarmament, in effect we have had an armaments race. Two years ago when my delegation, almost by inadvertence, put into a draft resolution the words "armaments race", it was very strongly objected to from either side, and it was said that we ought to make it "competitive armament". I thought a race was competition, but there it is. What we have in the armaments race is the development of these new formidable weapons, not only in size but in their potency and, what is more, in their portability, which is greatly important. Next, the area of this has so widened as to include the open seas of the Pacific-not the Atlantic but the Pacific-the Polar regions north and south, and vast expenses of countries which for this purpose cannot morally be regarded as exclusive sovereign territory. These have advanced the capacity for discharging them with very little human guidance from day to day. That has increased. Even the continent of Antarctica and its possible use is a cause of great apprehension.

All this progress in a reverse way-or I should say all these developments in a reverse way-and the fear, which seems to be reflected in some of the items put down, that even so-called outer space may perhaps be pressed into the service of war-that is dominant in people's minds.

When first this problem was brought before the Assembly, there was a general acceptance or a general disposition to regard this as a possible thing, because comprehensive disarmament had been discussed year after year and had been bogged down by rival propositions which, from an analysis of them, seem very much alike, though it may be that our imperfect minds do not grasp the subtle differences. The Assembly came to the conclusion, through the Disarmament Commission, that on the one hand it had to be done by stages, that any step in this direction, as one of the resolutions said, would be something that would lead to progress in other directions. In that way the idea of the suspension of explosions came about. Since Geneva we have spoken about discontinuance. In fact, the Geneva item itself, so far as I understand, is discontinuance. The reason for being allergic to this word "suspension" is that suspension has become associated in fact with preparations.

To save time, I shall try to think aloud on what is the case against

this, why we must not do it and why we should. The representative of the United Kingdom has told us that the cessation of nuclear tests is not disarmament. With great respect, I agree. I hope it does not stop there. The first step that you take in a race is not reaching your goal; but that is no argument for not running at all. We have not said at any time that if we suspended nuclear tests there would be disarmament as the night follows the day. All we have said is that it would have certain consequences that would help towards this.

The second argument against suspension is this. It is now argued not only that suspension may be dangerous, not only that, suspension is not effective, but that non-suspension, noncessation, is necessary. The most categorical advocate of this is the Government of France, that is, that there should be no cessation of atomic weapons tests. The Foreign Minister of France, talking to us only a few weeks ago, ended his statement by saying:

That is why the ending of tests is

$$<$$
Pg-210>

conceivable only within the framework of effective nuclear disarmament. We shall never weary of repeating this, for the very safety of mankind is at stake.

In other words, the continuance of these tests is necessary if this argument subsists. But, happily, the trend of the discussions here from every side has shown that that is a view that may be subject to modification. It is argued that if tests are suspended humanity might get a feeling of comfort and that under the general atmosphere of satisfaction that would be created those who are capable of manking these bombs will continue to make the old type of bombs without further tests. It is argued that tests are not necessary for development. If tests are not necessary for development, then why have tests? We have it both ways. We are told that it is necessary to develop these weapons and that therefore we must have tests. Then we are told that you can develop them without tests and that therefore, if you suspend tests, the developments will take place without being known, that there will be no bang and that therefore people will think there is no nuclear arming going on. That is another argument that is put forward.

Finally, there is the theory, to which my Government is irrevocably opposed, that these atomic weapons are the instruments of peace. That is what is called the theory of deterrent. The theory of deterrent is logically, philosophically and practically fallacious. The theory of deterrent on the one hand is based upon fear: the whole of its foundation is fear. At the same time its effectiveness is dependent upon faith. You may say that the weapon deters because the other side may be afraid of being killed. But at the same time, if it is to remain a deterrent and not to be active, then you have to rely on the other fellow not using it. So you have some faith in the man on the other side saying that when it comes to that he will not destroy

humanity. It is very difficult for us to reconcile these two contradictory positions. My Government is irrevocably opposed to the conception that the peace of this world can be balanced on two, or now three, hydrogen bombs. They are a definite menace to humanity. They ought to go out of use altogether. Their stockpiles ought to be dismantled in whatever way is possible. There ought to be no further manufacture of them, and they should not be regarded as instruments of war.

We thought that, when the great move initiated by President Eisenhower in regard to the peaceful uses of atomic energy gained so much public support, while it was not a step towards disarmament, the emphasis would be shifted. But, if we were to be realistic and truthful to ourselves, far greater attention has been paid in the last two or three years to the war uses of nuclear energy than to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

It is quite true that developments have taken place-might have taken place in my own country-but the whole conception of this deterrent theory, that is the fear that it will keep. Then it is said that these tests are required to eliminate the evils of radiation, because one of the reasons for giving up these tests is the contamination of the air and the consequences it will have on humanity as a whole. So we at last hear a great deal of emphasis on what is called the "clean" bomb-a contradiction in terms; a "clean" bomb, one gets a "clean" death somehow or other.

The head of the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States has said that these tests are required for developing relatively clean accurate weapons for defence against bombers. Well, I do not say that it is an argument for continuing tests but that statement is contradicted by another responsible quarter, namely, the Secretary for Defense of the United States. He has informed the American Congress only some time ago that "some nuclear weapons in the nation's stockpile have been altered in a way that increases radioactive fall-out over a local area." Then he goes on to say "we are stockpiling bombs which are essentially 100 per cent fission and have never made any statements to the contrary. In our terminology these are 'normal' weapons." He went on to say that "when he referred to 'normal' were those in which no attempt had been made to cut down on fall-out as opposed to 'clean' weapons." Therefore, the idea that these tests are in order to evolve "clean" weapons does not hold water. The Russian weapons are also called "non-clean" and there are dirtier and dirtier weapons-so we are told by these statements. And now we have the Secretary of Defense of the United States telling us that what he calls a normal weapon is a non-clean weapon.

Dr. Teller told the United States Senate Disarmament sub-committee that by suspending nuclear testing now "we may be sacrificing millions of lives in a 'dirty' nuclear war later." Therefore, all these arguments tend to justify a kind of apprehension that is created in the minds of people who have no desire to attribute motives to any statement that is made.

If the representatives of the United Kingdom,

#### <Pg-211>

the United States or anyone else tells us either privately or publicly here, my delegation would not say that it means something else. We would say that it means what it says. But it says a great deal. And that is, that there can be cessation of nuclear testing, and of these explosions until there is effective disarmament. Well, of course, if there is effective disarmament, they themselves will not want the tests, it would be a useless occupation. They would not use these bombs anymore.

Now, I say again, there has been no progress, and Commander Noble said to us that the picture looked more hopeful. Now let us look at these explosions. In 1957 the United States had to its credit twenty-four explosions, the United Kingdom six, and the Soviet Union twelve, thus making forty-two explosions in all. In 1958 there have been eighty-seven explosions-in the last twelve months there have been eighty-seven major thermonuclear and nuclear, I suppose, explosions-in the way of fifty-six and thirty-one. That is to say in the previous year there were forty-two explosions. So while the technical discussions are going on in Geneva, while we think we are getting a better picture, in the last twelve months the explosions have increased by 100 per cent. There were forty-two last year; there were eighty-seven this year.

Now, the case that there would be a clandestine manufacture of weapons, there would be more other destructive weapons. I think it is only fair that we should try as best we can with limited knowledge to deal with this element. There is a legitimate apprehension that once these nuclear tests are suspended, one or the other side may devise weapons that may not come into this category; that is to say, we stop explosions. In the meanwhile other weapons of mass destruction may be devised, thereby leading to consequences which are graver than they are.

My Government is of the view that any kind of suspension or cessation of this character must apply to all weapons of mass destruction; because so far as we know these weapons of mass destruction can only be weapons of this category of this thermonuclear, nuclear or any other development arising from that and could not be the old conventional war-type. Therefore, there is no question that this cessation refers only to the kind of explosions that might take place in Siberia or in Christmas Island only, but any other kind of development, whether it takes place between countries in the way of inter-continental missiles or from anywhere else-we do not know anything about these things-from other space or whatever it is. This ban must apply to the whole lot of them if there is to be a step towards peace in this world.

Now, having put this in this negative way, then it is our duty to

state before the Committee what are the positive results of cessation. We say first of all, the immediate positive result of cessation would be to increase the danger to humanity. I should have said that in the expansion of the destructive potential of the world, not only have we increased the size of it and the quantum of it, not only have we increased the variety of it, not only have we increased the area of its use, we have also increased the destructive potential in the other dimension-in time. That is to say, in former wars you killed, and I suppose you buried the man who was killed if you could get him, and that was the end of it. But now, the destruction is towards generations yet unborn. And in that dimension also it increased. We say therefore, if there is cessation of these tests, there will be less radioactivity in the world harmful to humanity.

Now, there has been a considerable amount of argument in this room. The main exponents as against the position we take up, being the representatives of France and the United Kingdom saying that these radiation results are not so important; in any case we carry a certain amount of radioactive elements within ourselves, and so on and so on; therefore, it is not too bad. Fortunately, the Committee on Radiation which we shall discuss later, while its report is couched in very cautious language, makes it quite clear that any further increase in this would be harmful to us.

The Committee, in its general conclusions-I do not want to go into great length, because we shall be discussing this afterwards-says "even the smallest amount of radiation is liable to cause deleterious genetic and perhaps traumatic effects. Natural radiation fallout involves the whole world population and to a greater or lesser extent only a fraction of the population with medical or occupational exposure. It is clear that medical and occupational exposure in the testing of nuclear weapons can be influenced by human action and that natural radiation already injected in the stratosphere cannot". What we cannot prevent, we cannot prevent. But what we are causing we can stop from causing.

Paragraph 54 of this report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation states:

# <Pg-212>

Radioactive contamination of the environment resulting from explosions of nuclear weapons constitutes a growing increment to world-wide radiation levels. This involves new and largely unknown hazards to present and future populations; these hazards, by their very nature, are beyond the control of the exposed persons. (A/3838, pag 41).

In other words, all that the majority of the peoples of the world can do is to just await atomic annihilation. In the same paragraph there is this statement "The Committee concludes that all steps designed to minimize irradiation of human populations will act to the benefit of human health". Now, there is another factor that we ought to bear in

mind, that this Committee has assumed that there will be no increase in radiation levels because there is all this talk of suspension and so on-set out in tables-that if there is no further radiation, then perhaps we can keep at this present level of danger.

They already say that an estimated total of 2,500 to 100,000 of cases of leukemia will ultimately occur in subsequent years from tests already made, if they are stopped in 1958. Their effects are not now known, and each year from 2,500 to 100,000 people will suffer from these genetic effects.

Naturally a scientific committee does not go into the political issue of whether or not tests will be continued. All this is written on the basis of what has happened. Since then, we have the continuance of these tests.

My Government and a great many Governments in the world received with great relief and feeling, which we did not disguise, the news that the Soviet Union had unilaterally decided to stop exploding these bombs. There were two reasons. First of all, it was because this was a beginning in cessation. Secondly, my Government rightly or wrongly thinks that, in a contest of this kind and generally in the case of all conflicts any unilateral action undertaken with the realization of danger has not only political but good moral effects on the world as a whole. Therefore, when the Soviet Union suspended these tests five months ago, not only my country but a great part of the world, particularly Asia and Africa, responded very generously. It would be wrong-in fact, we would not want to do so-to disguise our feelings of disappointment at the fact that these tests have been renewed. That the United States and the United Kingdom have not discontinued the tests is, in our opinion, no justification for their renewal by the Soviet Union. We understood that the tests had been given up unilaterally and this was a recognition of the dangers inherent in them and a denial that no amount of capacity for nuclear war as a possible deterrent would in any way make up for the results against humanity.

When I have said this, I want also to refer to the other side of it. The representative of the United Kingdom said here that his delegation had said in August that they were prepared to stop these explosions if there was agreement on it. I submit with great respect that greater than all agreement at that time was the fact of cessation, and the interest of cessation as a whole required that there should have been a general stopping on all sides.

From August to the end of October time has elapsed. In the meanwhile, instead of proceeding towards cessation we have moved away from it in the sense that one party that had stopped has already restarted and, what is more, restarted not only with the consequence of increasing radiation but also throwing some doubts and suspicions on the bona fides of suspension as a whole.

We have tried to state as objectively as we could the results of this

action as we saw them. After all, if there is a crime against humanity, if it is an anti-social action, if it is a deleterious action, it does not appear right to say that we shall stop this on a particular date. We believe that a great opportunity has been missed and therefore the responsibility to recreate it arises very strongly.

We have the other side of it. We are very happy to see that at this session of the United Nations and preceding it, the call for the giving up of these tests has come from quarters from where it did not come before. We had the privilege of having present with us one of the veteran statesmen of the world in the person of the Prime Minister of New Zealand, a great advocate of the cause of peace over the years whether or not he was in government. He told this Assembly categorically-and this does not come from an uncommitted nation or from a nation that belongs to any unnecessarily critical group of the present nuclear Powers on his side.

"For reasons of overwhelming cumulative force"-this is Anglo Sexon understatement-"the cessation of nuclear tests is essential."-He does not say it is desirable.

<Pg-213>

First, it would end the problem of radioactive fallout from test explosions of nuclear weapons....

"Secondly, it would, if it were universal in its application, rule out the danger that efficient atomic weapons will be developed by an ever-increasing number of countries....

"Thirdly it would establish for the first time a world-wide inspection system..."-In this we heartily agree.

"The Fourth benefit of an early agreement ... is more general and more tangible, but potentially the most important of all: confidence and trust between the nations." (A/PV.770, page 12)

So states Mr. Nash. These are the four reasons that have been set out by him.

We also have an appeal from another Western country not committed to the western group as such, that is, from Sweden, to ask for the cessation of tests in spite of a certain section of opinion in that country not being so much in favour of it. Mr. Unden told us only a few days ago:

"The Swedish Government supports the proposal for a universal discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests." (A/C. 1/PV, 946, page 62)

I wish I could be as brief and as effective as Mr. Unden.

I return to these reasons why there should be. First of all, I have referred to the reasons of lesser radioactivity. I have said

something like this in the Assembly previously. But I think it is well for us to remember that publications in this country-one of them by groups of men who are engaged in big business and therefore cannot be regarded as being uncautious, to put it very mildly-have all referred to this enormous destructive potential of these weapons. And to make it more graphic and more real to our imaginations it is calculated that, shall we say, the power of a twenty megaton explosion, one of these big explosions that either the Russians or the Americans have set off, we are told, if it was to be equated in terms of TNT, would require as much of that material as would cover wagons that would stretch from here to Los Angeles and back. And one of these smaller ten megaton explosions would require more explosives than were used in the whole of the last two world wars.

That being the position, I think that when we deal with these matters we may not simply look to our sights as such, as to what are our immediate political advantages. And we say definitely that if there are risks in this, there are risks of peace and of human survival which we should take.

The second cause for cessation is this: It is quite true that we are representatives of our Governments. No doubt, we are all very estimable people-because, if you were not, I would not be. So we are all very distinguished representatives over here. But we do not live in isolation. We are here, we are heard, we are able to speak, because, whatever our forms of government may be, we represent the enormous public opinion of this world, and there is no doubt that in every country, irrespective of their forms of government, irrespective of the freedom of press or otherwise, irrespective of their economic organization, the overwhelming volume of world public opinion is in favour not only of the cessation of these tests but of the non-use of nuclear and thermonuclear power for destructive purposes.

Only recently, nearly ten thousand scientists, who ought to know something about this-I wish they had all taken some sort of binding oath upon themselves that they should not use their talent for the purpose of destruction-sent out a memorial calling for the cessation of tests, and said:

Each nuclear bomb test spreads an added burden of radioactive elements over every part of the world .... We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect an international agreement to stop the testing of all nuclear weapons.

I spoke of them simply as ten thousand scientists. But they are not just new graduates of universities. They include some seventy or eighty Noble Prize winners. Since we know that these distinctions are not conferred upon men with small ability or men of small stature, we know that this is an expression of opinion of what may be called the intelligentsia and the scientific knowledge of the world. This does not come from science fiction.

I have here another quotation, which reads:

Two Japanese ships showered with radioactive

<Pg-214>

rain in the Pacific returned home today to a nation showing increasing bitterness towards American nuclear weapons tests. But Japan, the only nation to know first hand the horrors of atomic bombing, feels any radioactivity at all is suspect.

This is from an American paper in 1958.

I want to refer to another expression of American public opinion, and I am sure that my colleague from the United States will not regard it as interference in domestic affairs, because these are published documents. They are public documents of an organization called the National Planning Association, which I understand is an organization of comparatively conservative people. They say:

We believe the test control issue should now be separated from others, and that our country should take prompt initiative for a world-wide test control programme.

That is not along the same lines as the remarks of Commander Noble.

Again, I say that we entirely support the idea that controls should be effective. But we would not say that, because controls are not yet effective, we cannot do this. We should not plead machinery in bar of an objective.

In this way, the enormous volume of world public opinion that is welling up, expressing itself in different ways, is something that we cannot ignore, because world public opinion really represents the side that is most affected, namely, the victim.

The third argument is that other weapons cannot be developed if there are no tests. Well, for myself, I would say: "Thank God that they cannot be developed". But, since the ban should be on all weapons that carry nuclear or thermonuclear power, I do not see the force of this argument. If the argument is that we can still manufacture the kinds of weapons that have already been manufactured even if there are no tests, we say that in addition there is the matter of the radioactivity that is spread-and, what is more, it is only another argument to push us on toward obtaining the total prohibition of these weapons of war.

Fourthly, my Government thinks that a decision by the great Powers concerned, endorsed by the Assembly, as it would be-an appeal to other countries not to make these things and to explode them-would reverse the trend towards war.

In all that I have said, I have tried to show that in the last ten

years, instead of disarming, we are rearming, and what the world wants most is to reverse that. Even if we agreed, for the sake of argument, that cessation of tests is not disarmament, nevertheless its political and psychological and emotional effects would be such that there would be a wave of feeling away from war. As Mr. Walter Nash has pointed out, that would probably be the most important consequence of such a step.

Moreover, once the test question is out of the way, with all the feeling that arises from the immediacy of its possibilities and other factors that surround it, it would be easier to take up a comprehensive disarmament programme-and I am here to commit my Government to any effort that pushes all the other aspect of disarmament.

We therefore say that not only is there no case against cessation, but everything is in its favour.

So much for the cessation of tests. There are two other items on the agenda that I want to discuss, one relating to the disarmament problem as a whole and the other to the problem of military budgets. But I should no: like to proceed to that without referring to another topic that is to be discussed at Geneva and that is included in the Western resolution-that is, the matter of surprise attacks. I am free to confess that countries of our size, situated as we are, are no: motivated very much by these considerations. But I dare say that those who think in these terms have to do so, because they pay attention to it, and we are therefore happy there is agreement to consider this problem. But may I say, without being cynical, that a surprise attack about which there is so much talk and discussion can hardly be a surprise-a surprise prepared over a generation. But, on the other hand, if the fear is about another Pearl Harbour, I think it is a legitimate one.

We therefore hope that the attempt will be made to reach agreement and what is more, to establish machinery of inspection and control, without unnecessary and mischievous interference in one another's affairs or in such a way as to violate not only the sovereignty but the sense of dignity of people. We think that would be a great advance, and my Government: would welcome any development that takes place in that

### <Pg-215>

way, because the consequence would be the removal of fear and the creation of confidence. It would remove another argument against disarmament, and it could also be another nail in the coffin of the "deterrent" theory. We therefore welcome the meeting in November to discuss the question of surprise attacks.

We also have a secret hope that all these discussions about surprise attacks will lead to a method of discovery of stockpiles. It is true that it has been said that there are no known methods of detecting

stockpiles. However, the data that each side would have to place before the other in order to ensure that there would be no surprise attack would also lead inevitably, in some measure, to some statements with regard to existing stocks, and that would be a contribution toward disarmament. For that reason also, we welcome the November talks.

That takes us to the general problem of disarmament. If we had had no item before the Assembly on the cessation of these tests they would have come under the discussion of the general problem of disarmament. Therefore, there is no competition between these things, but since I have spoken at length about the cessation of tests and there is another item I shall not, in discussing that other item, deal very much with nuclear tests.

The Disarmament Commission has been functioning for many years. My delegation, during the sessions of the General Assembly, has been associated with the endeavours to make progress in that way. In 1954 a Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission was set up-first in the face of opposition, when the proposal came in here, and afterwards by general acceptance, proving what the representative of the United States has said, namely, that these debates do have the effect of creating flexibility.

Before the Disarmament Commission proposal after proposal has been made. I want to say this in no way of petty complaint, but these proposals are discussed; they are not thrown out of the window. And delegations such as ours agree to the practical idea that they should be referred to the Disarmament Commission for discussion, but year after year that has been opposed. The opposition, I am sorry to say, has come mainly from our friends of the United Kingdom. Equally, it was the United Kingdom which suggested in this Committee that those proposals, including the Indian proposal, should go before the Disarmament Commission.

So, after nearly eighteen months of argument, and continued representations by the Government of India, India's proposals were received by the Disarmament Commission somewhere in 1955. I had the privilege of representing my Government on that occasion, and I am glad to state before this Committee that all the members of the Disarmament Commission, and not least of all the representatives of the United Kingdom and of France, welcomed the suggestions that we made in terms so embarrassing to me that I do not want to quote them. But at any rate they agreed to grant our request to be allowed to appear before them. They paid tribute to the suggestions that we made, but nothing more came out of it.

We made many suggestions at that time, one of which was that there should be technical consultations on these matters. Those proposals and others made by various delegations had been sent time after time to the Disarmament Commission. Now this is the occasion to look at the whole of the disarmament problem and the disarmament machinery, because what we have is a situation where, in between sessions, there

is discussion-in the last three or four years mainly in the Sub-Committee Commission meets in order to forward the documents, they come here, there is a general debate, and the matter goes back to the Disarmament Commission. That was bad enough, but during the past twelve months the Disarmament Commission has stopped altogether. That is to say, the machinery of consultation, the machinery of what is euphemistically called connexion with the United Nations, has disappeared altogether.

My Government, for one, welcomes the direct talks between the Powers mainly concerned which are in a position to stop these tests, but we think that it has to go on two lines-or several lines if you like. On the one hand, there should be these direct talks, but the general competence and the influence of the General Assembly ought to be upon them.

We regret that in the last twelve months the Disarmament Commission has not met and that there has been no progress in that direction. This brings to mind one or two matters. One is the matter which was put very much better than I can put it the other day by Mr. Noble when he said that no resolution that is passed, whatever the majority, has any effect unless it has agreement. I believe he said this last year, and it was not a statement which met with much approval.

Last year the Indian delegation brought three draft resolutions before the General Assembly,

### <Pg-216>

one of which, appearing in document A/L. 232 dated 14 November 1957, was to the effect that the great Powers, with such other assistance as might be required, should conduct a technical examination, with a commission to be set up for the purpose, of the one impediment to the cessation of test explosions, which was-if the speeches made are to be accepted at their face value, as they must be-the inability to detect them. The draft resolution came before the General Assembly, and it was rejected by 34 votes to 24, with 20 abstentions.

I think these abstentions are not only increasing but are becoming increasingly significant. The defeat of the draft resolution had minority support, taking the membership as a whole. But, in any case, we are happy that practically that suggestion is now before Geneva. The work has been done in that way, and the results are as they are set out. The Swedes had at that time conducted experiments which made the discovery of explosions possible even to the extent of the slightest consequence to the atmosphere of the world, and, without the consent of the Swedish Government, we produced that evidence before the Assembly last year.

As far as the Disarmament Commission is concerned my delegation wishes to submit that, on the one hand, we should not divorce this problem from the competence of the Assembly. I do not mean the

logical, official or technical competence, but the Assembly's generally having its hand on it. Secondly, in view of the experience not only of last year but of previous years, the time has come, perhaps, to have a de novo approach to this problem in our opinion. We think that the only time when disarmament really gets any attention is when the Assembly meets. We believe that, as Mr. Lodge has pointed out, it has a very healthy effect on those who are thinking about this problem. It leads to flexibility; it leads, if you like, to some sort of light on any rigid positions which may have the effect of ameliorating that situation. But where we differ from the representative of the United States is when he equates any assistance of a technical character which the Secretary-General may give with the United Nations as a whole. This is what Mr. Lodge tells us:

"Fourthly, there is the role of the United Nations. The United Nations has a vital responsibility in the field of disarmament".

No one could disagree with that. He then goes on:

The last section of the draft resolution states explicitly how the conferences and the United Nations can assist each other. Operative paragraph 5 invites the forth-coming conferences to avail themselves of the assistance and services of the Secretary-General. We are pleased that both sides in these conferences have in fact already been working with the Secretary-General to this end. This paragraph also calls for the United Nations to be kept informed about the forthcoming conferences. This is obviously important. Operative paragraph 6 reflects the significant role that the Secretary-General can play. He is invited, in consultation with the Governments concerned, to give such advice not only as may seem appropriate to facilitate the current developments, but also with respect to any further initiatives on disarmament. Finally, operative paragraph 7 assures that the deliberations of the General Assembly and the proposals made here should be taken into account by the States"... concerned. (A.C. 1 PV. 946, page 58-60)

My delegation yields to no one in connexion with the part which the Secretary-General has played in the promotion of peace efforts during the last three years, especially in the Middle East, but the whole of this relates only to this particular conference in Geneva, the technical parts of it, and so on. It would be quite impossible to accept the contention that the views of Governments have to be communicated to the disarnment Powers or to the disarmament bodies second hand. We believe, therefore, that while all this may be subscribed to, and while it may be all-important, it does not exhaust the problem. The problem is that of the concern of the United Nations, expressed through the General Assembly, making its continuous impact upon these discussions to create a situation whereby the separate conferences outside these meetings, whether here or anywhere else, must take place, with whatever the Secretary-General can do in this way being done. At the same time, the United Nations must be able to play its part, not for any reasons of what we

call organizational selfishness or otherwise but because the impact of world public opinion comes only in that way.

I think, therefore, that-even forgetting the Disarmament Commissioninstead of again trying these permutations of various combinations and various figures, we should get to a position where the United Nations General Assembly has

#### <Pg-217>

more intimate contact with what is going on. Therefore, at the appropriate time when moving a draft resolution on our item-we have a draft resolution on one item only-we would suggest that full consideration should be given to this idea that the General Assembly as a whole should constitute the Disarmament Commission. Our permanent representatives live here the year round; disarmament is not a seasonal crop, but is with us always. And it is our view that, other methods having failed, the Assembly as a whole should have an interest in this matter.

This is not a suggestion that vital problems can be decided upon by public discussion or by debates. It gives the opportunity, for private discussion. It gives the opportunity to which Mr. Lodge referred, for the impact that brings about flexibility.

It gives the opportunity, if you like, of showing up those who are making difficulties. It gives the opportunity of the concern of various parts of the world to be more alive in the minds of those who have the responsibility than otherwise.

Therefore, we would, at the appropriate time, make a suggestion that the Disarmament Commission be composed of the eighty-one nations represented here; how it should function is a matter that will work itself out. Then there will be no question of parities and nonparities, there will be no question of some being left out or not left out. Even the smallest of us may have to make a contribution. We have heard a speech by the representative of Ghana a few minutes ago. Ghana is one of the smaller and newer countries of the world. Who would say, after hearing the representative of Ghana, that his concern, the part which he is to play in this, however different it may be from that of anyone else, is any less significant to his country and the world than any other?

The overall responsibility, said the representative of the United Kingdom, in referring to the preamble of the draft resolution, for disarmament still lies with us here in the United Nations. If I may say so, that word "still" is significant, as soon as possible we want to see substantive discussions on disarmament brought back into the United Nations so that the Organization may be entitled to begin to discharge its responsibility. I think that any arrangements we should make should not sort of isolate this problem and take it away and prevent the impact of opinion playing upon those concerned.

At the same time it would be fatal that it should prevent direct contacts between those primarily concerned of anyone else who would make a contribution. The efforts which we have made have been rather infructuous in the last two years. Any expansion of Disarmament Commission was totally opposed by the representative of France last year and the expansion as it was made caused the efforts to be infructuous because it did not work according to plan.

Therefore, we submit that the responsibility lies on the world as a whole and that the United Nations should be the Disarmament Commission. We believe that, in this way, attempts made in the very effective talks in Geneva, particularly in regard to inspection and control, will become transmitted to the general knowledge of the world and the growth of opinion in favour of effective inspection and control will develop; and inspection and control, instead of becoming a bar to consideration, will become an instrument of effective action.

There is also an item on the agenda in regard to military budgets. It is very difficult for us to pronounce on the most efficatious way of dealing with this, but in so far as it is an attempt to limit the quantum of armaments, I am sure that we are all in general agreement with it. It is not always possible to say what a certain quantity of money means in a country and, therefore, the actual detail of it must be left for study and discussion, but we would support any limitation in this way; and, while we are not one of the highly armed countries, I am sure that the Government of India would make its own modest contribution towards the scaling down of defence expenditures if there were any possibilities in that direction tending to lower tension in the world, particularly in our neighbouring areas. I want to say here and now that when we are taking military expenditures into account, it is not sufficient to take into account the actual amount of money spent in the building of arms in a particular country: we must also take into account the expenditures incurred by providing arms to other people through the creation of armed stations elsewhere and by the whole system of military pacts. My country is definitely opposed to the system of military pacts, which not only has sent instruments of war, but has projected the machinery of war into otherwise non-warlike lands. We have been definitely opposed to this position always. Even in the last few years these pacts have shown definitely that they have no value, even in terms. So, whether it be the line to the east or the line to the west, drawing

# <Pg-218>

in more and more countries to the socalled defence systems, they would become unnecessary in the general course of disarmament. But the continuation of the situation would, on the one hand, distribute arms more and more over the world and project the machinery of the cold war into areas where it should not. It creates deep concern in other areas, and while it would not affect us in any way in many countries it would lead to greater armaments.

Looking at the greatest proposals that have been made over the years, my delegation finds that there are many proposals which are common, and if the idea of the General Assembly becoming the Disarmament Commission is seriously undertaken, then it should not be impossible to take either the greatest common measure of agreement in this or to take those items on each side, whichever contribute to the widest disarmament, and put them together. While it has incurred definite opposition from one of the great Powers, we should still have before us what may be called the abridgement of a disarmament convention. Then the discussions would be more concrete instead of always as they have been before. From 1955 onwards there have been various proposals, and we find that in regard to the reduction of conventional armaments there is a general degree of agreement. In regard to the second stage also there is general agreement, except that the question of political issues is tied up with it by one side and not by the other.

Our view is that disarmament will lead to the solution of political issues; and we should go back to the phraseology which Mr. Selwyn Lloyd put to us at one time, that progress in one field would result in progress in other fields.

There is a reference to disarmed manpower of other countries: all the more reason why those countries should be involved. Even the smallest country would hesitate to have an imposition on itself with regard to its military, civilian or other potential without consent.

With regard to nuclear disarmament, my Government wishes me to state that our position is and will remain unchanged. That is, there can be no disarmament in the world unless the world of nuclear Powers as a whole decides that the nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and their development for destructive purposes must come to an end. That is to say, we must implement the general decision of the Assembly in regard to the total prohibition and abandonment of nuclear weapons. But we do not say that it can be done without progressing from stage to stage; and small as it is, the stopping of these tests is the first stage, the introduction of control and inspection, and the confidence which it would create would lead towards that. Equally, we think that the development of long-range missiles is a greater danger and they would be checked by this process.

I made the proposal, on behalf of my delegation, that there should be a discontinuance of tests-and by discontinuance we mean discontinuance.

At this stage I might deal with the draft resolutions that are before us. His Excellency Prince Wan, the representative of Thailand, in discussing these draft resolutions, referred to the draft resolution submitted by India, I think almost alone. We have not had the privilege of knowing the views of the United Kingdom or others on it, but I believe they are probably sympathetically disposed to it, but do not want to say anything.

The main objection, in regard to the representative of Thailand-which is the only one I can take up at the present time-is that we have said here that there should be discontinuance "until agreement is reached". Two questions have been asked in the lobbies of the United Nations. What does the word "until" mean? It means "until", and nothing else.

Prince Wan asks us: Supposing there is no agreement at Geneeva, then what happens? I would like to tell him what happens. What does he think should happen? If there is no agreement in Geneva, should there be continuance of these tests? The answer is, that there should be agreement, if not in Geneva, then somewhere else. We should do everything to get agreement, and we say that tests should be kept discontinued until there is agreement. That is what is mean, as a corollary, that if the discontinuance remains and one or the other of the three Powers should in spite of the discontinues start explosions, then it would be for the Assembly to intervene.

That would be the occasion when there is a real breach, a real fear, that there would be no agreement at all. That is why we have said the we should proceed on the basis that there will be agreement, that we should work for this agreement. The technical people have said it is possible.

We have heard statements of the United States and the Soviet Union that they are favour of controls. The Soviet Union press itself as accepting the control position the

<Pg-219>

all that remains on this is the devising of the machinery of control. The machinery of control has been tried in other contexts where there were ??? difficulties, and they have, if not one ??? per cent, succeeded. Even in the very difficult situation as between Israel and the Arab Countries, we have had a degree of success in these arrangements, and we should try and pursue the methods either of direct balancing of positions as between the parties concerned or seek other methods.

Therefore, we say, in answer to the representative of Thailand, that what we mean is that their should be a cessation of tests and not suspension, which means that they will stop for some time and when some thing happens they start again. The only condition where discontinuance should be discontinued is where one of the parties starts all over again. It is agreed that a test explosion is not a surprise attack and therefore there is no danger involved. We therefore hope that the General Assembly will tell the great Powers concerned that there should be adiscontinuance of these tests.

Now we come to the draft resolutions before the Committee. There is before the Committee the draft resolution (A/C. 1/L. 205) submitted by the United States and sixteen other countries. We have no objection to a great part of it. But we have certain objections to

putting all these problems into the same draft resolution-not because they are not inter-related, but because we happen to be discussing different items and this is the purely a procedural matter. The very fact that they are put together lends colour-not in our minds-to the fears that are entertained that it maintended to make the suspension conditional, ??? as it is called by others.

Now I say, with great respect to the representative of the United Kingdom, that there is some justification for this apprehension. If he was read his own speech, he will see it. In one ???of his speech, he says that the suspension, calls it, can take place:

"Our ultimate aim is of course the final cessation of all nuclear weapons tests..." A/C 1/PV, 948, page 28-30)

There we part company. He says:

"Our ... aim is"-and that is what we are now trying to do-"cessation, because that is part of the aim of comprehensive disarmament..."
(Ibid.) This knocks the bottom out of the whole idea of cessation.

It is only in comprehensive disarmament that there can be a cessation, in the United Kingdom view. There is part of the aim of comprehensive disarmament which we hold constantly before us. We want the cessation of tests with real disarmament, because only thus will real security be achieved.

This word "with" is a very difficult word. It has the advantage that if the United Kingdom is so disposed, it can adopt for it a meaning which simply means "in the same direction". I looked up all the English dictionaries in the world on this, and I find that this little word has miles and miles of explanations. Therefore the word "with" can mean almost integration; it can also mean pointing in the same direction.

Therefore, if the representation of the United Kingdom would accept the view that the suspension points in the same direction, then we should all be happy. Thus, he does not abandon his word "with"; he remains with the "with". But if it means a condition precedent, the cessation is conditioned by the other fact; and, of course, if rearmament goes on in the world and there is no improvement in the position, a new situation arises. If anyone makes a breach of the cessation arrangement, then a cause arises for this purpose.

I would like, with great respect, to ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether a Government like mine has not reason to be apprehensive of this matter. When we brought this matter up before the General Assembly, with the United Kingdom itself, in early 1954, there was general enthusiasm. I submit that all the resistance to this has come from that quarter. First of all, we were asked to accept limitation of explosions, and some of our friends from Asia agreed with it to a certain extent. We were totally opposed to the idea of limitation of explosions because it legalized them and lent a

colour of morality to it. A limitation of explosions, we thought, was licensing this evil-and that came up in 1955.

Then there are repeated statements that the suspension of tests must in the long run be conditioned upon the progress towards real disarmament. If there is no progress, then you use this as a lever to bring about progress. In our opinion, that is wrong. Thirdly, we heard the position, after the first initial enthusiasm were over, that the main difficulty in regard to this was that the explosions could not be detected. At

### <Pg-220>

no time was the Government of India and its advisers of the opinion that there was any substance in this argument. Not for a moment did the people in Asia regard that there was substance. But from our point of view-and we have some knowledge on this matter, though very limited, and which now has been justified by the technical committee-I have stated this each time on behalf of my Government.

#### In 1956 we said:

We have taken scientific advice, in our own and other countries, and we find that there is no valid reason to support the contention that large-scale explosions, explosions, that could do the kind of damage which I have described, could take place in a concealed way.

#### I also said the following:

"No concealment of any effective character is possible in regard to this."

#### I further stated:

... all the evidence that my Government has is to the effect that atomic, nuclear and thermonuclear explosions, under proper arrangements, are detectable ... No one can say that it would be one hundred per cent detection, but the evasion of detection is almost impossible.

We went on to repeat this position. That enables me to say the following: If it is true that a one hundred per cent detection cannot be assured is it not also true that evasion would not be effective? We may not be able to detect explosions in a case-there may be a case where you cannot-but no country that commits an explosion will feel sure that they will not be found out. Is that not the basis of all law? Are there any policemen in any country who can prevent every misdemeanour of crime, a real crime or misdemeanour? The departure from law is prevented by the fear of that exposure. Non-exposure is not a certainty. Therefore, if it is true that all detection is not possible, it is equally true that all evasion is beyond the bounds of detectability. I think I have made the submissions I have to make. We are not in favour of putting forward one resolution.

We hope the United States and its colleagues will consider this problem again. We hold no brief for every word that appears in the resolution that was put forward. There is no reference in the draft resolution of the Soviet Union to the attempts that will be made at Geneva, which we think is a great defect. We also cannot support that draft resolution for that reason. It creates suspicion in the minds of others because there is no reference to control. But in justification it must be said that any agreement means that there will be control; therefore, it is not necessary to state it. The two parties are not likely to come to an agreement unless there is control. Therefore, control is implicit; but, in our opinion, it should have been said.

The main defect from that point of view in both draft resolutions is that there is no reference to the return of this matter to the General Assembly. We think that whatever happens in Geneva-agreement, partial disagreement or disagreement-it ought to come back to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly which, so far as this item is concerned, should stand adjourned for the purpose, unless of course the idea of the whole Assembly becoming a Disarmament Commission finds acceptance in the minds of the Assembly as a whole.

Therefore, my submission is this: in view of the great dangers that face the world, in view of the fact that control and inspection is regarded by all responsible peoples as necessary and in view of the fact that suspension of these explosions would create a change in the psychology in regard to this and would bring hope to humanity, there is no alternative.

Prince Wan asks us, "What would you do if it were not effective"? I ask him the same question. Does he say that if there is no agreement in Geneva we should go on testing ad infinituum until the preparation for a more complete blowing-up of the world is in train? We are told that the present stockpile of weapons are enough to destroy civilization as we know it. Why should we destroy the world more than once even though the once who think that when the contingency comes it must be met? If there is enough destrustive power either to bring a war to a conclusive end or which will lead to total destruction, why should there be any more power than there is at the present time? There is no case whatsoever in the world for developing more massive weapons of destruction I say this not in any sense which is beyond my competence, but this Assembly and the United Nations will live or fall by the contribution it makes in our time to the problem of disarmament, irrespective of political parties and affiliations and philosophies.

# <Pg-221>

The world is tired of this conception of bearing the burden of arms. The world is tired of the idea of living under fear. The world is afraid that today we have the problem only of three Powers but that next year there may be four, there may be five or there may be six.

Personally I do not subscribe to just six Powers; there might be forty or fifty because it will be purveyed to other people; whether they make it or not they will have it; we should have the imaginativeness to see the consequences of these things as great as they are. Perhaps even soon after New Mexico and soon after Hiroshima it would have been possible to use restraint with greater case, but there is no use for us to go back, to look back into the past except for gaining experience. Therefore, the survival of this Organization as a body that is in the service of humanity, the promotion of its objects, the prevention of evil that must come to succeeding generations is involved; even according to this conservative representative committee of the United Nations, which says that even the explosions that have already taken place can have genetic effects on from 2,000 to 100,000 people every year-that means that there is a progressive deterioration.

Even knowing that damage has been done, it is the appeal of my Government to these great and powerful nations which have contributed so much to humanity. Whether we agree with them in one way or another, they have brought full succor, shelter, sanitation and education; they have made great contributions to human knowledge in the conquests of space and time. They have helped the endeavours of other underdeveloped nations like ours to come forward. The masses of the people, from which are not excluded the statesmen who govern their countries, want to see an era of peace. But peace will not drop from heaven. We must be prepared to make an effort, this small effort that is now required to tell the world that we shall reverse this armaments race, whatever its cost.

We have been told they will suspend tests for a year and are prepared to continue. Why introduce into this act of faith that element of fear and suspicion which nullifies it? The appeal of my Government, therefore, to the United States, to the Soviet Union and to the United Kingdom is that they report to this Assembly before it rises that there has been an agreement in regard to the cessation of these test explosions; that is to say, the explosions of all weapons of mass destruction, which will bring relief and hope to humanity and, what is more, bring faith to us in the United Nations that in spite of all the failures of the last ten years, in spite of the many speeches we have delivered and the large numbers of resolutions we have adopted, the various ways of balancing the minority with a unanimous vote, which is like covering a crack in the wall with a piece of tissue paper-all that must belong to the past. We make this fervent appeal to everyone concerned, and we hope that it will be agreed that in view of the very closeness of this problem, in view of the possibility of doing something and in view of all the consequences I have spoken about, we will be able to have a special resolution on these tests, to come to a decision of a character which will enable us to review the results of the decision very shortly. Then we can go on to the problem of disarmament in such a way as to make our functioning in this more operative. What is more, we all can do as Poland and some other countries have done, either in the way of denial of our space for these purposes or our voluntary desire to

limit military expenditure-I speak of the responsibility in this matter. By all this we will make a step forward.

INDIA USA CHINA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SRI LANKA NORWAY EGYPT IRAQ MALI LEBANON JORDAN KOREA NORTH KOREA CANADA POLAND SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA LAOS FRANCE DENMARK THE NETHERLANDS PORTUGAL GHANA GUINEA CAMEROON WESTERN SAMOA CYPRUS ICELAND GREECE TURKEY ALGERIA SOUTH AFRICA LIBYA MOROCCO SUDAN TUNISIA TAIWAN JAPAN RUSSIA INDONESIA PAKISTAN MEXICO OMAN IRELAND UNITED KINGDOM NEW ZEALAND SWEDEN THAILAND ISRAEL

**Date**: Oct 07, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on South West Africa

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a Statement in the Trusteeship Committee on Oct 13, 1958 on the Report of the Good Offices Committee on South West Africa.

The following is the full text of his Statement:

Mr. Chairman,

It gives me great pleasure to join a great many others, who preceded me, in offering you the felicitations of my delegation. I am particularly glad to see you, an old colleague of mine, in the chair of this Committee. I hope you have a good time. I would like to associate with this expression the communications of the same through you, Mr. Chairman, to your distinguished Vice-Chairman and your distinguished Rapporteur.

We are, Mr. Chairman, discussing an item which is entitled "South West Africa"; we are dealing with several aspects of it, the first of these being the Good Offices Committee's report.

<Pg-222>

I think I would not be overstating the facts, or emphasizing it more than necessary, when I submit to the Committee that we are not here, dealing with the detailed problems of administration, or maladministration but concealed in or subserving all these arguments are very vital fundamental principles on which this organization rests, and what is more, if we should take a decision that is morally

indefensible and incorrect or inhuman in its consequences, we shall have to pay the penalty for it.

So, in discussing this problem we have to approach it with a degree of caution, and, so far as we are concerned, with no malice towards the Union of South Africa or its government or its representatives. Incidentally, we regret that they are not here, but, I am sure, if they had felt their case to be so strong they would have not wanted to be absent. We have, here, before us this report, and my delegation approaches it with regret from many points of view-not only on account of its contents but because we expected that we were making a departure from the comparatively sterile pursuit of this problem over many years.

Mr. Chairman, may I have your permission to express our gratitude to the three Members of the Commission, Sir Charles Noble Arden-Clarke, Chairman, who comes to us with a vast wealth of experience as a colonial administrator in the good liberal tradition, who has made a great contribution towards the termination of trusteeship in Togoland and who, along with those who went before him, established in that part of Africa the colonial tradition which has led the indigenous people to independence and is continuing to do so. I would also like to say that Senor da Cunna of Brazil comes to us with a vast wealth of experience as a veteran diplomat of international relations. The third member of this Committee, Mr. Walmsley, represents a country which has always said that it cannot live half-slave and half-free, a country which is putting up a gallant fight against the problems of discrimination and is wedded to the ideals of self-government of peoples. Therefore, it is all the more regrettable for us that we have to join issue not only on one particular part of its recommendations but the whole of this report lock, stock and barrel.

This report is, really, not a report which affects South Africa as much as it affects the United Nations, the whole challenge of the South African Governmet is to this Organization. They swear that under no circumstances will they negotiate with us. That takes us to some other alternatives that have been proposed, but the Committee should not take the view that my Government regards this problem as insoluble. Nor does my Government think that the method that we are now pursuing in regard to other mandated territories, where the mandatory powers have been wise, generous, liberal and magnanimous enough to place them under trusteeship, is the only solution. We shall not take such a narrow view. But before I turn to the report, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that My Delegation at some point proposes to ask that in regard to this sub-item the entire verbatim record should be kept, if nothing else for posterity because the small differences in this area so important that we cannot for the future discussions rely on merely a summary of these deliberations. Therefore, my delegation proposes, at some stage, to move that the verbatim record of discussions on this sub-item should be made available. The Fifth Committee in its wisdom-and I am glad to say by their representative support-has this year decided that it is for the Committee to decide what record should be kept and how and so on.

This is, in our opinion, a great advance in the way of public information and in the direction of a democratic development.

We shall now turn over to the last part of this report which, Mr. Chairman, is a summary, and a good summary at that, of this report. I turn to paragraph 20 on page 21 of document S/3900, which contains the concluding remarks of the Good Offices Committee. I left this Committee (Fourth Committee) some days ago after hearing Sir Arden-Clarke with the impression that, perhaps, they were not making a recommendation, that they were simply trying to give us a photostatic record of what happened. But I find that that is not the case. First of all, there are recommendations here, and recommendations that go to the root of this matter, and, what is more, which will require examination here and now.

The first attack on the United Nations comes from the Union of South Africa in denying the one point on which there could be no doubt in the mind of anyone who has signed the Charter, and on which the World Court, in spite of dissenting views, was unanimous: the international status of this territory. Now, the South African Government wants to say that this territory has only an "international character". I submit, Sir, that every territory, including the Emerald Island of Ireland, has international character because the aeroplanes of international airlines go through Shannon. When radioactivity goes on around the world in an indiscriminating way, probably every country will be infected; that also in a way

# <Pg-223>

lends international character to every country or territory. But what is peculiar to these mandated territories is that they have got a "status" which is different from "character," and the differences between status and the position established by contractual obligations are well defined in text-books of international law, and these differences are clear to any person, who has even an elementary knowledge of them.

Therefore, when the Government of the Union of South Africa put out that this territory does not possess international stutus, it is denying its entity, its personality; in fact it is denying its parentage. The status of South West Africa derives from its parentage, going back to the days, to take a short-term view of history, of the League of Nations where the first obvious technical abandonment of colonialism was undertaken-thanks largely to President Wilson's fifth point-and a kind of trusteeship-by whatever name it is called; they called it "Sacred Trust," and we call it "Trusteeship"was established. And, here, I would like to hark back to the World Court's advisory opinion on this matter, in which no dissenting judge, and no dissenting opinion had ever questioned the international status of this territory. I promise, a few minutes later to come back to this and examine what is the content of this international status. I should first, like to turn to the concluding remarks of this report of the Good Offices Committee.

In pargraph (2) of these remarks, Mr. Chairman, the Good Offices Committee gives us in some sense a jolt of hope and says that the Good Office Committee would have felt able to recommend to the General Assembly that certain arrangements should be accepted for inclusion in an agreement to which the United Nations would constitute a second party. Practically the whole of this report contradicts that because South Africa will not agree to the United Nations being the second party. We shall be able to understand the unacceptability, the fallacy of this position only when we examine the content of status. Therefore the second paragraph, apart from this mention of the United Nations constituting a second party, is really a proposal of some sort of "horse-trading", whereby a small part of this territory will be placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations in a strategic or other context, of a limited character, of a limited place, so that the rest of the territory may lapse into colonialism. Mr. Chairman, let us make no mistake about annexation, about absorption, about integration, what we are really doing is not adopting one device in preference to another: what we are doing is abandoning the whole conception of the mandates, abandoning the whole conception of trusteeship, and going back to predatory colonialism. And neither in Asia, nor in Africa, nor even in more enlightened continents today, would there be people that could be pushed back into slavery once again.

In paragraph (3) this hope is completely belied. It is a false hope. It is stated that the Union Government is not prepared to accept the United Nations as a second party to such an agreement, nor to undertake any obligations towards the United Nations. That comes from a Member State of the United Nations and, what is more, from a State which produced one of the draftsmen of the Charter itself, and, earlier in the mandate period of thirty years ago, put out the philosophy of the Mandates system in a little pamphlet called, "The League of Nations", in a more practical form than any of us could describe.

Though afterwards he might have contradicted it, but General Smuts had himself said that the "mandatory state should look upon its position as a great trust and honour, not as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for its nationals". This is what was said by General Smuts, and not by the delegate of India. General Smuts adds further: "And in the case of any flagrant and prolonged abuse of this trust the population concerned should be able to appeal for redress to the League, who should in a proper case assert its authority to the full, even to the extent of removing the mandate, and entrusting it to some other State, if necessary. No pegging out of claims should be allowed under the guise of the Mandate."

Now what we have before us is almost a verbal contradiction of this position taken up by South Africa sometime ago. On page 22 of its report Sir Charles Arden-Clarke's Committee points out that their own approach precluded any agency other than the United Nations being the second party to the agreement, and it did not, therefore, consider

itself in a position to express an opinion on this proposal. Well, if that is the position I am rather at a loss to find out what the opinion of the Committee is in this matter. On the one hand it says that its terms of reference precluded any arrangement to which the United Nations is not a second party. Now that is quite true. Such an arrangement is precluded not only by the terms of reference but by the whole concept of the United Nations-loyalty to the Charter. And yet, when we read the earlier part of the report, we find that proposals had been put forward

## <Pg-224>

by the Good Offices Committee for the examination of information to be submitted by the Union Government which would set up machinery of various kinds-the new Mandates Commission or whatever it may be called-in direct contravention of the machinery already set up by the United Nations, such as the Committee on South West Africa.

In paragraph (5) of the concluding remarks it is stated that if the General Assembly should indicate that it would be willing to consider as a possible alternative basis for agreement the partioning of the Territory, part of it to be placed under Trusteeship and the reminder to be annexed to the Union of South Africa, the Union Government would be prepared to carry out, by its own means, an investigation as to the practicability of such partitioning, and if that Government finds it practicable, it will submit to the United Nations proposals for partition. Now what does it all mean? It really means that the United Nations should come forward and sanctify annexation. Now if the General Assembly were to consider annexation, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it would be acting ultra vires, because in its first session, the General Assembly, after considering a similar proposition had already rejected annexation. The U.N. has not rescinded that resolution by a two-thirds majority. How can it, then, go back upon its own decisions?

As regards annexation-and it makes no difference whether part of the Territory or all of it is to be annexed-it means that the territory held in sacred trust is to be pushed back to become a colonial empire in a country, whose racial laws are nauseating in the extreme, apart from their being harsh on the people concerned. So much for one part of this proposal for partitioning the territory. As for the other part of partitioning, Mr. Chairman, I must say, I am quite sure that the authors of this report, probably, had not looked at it from this point of view: and I do hope I do not exaggerate when I say that the second part of this proposal is a demand-a request to the Assembly to internationalize apartheid, not merely in the Union of South Africa but in what is now an international territory. There will be set up two territories: one for the Whites and the other for the Non-Whites; and in this way apartheid will be internationalized. That is the proposition. I am afraid-and I am not being optimistic-this matter will gain no vote in this Assembly except that of the Union of South Africa, and since she is absent it will be unanimously rejected.

Of course the Union is quite willing to carry out an investigation, and who wouldn't in those circumstances? Therefore, I join with the Delegate of Haiti in saying that my Government will not in any way lend any support to any proposals for the partitioning of this Territory, not because the Territory may not be partitioned as a Trust Territory-it is conceivable that in the future a Trusteeship Agreement instead of providing for administration in one unit, may provide for administration in five units, or two units, or three units; that is not the point-but because we could not agree to a proposal whereby a part of this territory is to go out of what is called the "sacred trust". Even this trusteeship, contemplated for a part of the territory, is to be of a limited character, and we regret that in paragraph (7) the Committee expressed to the General Assembly the view that partition might provide a basis for an agreement concerning the Territory of South West Africa. With great respect we entirely reject this view. This will not provide the basis of an agreement; this will be the expression of the sanctification of apartheid by an international authority; it will take away the richest part of this Territory for colonial exploitation and for economic imperialism; it will be disregarding the provisions of the Charter and bowing before the challenge that has been thrown out to the United Nations. It will merely create a situation in which while we criticise, when criticism is due, the record of administration of countries like the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Belgium, Australia and the United States, who, voluntarily placed other mandated Territories under the United Nations Trusteeship, we shall be putting a premium on bad behaviour to put it mildly.

And then we are asked to encourage this partition idea! I think in discussing a question of this character we ought to go back to the basis on which the whole of this position rests. The South African claim, in as far as it has been acclaimed in opposition to the United Nations, is based upon the idea that they had this Territory mandated to them by the League of Nations. They are not prepared to accept any greater obligations than under the Mandate. For myself-though I think it is the wrong thing to say in this day and age when the world is not what it was at the time of the League of Nations, when hundreds and thousands of millions of people have come into the orbit of freedom, when all continents have come into this Organization, which was not the case during the life time of the League, and from that point of view it would be an indefensible position-but I am prepared to accept the position that we do not ask the South

<Pg-225>

African Government to accept any more obligations than those under the Mandate. But what are those obligations under the Mandate?

First of all, the essence of this Mandate system is the idea of a sacred trust. One doesn't have to belong to one religion or another or to any at all, in order to accept this conception. The element of sanctity in a trust is that it is dedicated, devoted exclusively to a certain end, and that end in this particular case is the well being

of the people, who have not yet attained self-government or independence. This was repeatedly stated by President Wilson at that time in his speeches and statements, and it was embodied in article 22 of what is called the Covenant of the League of Nations.

It is quite true that in those days, forty years ago, the advocacy of indigenous populations assuming the rights and obligations of self-government was not easily acceptable; but it was accepted by implication in the Covenant in so far as it said that this applied to peoples, who had not yet attained self-government, meaning thereby that they would attain, should attain self-government. "Sacred" also is something entitled to reverence and respect, but more than anything else sanctity involves inviolability of purpose, and is not to be profaned. We cannot abondon the basic purposes of the original foundation of this Sacred Trust.

This Sacred Trust has a comparatively early history stating, as most of these things, in the conflict between the haves and the have-nots, between liberty and authority, in the United Kingdom. A compatriot yours, in historical context, Mr. Chairman, who was one of the leaders of British political thought in the House of Commons, faced with the repression of the British in India, challenged the Government of the day. When Mr. Fox, the then Secretary of State, introduced the India Bill in the House of Commons in 1783, Edmund Burke had said "all political power, which is set over men, ought to be in some way or the other, exercised ultimately for their benefit. Every species of political dominion and every description of commercial privilege are all, in a strict sense, a Trust." It is the very essence of a Trust to be rendered accountable, and that is exactly where South Africa has challenged us. Therefore at this stage you will, perhaps, allow me to analyse our point of view briefly.

Whatever the content of this Trust, the main essence of it is accountability whether under the Mandates system or under United Nations Trusteeship. It may be that under the Mandate accountability is somewhat limited, but the point is in whom does this accountability vest? Surely the Mandatory Power is accountable to some one. It cannot be accountable to the population because the population is not yet free, and is not able to guard and look after its own interests.

Secondly, the Government of South Africa is not the Government of South West Africa. The Union Government is not the Government, much less the sovereign authority, over South West Africa. The Union of South Africa is the Administering Authority. It has no dominion over this Territory, is not a sovereign power of this Territory, it is truly a mandatory of this Territory. The League of Nations called upon it to look after it. It has already been set out in so many documents and so many text-books of law, in the advisory opinion of the World Court itself, that the Union Government has no sovereignty over South West Africa. No mandatory power has any sovereignty over the mandated Territories. Sovereignty does not rest neither in the Union Government, nor even in the United Nations or the League of

Nations. Sovereignty over this Territory rests in the people of that Territory alone and lies latent, and the purpose of development of the Territory is to make it actual. The latent sovereignty-some people call it retarded or reserved sovereignty-vests in the people and South African Government has a right to be there only to the extent that Administration had been conferred upon it by the League of Nations under certain conditions. That is the second aspect of the content of the international status of the Territory of South West Africa.

The third aspect is that there is no unlimited or residuary power vesting in the Union. The Union acts in the Territory, and administers it under a definite arrangement. Now therefore, I come to that part of it, for the South African Government and their friends bank a great deal on that part of Mandate, which says that the Territory is to be administered as an integral part of the Union, and the laws of the Union are applicable to the Territory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, subject to certain reservations, I submit that similar provisions exist in some Trusteeship Agreements whereby the Trust Territories may be treated as integral parts for administrative purposes only. In the case of South West Africa and the Union Government there is one factor, which we may never forget and that is that the laws which were to be administered and which were to be applied in this Territory were the laws of the Union as

#### <Pg-226>

they existed in 1920. It is since then that South Africa has made laws, which make the existence of a human being, who is not a white citizen of South Africa, very unenviable. As a distinguished South African Judge once said, they make so many laws in that country that if an African steps out of his house he commits a crime. The laws that are applicable to South West Africa are the laws framed by an imperialist government in a period of liberal thinking, in the days of Wilson. None of the laws, whether it be the Suppression of Communism Act, so called, or the White Bill, or the Black Bill, or the Blue Bill, none of these laws is applicable to this mandated territory. In this same way the old Common Law that is applicable to certain British Territories is the Common Law that they took from England at the time they went away. Any developments that took place in England thereafter are not included in it. And, therefore, if you take this view of the status then we come to the question, not whether South Africa would place these territories under Trusteeship in the future-and we can quite well understand why the Union, in view of the inapplicability of these attributes today should deny the international status of the Territory-but-what the obligations of the Union are in relation to the Mandate. There is the question of accountability. First there is no accountability to the indigenous population because they are not citizens, they are denied freedom. There is no accountability to the international authority.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that the League of Nations,

in this case, any more than the United Nations, is not a super-state. The League of Nations had no authority over this Territory, except in regard to the supervision of the Mandate. And, therefore, the argument that the League of Nations is dead is not relevant. The League of Nations may be dead, may have passed away; but, as Justice MacNair has pointed out, though the Mandator may not be there, the Mandatory Power is there, the Mandate is there, and the Mandate cannot be disturbed.

Now, the question arises: who are the parties? Sir Charles Arden Clarke's report speaks about the second party; it does not speak about the third party. As far as the Mandate is concerned, there are three parties: the League of Nations, the South African Government as the Mandatory Power, and the Principal party concerned, the people of South West Africa. They are the real owners of this place in whom sovereignty rests. So, if it is argued that the League of Nations having passed away the Union of South Africa becomes the residuary legatee of the League in so far as this Territory is concerned, that is a position that cannot be accepted.

Several statements were made by South Africa itself before this Organization and in the League of Nations before and at the time of its dissolution to the effect that the Mandatory Power was willing to continue to discharge its obligations as heretofore. "The Union will continue to administer the Territory." said Mr. Leif Egeland, a former colleague of mine, "scrupulously in accordance with the obligations of the Mandate, and for the advancement of moral and material interests of its inhabitants as she has done during the past six years when meetings of the Mandatory Commission could not be held. The disappearance of those organs of the League concerned with the supervision of the Mandates, primarily the Mandates Commission and the League Council, will necessarily preclude complete compliance with the letter of the Mandate. The Union Government will, nevertheless, regard the dissolution of the League as in no way diminishing its obligations under the Mandate, which it will continue to discharge with the full and proper appreciation of its responsibilities until such time as other arrangements are agreed upon concerning the future of this Territory." This is not our statement, it is a statement of the South African Government. I do not know this will translate into French or Spanish, Russian or Chinese, but these words-"until such time as other arrangements are agreed upon"-have got a significance. They presuppose the eventuation of an event which is to come. When you say "until such time any other arrangements are agreed upon" it does not presuppose that these arrangements will not come about; it means that they will come, but they will take time.

There are several similar statements made by the South African Union at various times. But here. I shall refer to only one more of these. In 1946 a memorandum was submitted by the South African Legation in Washington to the Secreatary-General of the United Nations, which stated that the responsibility of the Union Government as Mandatory was necessarily inalienable. In 1946 the Prime Minister of the Union

in a statement to the Fourth Committee repeated this declaration. On the 23rd July, 1947 in support of a resolution of the Union Parliament, the following declaration was made: "the Government should continue to render reports to the Organization, as it has done hitherto, under the Mandate. In the circumstances, the Union Government has no alternative but to maintain the status quo and to continue to administer the Territory in the spirit of the existing statute." It is, therefore, obvious

# <Pg-227>

that all that time, while the Union Government did not enter into a Trusteeship Agreement in respect of South West Africa, the matter was pending. There was no question of denying the Union's obligation of accountability.

Now from there, from this rather legalistic, if you like, or the more political-scientific content of the status of the Territory, we may come to one or two matters, which are important to the people of South West Africa. It is the essence of a Trust Territory of Mandated area that it is not to be exploited to the economic advantage of the Mandatory Power. Any such exploitation would be totally contrary to justice. If you look at this document that we have here before us, (S/3900) and look at the objections of the Union to placing this Territory under Trusteeship, then it will become clear that the reasons why these people cannot be free or be placed on the road to freedom, the reason why the sacred trust has been violated are: First, that South West Africa is essential to the security of the Union. Now, as I pointed out, the essence of the Trust is that the purposes, not of the Trustee, but of the Territory placed under trust come first.

Secondly, the interests of the Union of South Africa and South West Africa are inextricably bound with each other. Now, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I would say that that is not an unusual phenomenon. There are many trust territories in East Africa, for example, whose interests are bound with one another. There are many common arrangements between Tanganyika and certain other East African Territories. No one can take objection to these arrangements. It may be their economies are complementary. It may be that the development of one helps the development of the other and so on. But it cannot be said that because there is a relationship of a close character between two persons therefore one person cannot be free. Togetherness in this case lies in one person having his hand on the other fellow's throat. That's the very close proximity of which we hear, and a very convenient one! That is the inextricable nature of this relationship!

The third reason is that South West Africa by itself could not be economically viable. Now that is a very classic description of an imperialist power's attitude. An economy is not viable because under conditions of exploitation its resources will not be developed. It is not viable in the existing terms of trade so long as the people of a territory continue to be reduced to hewers of wood and drawers of

water.

Then the fourth reason is that the South African People-and I do not in any way minimize the burdens they carry-have borne financial responsibilities for the Territory's administration. First of all, it is difficult to make balance-sheet of what the imperial powers take out of place and what they put into it. But South Africa would not be the first Mandatory Power before us; she is not the only administering authority before us which has accepted responsibilities. We may turn around and ask, for example, the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom or of Belgium to what extent they have borne financial responsibilities, shall we say, in Tanganyika or some other place? Therefore, these are arguments, which not only have no substance in them, but contradict the whole conception of the sacred trust, and, what is more, they are cast in the conception of an exploiting imperialism.

Then we are told that there are two types of people here and the Bantu inhabitants have in the past, indicated their satisfaction with an agreement involving annexation of the Territory to the Union. It reminds one of the sorrowful tales of the days of slavery, when it was always said that slavery could not be abolished because the slaves did not want to be free. I ask, Mr. Chairman, how it is possible that the Bantu inhabitant is competent to express an opinion about the status of the territory if that status means alliance with South Africa, but it is competent to govern himself and express opinions in other ways. If he is competent to express his opinion, then he must be competent to govern himself. And if he is competent to govern himself, no question of annexation, no question of trusteeship arises. That is the position.

Then the question is: the League of Nations having passed away, if there was an authority in the League whether that authority should rest in the United Nations or not. There are two aspects I wish to consider. First of all, Sir, it is not a question merely of what agreement there was between the League and any other country in the world. Those who subscribe to the Charter have an obligation, and have a relationship with the rest of the world. The relationship with regard to the world problems will superviene any agreements that might have been reached in the past.

The Charter, in that sense, I cannot say eclipses, but comes above all these things; but over and above that, there is a sufficiently outstanding authority for us to rely upon; and

<Pg-228>

that is the fact that succession in regard to world affairs today rests in the United Nations. Now, on this question, again, there are so many observations and so much analysis of the position in the Advisory Opinion of the World Court that it is unnecessary to argue about it at length. There can only be one World Organization, if it is to be a World Organization. Otherwise it is only a half-World

Organization. When an international organization like the League of Nations-says one of these advisory opinions-disappear, another one is created, without indication as to whether the latter replaces the former. If the first organization has created an institution, such as the Mandate having for its purpose the same sacred trust of civilization as the Trusteeship created by the second Organization, then the latter must be considered as succeeding the former, ipso facto. Therefore the successor to the League is the United Nations, whatever may be the legal quibbles. But if, South Africa wants to argue that she is prepared to go on with the arrangements under the mandate, there may be a case for working that out. It is up to the United Nations to set up its own Mandates Commission, to receive reports on the territory, and to supervise the work in the same way that the League may have done. I can see a case in that way; but I cannot see a case, particularly with any authority, whereby one may say: the donor of this is dead; I am the beneficiary; I have got the beneficiary rights.

The mandate has not only been vitiated, it has been violated by nonaccountability. It is not that non-accountability is not selfevident, because South Africa itself submitted information. Again I regret that I cannot fully agree with the Good Offices Committee's report, which says that information should not be sent to the United Nations. It is quite true that article 73 is not the most complimentary, the most appropriate but trust or no trust, mandate or no mandate, this territory is non-self-governing, and article 73 applies to non-self-governing territories. It may be that it is not adequate, but then we should be the ones to complain. When South Africa sent in the reports, sent information, it was quite clear that the South African Government, as then constituted, felt that it was right to send these here, and it was evidently not, then, sure of its position in every way. Non-accountability having disappeared, the bottom has been knocked out of the Mandate altogether. So all this argument is futile in as far as the doctrine of nonaccountability is not accepted. The idea that these peoples ought to progress towards selfg-overnment-their independence is latent-should fructify the administration. Though the League resolution (of April 18, 1946) says that at the termination of the League's existence, the functions of the League with regard to the mandated territories would come to an end, it goes on to note that Chapters XI, XII, XIII of the Charter embody principles corresponding to those declared in article 22 (of the League Covenant). It goes on further to take note of the expression of intentions of the member of the League, which included the Union of South Africa, to continue to administer the territories mandated to them for the well-being and development of the peoples concerned in accordance with the obligations contained in the Mandates until other arrangements are agreed upon. Therefore, the question of there being nobody to step into the shoes of the League of Nations does not exist.

I come now to the almost fantastic suggestion, if I may use the word without offence, in regard to an agreement with the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. Who are the Principal Allied and Associated

Powers? The Principal Allied and Associated Powers are the USA, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, and then other powers constituting with the Principal Powers mentioned above are the Allied and Associated Powers. I say, first, that even if there was to be an agreement of the kind suggested, if this were to hold any water at all, especially in this day and age, you could not separate the Principal Allied and Associated Powers from the Allied and Associated Powers as a whole, and these latter include Belgium, China, Ecuador, Cuba, Bolivia, Brazil and all of us who sit here-or most of us. But for the purposes of this argument I need not go so far. One of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers is His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom ef Great Britain and Ireland, the British Dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India. Now, my distinguished colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom will notice that this was the title of His Majesty, prior to 1932. Those were the days when the King of the United Kingdom was sovereign of the territory of South Africa and of India. If you read the list of signatories of the Versailles Treaty, you will find that the United Kingdom was represented by five delegations: the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa so she is herself one of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, and what the Union Government is asking is that she concludes a treaty with herself-Britain and New Zealand; and also Indlia, represented by the Rt. Hon. Edwin Montagu and His Highness the Maharajah of Bikaner. If there are Principal Allied and Associated Powers, we are part of, and successor to, these Allied and Associated Powers. Therefore there can be no

#### <Pg-229>

question of resurrecting this ghost of the Principal Allied Powers, the remnant of a predatory imperialism, in order to beat the purposes of the trusteeship system.

If I go back, the conception of the sacred trust and of the discharge of this trust, which is not an invention of the modern age, and does notcome from what may be called an extreme doctrine, comes from the arch-priest of British Conservatism, Edmund Burke, when he impreached the Government of the day for maladministration. The charges were the assumption of autocratic powers, breaches of trusteeship-breach of trusteeship now is worse than in the days when there were no trusteeship agreements-and injustices to the, people under its charge in India. Burke ended his historic speech of the 15th February, 1788-antl we do not seem to have moved very much further with South African relations; we seem to have moved very muck backwards-with an indictment and impeachmet of Warren Hastings, who is alleged to have perpetrated so many bad things in India. The impeachment was made not by him as individual but as a leader of the House of Commons. He said:-

"I impeach Warren Hastings,..

I impeach him in the name of the Commons of Great Britain in

parliament assembled .... I impeach him in the name of the people of India, I impeah him in the name of human nature itself....

The whole of this conception stands convicted today in the name of the people of South West Africa. It stands convicted in the name of what We call the Declaration of Human Rights. And here we are asked to hand over these people to a country, which has practised Apartheid and glorifies it which tells the world shamefacedly that this is the pattern you should follow in order to solve the racial problem of the world; we are asked to hand over a territory, whose people have said here that their position is that of helots, that they are foreigners in the land that gives thern birth, whose toil makes its wealth.

I do not wish to subscribe to any of the views that have been put forward as to how this partition line would work because I think this whole idea is evil in its conception, it is evil in its description and evil in its consequences. But if you look at it, you will find that the sea-board of South West Africa, all of its territory, its great mineral wealth-they are all going to be annexed, I here are some 50,000 non-indigenous people in South West Africa and a considerably large number of others. No one has suggested that this Territory should be distributed proportionately. I am not would have you agree to that, but on one has suggested that. What is suggested is a kind of equality; one chicken, one horse. Therefore, in considering this question we are taking into account the fate of these people and what is more, not only the fate of these people-I hope that the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom will bear with me-but if anything should happen to this territory by some adverse wantonness or by some extra-constitutional action to bring it under the Union, what happens to those Innocent people of Bechuanaland, whom the protee lion of the British Crown has kept away from obvious and extreme Apartheid, who enjoy comparatively human conditions, and the territory of South Africa should spread into these areas, and industrialization drag from these other areas peoples who will come under this inhuman tyranny. Therefore, the whole of this report of the Good Offices Committee is ultra vires in the sense that no committee appointed by this Organization can conceivably llave the right even to entertain propositions that are a violation of the Charter. And I submit the basis of this consideration is a violation of the charter; it is disregard of the United Nations.

It is not my intention to go into the very many legal aspects of this case. My colleagues will deal with other aspects of the question of South West Africa. Mr. Chairman it is sufficient for the day to say that thereis no reason at all why these territories should not be placed under Trusteeship: the strongest argument one sometimes hears in various circles is that the World Court's advisory opinion has said, or rather a majority opinion has said that there is no legal obligation on the part of South Africa to place this Territory under Trusteeship. It would be wrong, if I may say so, to quote three Summarizing paragraphs of this minute without reading the whole of the judgement. What does it say in regard to question What the

provisions of chapter 12 of the Charter do not impose on the Union of South Africa a legal obligation to place the Territory under the Trusteeship system. I submit, Mr. Chairman, a legal obligation in the sense of the interpretation of legal texts-perhaps not. But certainly there is placed upon the Union of South Africa a Charter obligation. I am not referring to a moral obligation, but a Charter obligation. The Charter placed the obligation. Now in this matter a great play is made of the use of the word "may" in the relevant article of the Charter. There again I have not the advantage of reading

## <Pg-230>

other translations of this article. I turn to article 75 of the United Nations which reads: "shall establish under its authority a trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements."

These territories are, hereafter, referred to as Trust Territories. I submit Mr. Chairman, that this 'may' is merely an expression of simple futurity. And when it comes it will be so placed this is not the intention. The reason for this is that the territories that come under trusteeship are not contemplated to be only those that were mandated, but others as well. And that is the reason for this 'may', because other cases--in cases of territories not under mandate--it must be purely a voluntary choice, because they are not under any kind of trusteeship.

If a kind of sacred trust prevails in the world, and the people who are one of the parties to the sacred trust are Member States and the other party, the people over whom the trusteeship is exercised, are the humanity of the world covered by the Charter, covered by the Declaration of Human Rights, covered by International Law, covered by ordinary decency, then I think that the trusteeship organ which has lapsed or is reincarnated in this form becomes a legitimate recipient. What is more, the trusteeship system provides for agreements of different characters; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, whatever strong views one may hold, we would be the last people to object if South Africa came here to conclude a trusteeship agreement of a character different from those existing in regard to Tanganyika or Western Samoa, or New Guinea or Marshall Islands. She is entitled to do so. But, I submit, she has a Charter obligation to enter into a trusteeship agreement, and this second paragraph of question B in the majority opinion (of the I.C.J.) should not be extracted from the context of the opinion. For, in other parts of the same opinion, on page 144 (Question C) for example, it is stated that "the Union of South Africa, acting alone, has not the competence to modify the international status of the territory of South West Africa." So, in this very opinion of the World Court, which has by a majority of 8 to 6, said that there is no legal obligation to place the territory under trusteeship, it is also said that changes of status must be with the permission of the United Nations.

Now you may well say, nobody is changing the status. I prefer to leave alone at the moment the characterisation of Union Government's position as conceding international "character"--not status--to the territory, but that is not the issue.

I submitted to you. Sir, the conception of my Government as to the content of the status, and, therefore, further submit that this modification has already taken place. Modification has taken place, or would take place if there were no accountability. The South African Government finds itself in the position in which the former kind of accountability is not taking place. And since it may not, acting alone, change the territory's status, then it must resort to other methods of accountability; and if it must resort to other methods of accountability, then it must come before the United Nations. Therefore, while paragraph 2 of this page (page 144 of the opinion of the I.C.J.) is correct in a very limited way, the Charter obligation turns up because the Union may not change the status of the territory. And if she does not continue to be accountable, then she changes the status and thereby she violates the mandate and she violates the principles of the Charter. On the other hand if she wants not to change the status, but at least maintain status quo, then she has to accept accountability, and accountability can only be to those who are here today in the world. In order to maintain the status quo, the Union has got to accept some form of accountability and, therefore, to make use of this Organization for that purpose in one form or another.

There could be no objection--I am not expressing an opinion of my government--there will be no objection to the argument, to looking at this proposition if the Union Government came and said: we do not like these new-fangled ideas of your Trusteeship agreements, which are bilateral agreements, contracts entered into; we are prepared that the United Nations should step into the shoes of the League of Nations and accept the mandate of South Africa as it stands, and merely alter the words "League of Nations" into "United Nations"; and it will be up to the United Nations to set up its own Mandates Commission. But the plans which are aired in this report--I do not want to be unfair, nor do I want to overstate the case of Sir Ardon Clarke--would provide for the setting up of a South West Africa Council, and then having a Mandates Commission selected for South West Africa. The South West Africa council would have three permanent Members--and those three permanent Members have a particular character. Thus administering or ruling powers would select the Mandates Commission. Therefore the tribunal before whom this question will go, who will be investigating reports and informations concerning the

#### <Pg-231>

administration of the territory, will be handpicked by a body consisting of three permanent Members from among the Allied and Associated Powers on the one hand, and on the other, two others elected not by the General Assembly, but by these three. Apart from

the Jarring note produced in all democratic conceptions, this method whereby on the one hand will be put three people, who have no basis in this matter at the present time, to select two other; and then these five to select a sub-committee called the Mandates Commission would imply a degree of indirect representation, which even 200 years ago would have been considered rather autocratic.

So far as this particular report is concerned, we deeply regret that nothing fruitful has come out of it. We regret that even such a person as Sir Arden Clarke, and his colleagues, approaching the South African Government has not been able to get any further than the statements of the Union Government made in this country and in this Organization. To the extent they got further is the blatant, unqualified request for the amputation of this territory and the surrender of it for colonial greed. That is to say, we are invited to be parties to colonial depradation; we are invited to be parties to the internationalizing of this infamous doctrine of Apartheid. We are asked to sanctify the violation, the profaning of the Sacred Trust, which has been placed in their hands. We are asked to disregard all the statements made by President Wilson and by General Smuts, Article 22 of the Covenant, and the Covenant of the League of Nations itself. We are, what is more, asked to forswear our own existence, to disregard ourselves as a world Organization--not a world authority, but a world Organization, which has made provisions for the looking after of these populations that are not yet mature for self-Government.

So from the point of view of accountability then mandate stands violated; from the point of view of what may be called the social or more material conditions of life, we have had the evidence not only of the people, who have come before us as petitioners, but of various documents submitted to us, that though 38 years have elapsed since this territory was placed under Mandate, these conditions have deteriorated. And do not let us forget that a mandatory is placed over these mandated areas because the mandatory is superior in civilization. It so happens that the people of South West Africa are the champions of freedom; they are undergoing sacrifices, they have to face the music, they take the risks of rebellion, they take the risks of protest. Are they the more advanced people or the people who deny them their freedom? The South West Africans are receiving into their community people of a different complexion, people of a different race. They work for these people, but the position cannot be reversed. So, let us ask ourselves as people who have pledged faith to the principles of the Charter: where does the incidence of civilization, so-called, lie?--with the people, who take those risks in order to obtain freedom, or with the people who use power and influence in order to suppress freedom?

We are told that there is no slavery in South West Africa, but those of you who care could read the report of the International Labour Organisation on Forced Labour. It says that there is forced labour in the Union of South Africa and there is forced labour in the territory of South West Africa. The Mandates, either by implication or

otherwise, did not permit special privileges for any Member of League of Nations. The Trusteeship agreements also do not admit of any such privileges. But the report of the International Labour Organisation to which I referred, Sir, reveals a different picture.

The whole basis of the Union's argument is that everything must necessarily be yoked to the interests of the Union of South Africa. My government, my country, the people of our country wish prosperity to South Africa, and we believe that prosperity, that power and strength will be increased by the liberation of these large numbers of people, by the exploitation of the wealth of this land in the interest of the people as a whole, by the removal of the this pernicious doctrine which divides man from man and creates a class of chosen people to rule over others. Only a few years ago the world went to the cataclysm of war to overthrow that doctrine.

Therefore, in considering this report, Mr. Chairman, I once again say: we are not merely considering just an item on the agenda--each item being as important--we are here considering the whole question of human rights, the question of freedom, the question of going back in our tracks on the liberation from colonial system, which the aftermath of the Treaty of Versailles produced in the Mandates system and which ultimately became advanced in the Trusteeship System. We are also considering whether one country, one Member State, can come here and say: you are not doing enough for us; we will resurrect the Allied and Associated Powers. Are we going to create a parallel Organization, when there is already so much division, so much difficulty even in our own organisation? The universality of this Organization is challenged.

#### <Pg-232>

Then--I won't say the authority--the sanctity of the Charter is challenged. We are called upon to internationalise--I repeat this again, to internationalise--this infamous doctrine of Apartheid. My Government will therefore, in no way, subscribe to any of these proposals.

As to the approach to be made in this matter, there is only one way. The time will come when the spirit of man will free itself in the continent of Africa. Whether he be black, white, blue, yellow, brown or of any other colour, he will establish the freedom on the basis of which humanity can progress. We are the representatives of free governments. We should not in any way subscribe to turn the clock back, and put people in the conditions of slavery. This is not a market; this is not a slave-market, where a government can come and say: you give us three-quarters of this territory, and we shall not look for the other one. This is, if I may say so, the most objectionable form of bargaining.

I went to conclude by saying that it should not be sufficient to analyse this problem. My Government will be prepared to take into account the fact that South Africa may want to stick to the letter of the law and say: the mandate--and no farther. Yes, why not the mandate? There is enough in the mandate. It may not be as explicit, as well-worded. And yet there is enough in the mandate to carry out the principle of accountability; there is enough in the mandate to enable close examination of the administration of the territory; there is enough in the mandate for the fresh winds of world publicity to go into reactionary methods and inhuman ways of treating people. Machinery should be set up so that the United Nation's side is concerned, that is our business. That is to say, the mandate--the texture of the mandate--ought to be transferred to the United Nations (and U say the words 'United Nations' should be substituted wherever the word 'League' appears), and then it would be for the United Nations, without disregard for the obligations in relation to South Africa, under the terms of the Covenant and of the Charter, to produce the machinery which will take care of the doctrine of accountability, and of the progressing of this people in conditions of freedom

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we submit that the Assembly as a whole, unanimously, both in this committee and, in the plenary session, should refuse to countenance this report, and demand from the South African Government, appeal to them to take into account the wails, the appeals and the cries that come from the suppressed peoples of South West Africa. And who today would use the words against freedom, that are used in a memorandum of the South African Government? Only this morning, at the Trusteeship Council, we had the pleasure of hearing the distinguished delegate of France, who told us of a great event, of the march of progress taking place in Togoland. The Prime Minister of the new Togoland is the man who was petitioning before us a year ago. So, the petitioner of today is the administrator of tomorrow. Changes can take place, even in South West Africa. For the last thirty years, the changes have been in one direction, but, of course, the bottom will be touched some day and there will be a change, because the spirit of men cannot be crushed, whether he be African or of some other continent. And there are large number of people in Africa, not merely indigenous populations, people who helped to build the economy of the country, people who come from your country, Sir, and from other countries, from liberal traditions and who are as opposed to this system as any others. The duty of the United Nations of world public opinion, is to lend support to these great moral forces that exist in the world in order that the freedom of man may grow from more to more.

INDIA USA MALI SOUTH AFRICA BRAZIL IRELAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC HAITI AUSTRALIA BELGIUM FRANCE ITALY RUSSIA JAPAN CHINA ECUADOR BOLIVIA CUBA CANADA NEW ZEALAND GUINEA MARSHALL ISLANDS WESTERN SAMOA

**Date**: Oct 13, 1958

# **Volume No**

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

#### Shri Arthur Lall's Speech in the General Assembly

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, on Oct 30, 1958 in the United Nations General Assembly, on the distribution of non-technical top posts in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

We are very glad to be able to participate in this debate, though we do so agreeing with the point made by the representative of France. This issue of the work of the Agency is an important matter. The International Atomic Energy Agency is perhaps the most important body that has been established in the family of the United Nations for many years. In our opinion, the item concerning the report of this Agency should have been put on our agenda after much more notice.

As this Assembly is aware, great stress has

<Pg-233>

been laid, throughout the stages of bringing this Agency into being and immediately after it came into being, on the need for a close relationship between the Agency and the United Nations. I find that Mr. Cole, the Director-General himself, has stressed that point. He said that the Agency "should work in particularly close contact with the United Nation." (A/PV 777, page 4). Again, he has said that it has been "clear from its inception that the Agency was intended to and can work effectively only if it is closely linked to United Nations". (Ibid). We agree with these sentiments, but we do not feel that it is consistent with these sentiments and with the necessities of the case that this debate should take place at such short notice, which inevitably curtails its effectiveness--and that is a great pity. However, I intend to revert to this matter of the relationship of the Agency with the United Nations.

There have been aspects of the Agency during the past year which we welcome. We welcome, for example, the increase in membership. We find that there were on 30 June this year sixty-six members as opposed to the fifty-four members at the opening of the first session of the General Conference. This is welcome. This shows, indeed, the great hope that the countries of the world have in this Agency. It shows that the Agency has a great responsibility which it must become able to fulfil.

Then, again, we take note of the fact that at the second regular session of the General Conference the Governments of Japan and the United States announced that they contemplated placing under the

Agency's safeguard a bilateral agreement for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I am not quite clear what is meant by the word "contemplated". I take it, though, that, if this announcement was made, the intention is that this bilateral agreement should be placed under Agency safeguard, and we shall observe this matter with great interest. It would certainly be an interesting development of the Agency's functions, which was indeed contemplated when the Statute was drawn up.

I would also draw attention to the offers of experts and consultants which have been made to the Agency. Among those offering such experts and consultants is India, and of course there are other countries that have offered large numbers. Apparently it has not been possible for much use to be made of these offers, but we hope that that will become the case in the near future.

Then there are interesting offers of fellowship which are mentioned, and we hope that it will be possible to make use of these offers fully.

However, having said so much on the positive side regarding developments in the International Atomic Energy Agency, the delegation of India, which, as I have said, is speaking at short notice on this important matter, would like to draw attention to two important points. One is that, though a great deal of energy has been expended by the Agency in building up its administration, perhaps too much energy has been expended in this direction. We are, of course, aware of the difficulties of building up a new organization of this kind, but still it seems as though almost too much energy has been expended on this particular aspect.

Though this has been done, we feel that the distribution of posts in the Agency, particularly at the top levels, leaves much to be desired. We are quite aware of the fact that competence in this field is limited geographically. But, if one studies the posts in this Agency, one finds that there is a very large number of non-technical posts, and we think that a more equitable distribution of the posts at the top levels could have been made. I say this now with some hesitation but I think it is a fact which should be brought out. The distribution of the top echelon posts in this Agency is not in accordance with the informal agreements which were reached regarding the staffing of the Agency when it was set up, and that is highly regrettable.

We should like to see steps taken to remedy this state of affairs. This Agency is of great concern to the whole world, and it does not conduce to effective co-operation bodies of this in kind if the staffing is on too limited a geographical basis at the top levels. It creates a wrong spirit in a body of this kind and we are anxious that that should not occur.

I come now to a point that I mentioned at the commencement of these brief remarks, that is, the closeness of the relationship of this

Agency with the United Nations. It has always been repeated throughout and is quite clear in the relationship agreement with the United Nations that this is an Agency under the aegis of the United Nations. This phrase was used repeatedly at the Washington negotiations when the Statute was being hammered out. It was then used again repeatedly at the New York Conference on the Statute. We feel that greater attention must be paid to the implementing of this close relationship between the Agency and the United Nations.

# <Pg-234>

We regret, for our part, the fact that it was not possible for the Agency to use the Secretary-General's Scientific Advisory Committee. This was a point which was mentioned in the relationship agreement itself, and yet it has been necessary for the Director-General to set up another committee. We realise that he has adhered as far as possible to the membership of the Secretary-General's Advisory Committee, but here was an opportunity, which is mentioned in the relationship agreement, to implement the close association of the Agency with the United Nations, and we are very sorry that it was lost. We do not think that the setting aside of that opportunity is consistent with the relationship agreement.

There is another general point that I should like to make in connexion with this relationship. The peaceful side of atomic energy work cannot be divorced in the minds of men from the other side of atomic energy. This relationship between these two aspects of atomic energy is inevitably a close one. The General Assembly has been struggling with the problem of disarmament and of the banning, the non-manufacture and the non-testing of nuclear weapons. As it achieves success in that field--and in fact at this session a beginning will be made and we hope that this success will shortly be achieved--there must be a close relationship between the Agency, charged with the primary responsibility in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and disarmament.

This is an important reason why the Agency must maintain the closest contact with the General Assembly and the United Nations. It is for the General Assembly, and it is for this Agency, to work out the details of this close co-operation. We would welcome some further steps in this direction in the next report of the Agency. We hope the Agency will give attention to this matter and will come here with suggestions next year so that the Assembly may take steps to implement those suggestions.

In closing, Mr. President, we do trust that next year we will be given more time to prepare for the debate on this important issue.

INDIA FRANCE USA JAPAN RUSSIA

**Date**: Oct 30, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Speech in the Political Committee

Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, delivered the following Speech at the United Nations Political Committee on the joint draft resolution by India and Yugoslavia, on Oct 24, 1958:

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my brief intervention today is relatively simple. The members of the Committee have already seen, and have before them, A/C.1/L.210 and A/C.1/L.211, which are two draft resolutions submitted by the delegations of India and Yugoslavia, under item 64 of the angenda. One draft resolution relates to the machinery disarmament within the United Nations, and the other draft resolution relates to our attitude and hopes in the matter of the technical Conference which will soon convene in Geneva to study technical aspects of measures against the possibility of surprise attack.

I have sought the indulgence of this Committee very briefly to introduce these draft resolutions, and I am happy that our other cosponsor, Yugoslavia, through its representative, will also add its voice to mine in introducing these texts. I will therefore be very brief indeed.

Too long have we in the United Nations hovered close to decisions on disarmament, too long have we come near a peak of decision, only to find it to be a peak of indecision from which we slipped down a slope of frustration. We have achieved, in terms of positive results, not even the subtraction of a single weapon from the total armoury of the world. On the contrary, armaments continue to build up.

The nature of present armaments and their growing volume and quantity are the basic reasons for th approach which this Committee will find in the draft—resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.210 on machinery within the United Nations for a continuing consideration of disarmament. The time has gone when the impact of weapons was on a specific target. The impact of modern weapons, not only of the weapons in use but of those when they are being tested, is on the world in general. We all know that if a war was let loose with the weapons which are now at the disposal of mankind there would be no question of spectators. Even those who did not participate in the war would be victims. It is this fundamental fact which has altered the nature of the discussions in this Committee.

Anyone who compares the discussions of this Committee at the current session with those of five or six years ago will find that, whereas the latter discussions were largely confined to generalities except in the case of a few countries,

# <Pg-235>

today, the representatives of almost all the countries of this greatly enlarged Assembly, which now numbers eighty-one Member States, are deeply concerned about the armaments position in the world. It cannot be hidden from the most innocent member of the world community--and none of the representatives in this rooms is in that sense innocent--that his fate today is bound up with this question of disarmament. This is not now a question which can or should concern two, three, four, five or six Powers; this is a question which does concern the generality of the membership of the United Nations. Therefore, whatever may have been the justification for arrangements, which many of us helped to initiate, which were made in the past-that is to say, arrangements of small groups of countries to form Disarmament Commissions, Sub-Committees or what have you--whatever may have been the justification for that sort of approach, it has been outdated by the developments in weapons by certain countries.

It no longer can be claimed that disarmament is the concern of four countries. It is the concern of this whole United Nations. It is the concern of every Member State in this room.

This has been stated repeatedly by speakers in this debate. It has been stated practically on those terms by the representative of the United Kingdom. And it had frequently been stated by other representatives whose countries are more closely concerned, simply in respect of the fact that they are more heavily armed that others, that the United Nations can never rid itself of its responsibility in the field of disarmament.

One more point in this connexion: It cannot have escaped the membership of this Committee that the only time in the year when we do face the problem of disarmament squarely is during the debate in this Committee on the subject of disarmament. Here, we do often seem to come near positive decisions, and this must be related to the fact that a large volume of opinion from countries big and small, from all parts of the world expresses itself on the urgency of these problems. Then the debate is over, the curtain is rung down, the General Assembly ceases to function, and we hear nothing of disarmament of another nine months.

Sometimes committees have sat elsewhere; but they have not got very far. It is no disrespect to the countries which sat on the Disarmament Sub-Committee to say that we feel we can no longer allow them to sit in that small group and try to reach conclusions. The plain fact is that the world cannot wait while a few eminent gentlemen representing great countries, fail to reach agreement on disarmament. How much more tension will the world bear before there

is an explosion of the most terrifying weapons which man has created? How much longer can we leave it to countries which, while they undoubtedly have had the best will in the world, have been unable to make any progress in disarmament? We do not want to blame those countries for having failed. But the plain fact is that these matters do not brook much further delay and that we cannot leave these matters of disarmament to countries which, for one reason or another, during the many years they have been given by this Assembly to achieve results, have failed to do so. We cannot take that attitude. No country in the would can take that attitude in the interests of its own security, and no country can take that attitude from a humane point of view. How can we stand aside and allow this situation to continue?

Therefore, it is logical and it is reasonable that the world as a whole should involve itself in this issue of disarmament and should be in a position to meet continuously, if necessary, but certainly at any time, in order to consider those issue which are now creating this fearsome prospect for our world as a whole.

It is against this background, it is with this sort of thinking in mind, that the delegations of Yugoslavia and Indian have proposed that the Disarmament Commission shall now be composed of all Members of the Untied Nations.

Let it not be said to us in reply that such a large body cannot take specific measures in disarmament. Who can say this to us? Can those four countries which have sat fruitlessly for years in a subcommittee turn around and say that to us? We do not accept it from them We do not accept it from the Disarmament Commission--the slightly larger group--which has also made no progress. This sort of statement, that we must be a small group in order to reach specific conclusions on issues of disarmament, does not cut any ice. Where have the small groups led us? To endless frustration, to a growing enormity of the problem, to a growing terror in the world. Therefore, we will not accept the argument that eighty-one Members of the Untied Nations are too large a group to make progress in the field of disarmament. We cannot accept that argument. Time is against us. The small groups have failed. The large group--the generality of the world--must now face this problem and attempt to reach solutions piecemeal in this field.

### <Pg-236>

Here, then, is the resolution, saying that we should all join in this endeavour and that we should meet from time to time, as necessary and appropriate.

We do not wish to spell out what subsidiary bodies, what committees or sub-committees, might evolve. That, we think, is something which will happen in the normal course of discussions in the Disarmament Commission as enlarged. It is no secret that, even while this Committee is sitting, a great deal of work goes on in smaller groups,

in informal discussions of groups which get together and try to look at problems confornting this Committee as a whole. It is not necessary to spell out these things. They will develop as required. And should the time come when the enlarged Disarmament Commission feels that a more formal small group should be set up for a certain purpose, it will be able to take such action.

These few remarks of mine dispose of the questions that might be asked: ``What about small groups? What about sub-committees?" Those small formal sub-committees have not been tremendously useful so far. At any rate, we envisage--and I am sure I speak also for the representative of Yugoslavia in this matter--the possibility of ad hoc formations of groups; we envisage the possibility that the Disarmament Commission will itself formally set up certain groups on certain specific tasks, should that appear to be the most practicable way of achieving progress. Nothing like that is ruled out by this draft resolution.

It is, fundamentally, a draft resolution which expresses the fact of today--the fact that all of us equally are involved, for life or for death, in this matter of disarmament. That is why we have introduced that draft resolution.

The second draft resolution, on the matter of the conference dealing with measures against the possibility of surprise attack, is a brief one. We hope that the conference will be very fruitful. We hope that the exchanges which will take place will be held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. We hope that the terrible suspicion and fear which clouds such meetings will lift and will allow results to be achieve.

However, because we take the view that the General Assembly must concern itself with disarmament, we have asked that those who will participate in this study should inform the United Nations of the progress that they achieve--and in due course, at the right time, it might then be possible for the Assembly as a whole, or for the Disarmament Commission, to give a further push to the efforts which will take place at Geneva commencing 10 November. We do sincerely wish those efforts well.

On paper, these resolutions often look like formalities. But that is the disadvantage of black ink and white paper and of the fact that our minds have become used to seeing so much black ink on white paper. But the resolutions are not actually formalities. They represent the deep feelings of the countries of the world that, even in this relatively abstruse conference on technical measures relating to surprise attack, there should be substantial progress which will lift some of the burden of potential disaster from the shoulders of this frightened world of ours.

INDIA YUGOSLAVIA SWITZERLAND USA MALI

Date: Oct 24, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the President of the Security Council

The following is the text of a letter dated Oct 24, 1958 from India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, Shri Arthur S. Lall, to the President of the Security Council. The letter refers to Pakistan Representative's letter of August 27, 1958.

I have the honour to refer to the letter of the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan dated August 27, 1958, as issued in document No. S/4092 dated August 28, 1958.

He has sought to argue that ``That the Security Council does not entertain India's contention is evident from all of its resolutions generally..." Furthermore he has advanced the

plea that the decision of the Security Council to continue consideration of the issue is in itself conclusive proof that at no stage did it ever consider the issue to fall within the domestic jurisdiction of either India or Pakistan. Neither argument has any foundation, in fact.

There is not a single provision in the Security council resolution of january 17, 1948, or the United Nations commission's resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949--the basic resolutions on this matter which India and Pakistan both have accepted--which gives Pakistan any locus standi in Jammu and Kashmir. Furthermore, Sir Owen Dixon, United Nations Representative, stated that the Pakistan invason

<Pg-237>

of Jammu and Kashmir is inconsistent with international law. It is a matter of the highest importance that neither the United Nations Commission nor the Security Council--nor indeed any of the three resolutions--has at any time questioned the legality of Jammu and Kashmir's accession to India, or the lawful presence of Indian troops in Jammu and Kashmir which is Indian territory. On the other hand, the resolutions require India to keep sufficient troops in Jammu and Kashmir for its security, including the observance of law and order.

The Acting Permanent Representative of pakistan has torn out of their context extracts from certain statements made by the Prime Minister

of India and telegrams which he sent to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He has withheld mentioning the crucial fact which the Prime Minister of India has emphasized time and again, namely that the problem has been created and bedevilled by Pakistan's aggression which continues to this day and without the ending of which it is futile to look for a lasting solution. One extract from a speech made by the Prime Minister of India in Parliament of August 7, 1952 from which the Pakistan Permanent Representative has chosen to give four extracts, will show the danger of quoting passages out of context:

``...All this is much more than can be said for Pakistan in this matter, because the entire Kashmir business is based on fundamental lie--the lie Pakistan has told in denying that she invaded Kashmir ...The armies of Pakistan were in Kashmir for six months and then they denied the whole thing. When you base a case on a lie, the lie has to be repeated; and it was repeated in the Security Council month after month. Their armies were still in Kashmir and their Foreign Minister went on saying that they were not there. That was an astonishing thing. When the United Nations Commission was here and was on the point of going to the front and when there was no possibility of concealing this fact any longer, they admitted it..."

As for fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person, which are emphasized toward the end of the letter from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan the following press comments in Pakistan are a sorry commentary on the actual state of affairs in that part of Jammu and Kashmir which Pakistan has seized by force:

"The decisions for the formation of all Governments installed in Azad Kashmir during the last ten years were taken in Karachi. They were all undemocratic and were forced upon the masses from Karachi. These Governments were against the claims of Pakistan that she wanted to achieve the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris." (Insaf, December 14, 1957)

"The way democracy has been trampled under foot for ten years in the area called Azad Kashmir has tarnished Pakistan's reputation, and Azad Kashmir is an area over which India has no control. India has never placed hurdles in democratizing the administration in this region, in forming a popular Government, and in enabling the people to exercise their right of self-determination...All this could be done by Pakistan." (Awaz-e-Haq, April 11, 1958)

In regard to the subsequent letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan, dated 10 September 1958 (S/4095), I wish simply to draw attention to my letter dated 15 August 1958 (S/4086) in which I have stated that the Government of India did not think it proper or dignified that the Security Council should be burdened with baseless and tendentious communications.

I request that this letter be circulated to the members of the Security Council as a Security Council document.

Accept, etc.

(Arthur S. Lall)

Ambassador Extraordinary and

Plenipotentiary

Permanent Representative of india

to the United Nations.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Oct 24, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G.S. Pathak's Statement on Apartheid Policy

The following is the text of a statement made by Shri G.S. Pathak, Member of the Indian delegation to the United Nations, in the Special Political Committee on South

<Pg-238>

Africa's Apartheid Policy on Oct 13, 1958:

On 26 November 1957 the General Assembly passed a resolution, reiterating its previous resolutions on the subject, and appealing to the Government of the Union of South Africa, in the interests of the common observance of the high principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter, to revise its policy of apartheid in the light of those principles and purposes and of world opinion. This appeal has met with no response. The Government of the Union of South Africa informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations on March 1, 1958 that it was not prepared to take note of the aforesaid resolution and the previous resolutions on the subject, as it maintained that the matters dealt with in the said resolutions were essentially within its domestic jurisdiction.

The plea has been raised, but always without success, before the General Assembly and other organs of the U.N., on so many occasions since 1946 that it is futile now to seek shelter behind the domestic

jurisdiction clause of the Charter, where violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter and the infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms are involved. Consistently, the General Assembly and other organs have repelled this plea and this rule in favour of the competence of the G.A. is now deeply embedded in the jurisprudence of the U.N. The General Assembly never felt any doubt about the correctness of its view and always proceeded on the footing that it had the competence to examine the question of breech of obligations by Member States as imposed by the Charter in relation to the observance of human right and fundamental freedoms.

The U.N. Commission on the racial situation in the Union of South Africa also examined the question of the competence of the General Assembly, and of its own, at considerable length. The discussion of the question by the Commission is so full and the reasons given by it are so cogent that it should suffice to refer to paragraph 254 of the first report of the Commission where the conclusion has been set out. The plea of domestic jurisdiction was raised last year also by the Union of south Africa in connection with this very item, and my delegation submits that it is now not open to the Union of South Africa to disregard the resolutions passed by the General Assembly on a wholly untenable plea like this.

The failure on the part of the Union, however, does not absolve us from our duty to examine the present position and to recommend such action as is demanded by the circumstances of the case. The picture of the race relations emerging from the facts determined by the U.N. Commission has been portrayed with such ability and clearness by the Commission in its reports that it is not necessary to reiterate the factual position of the race relations existing in the Union of South Africa. The Union of South Africa is a centralised State in which the real sovereignty is exercised by Parliament consisting of members who are all Europeans. Representing only a numerical minority the socalled Europeans want to maintain their position of domination over the majority and deny to the latter the political rights which they themselves enjoy. The Commission noted that the Union of South Africa closely resembles a colonial power, but one whose colonies, or, if the term is preferred, protectorates, are scattered over the territory of the metropolitan country itself (para 298 of the First Report).

The policy of apartheid has resulted in separation through the entire fabric of social and economic life in the Union. There is suggestion in hospital, churches, cemeteries, public baths and conveniences, playgrounds, tram-cars, railways, schools, universities, public parks, factories, places of entertainment, sports etc. The movement of non-whites inside the country is restricted by laws. The Group Areas Act has imposed restrictions not only on the freedom of settlement and residence, but also on the right to own property. Grave injustices have been perpetrated in the implementation of this Act. Places of worship have also come under its operation. According to Reuter's report of June 30, 1958, South African citizens professing the Muslim faith throughout South Africa protested against

the removal of their mosques from those areas set aside for whites under the group Areas Act proclamation and they were opposed to the application of the permit system to Mosques. The examination of the laws led the Commission to the conclusion that "one of their purposes seems to be and that their effect certainly will be, to make it much more difficult than before for non-white organisers to launch any concerted campaign of resistance against the laws, and even to prevent non-European leaders stating their opposition to a bill introduced by the Government or criticising it" (para 720 of the First Report).

The Commission proceeded to note: "It is understandable that the actions among these leaders, i.e. those who feel themselves called to

make the masses (non-white) aware of their under-privileged status in relation to the privileged minority (the whites) are chafing under the restraint and wondering whether they will be forced to resort to clandestine activities" (para 721 of the First Report).

Referring to the Separate Representation of Voters Act, the Commission observed: "This Act is of interest to the Africans also, for they see in it a further indication of the course which the Government is increasingly following--the constant curtailment of the liberties, rights and possibilities of advancement of all non-Europeans" (para 725 of the First Report).

With regard to the access to profession the Commission reported: "This is perhaps the most pathetic aspect of the racial situation as studied by the Commission in the field of education. Almost all professions, other than educational and the church, are closed to cultured young natives who have completed their studies" (para 707 of the First Report).

As regards the conditions under which the non-Europeans live the Commission said: ``The facts, accordingly, are beyond dispute; tens of thousands of non-Europeans are camping, rather than living, in the worst conditions of promiscuity, filth and destitution, exposed to every vice and every disease" (para 739 of the First Report).

A survey of the relevant legislation and the study of certain practices led the Commission to conclude that ``differential treatment in the most varied spheres for persons belonging to different racial or colour groups is a salient feature of the situation in the Union of South Africa" (para 858 of the First Report) and that four-fifths of the population are hereby reduced to a humiliating level of inferiority, which is injurious to human dignity and makes the full development of personality impossible or very difficult" (para 898 of the First Report).

Placing the laws and their implementation in the Union of South Africa alongside the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is clear that the said laws and their implementation are consistent with neither and that the policy of apartheid is a seriously disturbing factor in international relations and, to use the language of the Commission, the least that can be said of it is that it is likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relation among nations" (para 900 of the First Report).

The distinguished representative of Ghana has brilliantly placed before this Committee the events that have taken place since this Committee considered this item last year. He has very vividly described how segregation has penetrated the sphere of religion, education, the medical profession and sport. It may, however, be useful here to refer to a recent speech made by the Rev. Stanley sudbury, Chairman of the Natal District Synod of the Methodist Church. He said it was the duty of the church to warn the government that the country would have to face a 'day of dire reckoning', it Christain insights and conceptions were ignored in legislation and administration. He added that the Government appeared to be suffering from 'the inebriation of power'. "It seems incredible," he went on, "that such a list of restrictive legislative measures could be passed in a country which claims to be both democratic and Christian. But these are the facts which, in the minds of thinking people, are casting long and deep shadows over our land, shadows of totalitarianism, where individual liberty becomes merely a memory. As a Christian church we have cause to be concerned, not only because of the attack on religious freedoms, but also the attack on freedom in all spheres. No democratic government can ever become the sole arbiter of right and wrong conditions in individual or community life, and professional politicians are as much in need as anyone of the guidance of religious agencies in the shaping of policy and in the Government of the people." He further said that it was not statesman hip to introduce policies which must leave a legacy of bitterness and resentment for the next generation. "Having suffered for ten years a spate of apartheid legislation, there is a danger that we should all become 'conditioned' to it. Familiarity with its sharp provisions can easily dull the keen edge of Christian conscience. We need to keep constantly before our eyes the Christian values of life." (The Star, 4 August, 1958.)

On the subject of segregation in education I may be permitted to state the views of Father Huddleston, who is a member of the Community of Resurrection, a monastic community within the Church of England. In a message sent to the Committee on Science and Freedom, while pointing out the beginnings of the struggle for cultural freedom and against the philosophy of apartheid which is now being fought by the universities and churches and other sections of the community in South Africa, he said:

Our answer was: We know all that. But we believe that, for the African, totalitarianism has already gone far enough. The Minister of

Native Affairs (Dr. Verweod) has already become, virtually, a dictator. In controlling African education he is following a pattern which we have already seen and known only too well in Germany in the late 1930's. Sooner or later one has to take a stand and to make quite definite sacrifices. It is only a question of when and where that stand should be taken. We think it should be taken now on the Bantu Education Act."

The Separate University Education Bill, now about to become law in South Africa, is the logical consequence of the Bantu Education Act.

There is, and there can be, for the non-white citizen of South Africa, only one kind of education--an education which will fit him to take his place as a non-white in a society whose basic doctrine is that of white supremacy, now and always.

The meaning of apartheid is not just 'thou shalt not love thy neighbour' but 'thou shalt have no neighbour to love'. The logic of apartheid, therefore, is that there shall be no relationship between white and black in South Africa which could be, under any circumstances, anything other than the relationship of Master to Servant.

#### Father Huddleston concluded:

I pray that the conscience of the free world may be so stirred, so aroused at this time, that the present government of South Africa may be forced to realise that it is in fact isolated and alone, and that this isolation will threaten the very foundations of its own culture and civilisation. We owe this stand to those thousands of Africans who, in their own land are being persecuted, not for any subversiveness, not for any rebelliousness, but simply because they are black. (Bulletin of August 1957 of the Committee on Science and Freedom)

There have been other notable pronouncements on the racial policy of the Union of South Africa by eminent persons and independent organisations. But I do not wish to tire the Committee with further quotations. There is undoubtedly overwhelming world opinion against the apartheid policies of the Union of South Africa.

Race tensions are growing in the Union of South Africa at a rapid rate. There are repercussions outside the Union. But the answer of the Union to all this is more and more segregation. The attitude of the Union towards the appeals made by the General Assembly and to evergrowing world opinion is hard and unrelenting. This unresponsive and unyielding attitude is a challenge to the United Nations. South Africa is not the only country where racial problems have arisen. In all other countries where such problems exit ceaseless efforts have been, and are being, made by the governments concerned to remove the evil and to bring the laws and their administration into accord with the dictates of humanity and the standards of civilisation, and, if there are some remnants of the evil left, they exist despite the laws

and actions of the governments concerned and in the course of time they too are bound to yield to the pressure of the laws and governmental action. On the other hand, the Union of South Africa is unique in that it is the government itself which continues to pass laws which are intensifying and seeking to perpetuate the evil and victimising its own people. While the onward march of humanity in general is in the direction of progress, the Union of South Africa is proceeding, and what is worse, is determined to proceed, in the opposite direction. Race conflicts are not solved by aggravating tensions but by fighting the evil. The world knows the persistent efforts made by the U.S.A. in eradicating this vice of racial discrimination and segregation. We are aware of the unanimous judgement of the Supreme Court passed recently and reiterated more recently whereby segregation in education has been banned. We are also aware of the recent pronouncements of President Eisenhower in relation to this matter. We see in the U.S. how de-segregation is being effected and progressive elimination of racial discrimination is being achieved.

If I may refer you to my own country. Under the inspiring influence of Mahatma Gandhi, whose whole life had been devoted to the fight against inequality and domination, whether political or racial, the people of India at one stroke abolished discrimination, based on religion or race or colour, and declared untouchability--an evil which had existed for centuries--an offence and guaranteed political rights on the basis of adult suffrage and full opportunity in all employments without distinction as to race, colour or religion. Indeed, we are giving preferential treatment to depressed

### <Pg-241>

classes for a certain period. Mahatma Gandhi ??? to the depressed classes the appellation of Harijans', that is God's own children. There are countries in the world where the white population coustitutes a minority and yet the problem has been solved without recourse to the measures adopted in South Africa.

We can ignore only at our peril the trends in international society in this fast changing world. There is an awakening at a rapid rate in this huge continent of Africa. Eight territories in Africa have already attained independence. In other territories too, people are gaining political power and some more will attain independent status in the near future. There is a wave of nationalism which is sweeping over that continent. The spirit of the present age is opposed to all ??? of domination, whether national, economic ??? racial. It is not unnatural that people ??? in one territory should not only insist on their rights--political, economic and social--in their own states, but should also clamour for the rights of their brethren in other parts of the con???. Where a part of humanity is subjected to ??? treatment in one territory and suffers on that account, the suffering is bound to be shared by peoples in other territories. How long will South Africa turn a deaf ear to the voice of person?

At the Bandung Conference, where more than half the population of the world was represented, reference was made to the policies and ??? of apartheid and the Conference ??? the policies and practices of racial ??? and discrimination which formed the ??? of government and human relations in ??? regions of Africa and in other parts of the world." The Conference declared that "Such ??? is not only a gross violation of human rights, but also a denial of the fundamental ??? of civilisation and the dignity of man." The Conference extended its warm sympathy and support for the courageous stand taken by the ??? of racial discrimination.

The Accra Conference was another historical ??? of great importance. This Conference was ??? with significance for all non-white peoples in Africa. The African states assembled ???, while affirming their loyalty to the Charter of the U.N., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the Asian-??? Conference held at Bandung, pledged themselves, in a Declaration made at the con-???, to recognise, inter alia, the right of the ??? people to independence and self-determination and to uproot for ever the evil of racial discrimination in all its forms wherever it may be found.

To illustrate how the attention of the world is focussed on the policies and practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa, reference must be made to the organisation known as the American Committee on Africa, which is acting through an international sponsoring committee whose Chairman is no less a person that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The services rendered by Mrs. Roosevelt to the cause of humanity are well-known and shall always be remembered with gratitude by generations. The membership of the American Committee includes Senators, Members of the House of Representatives--both Republican and Democrat--University Presidents, national religious leaders, authors and scholars. This Committee published a document entitled 'Declaration of Conscience', which was signed by 123 world leaders from 38 countries, including Bertrand Russel, Arnold Toynbee, Trygve Lie, U.N. Dhebar, the President of the Indian National Congress. The declaration notes that freedom and human dignity are in grave jeopardy in the Union of South Africa and that the countless indignities inflicted on millions of South African people represent a long and tragic reversal of freedom. The signatories declared their support to the overwhelming majority of South African people, non-white and white, in their determination to achieve the basic human rights, pointing out how the South African Government has violated human rights and fundamental freedom.

How long will the Government of South Africa disregard the world's opinion and refuse to abandon a course which is fraught with such disastrous consequences? Can an unacceptable theory and practices revolting to human conscience be permanently maintained? What is the solution?

We feel that in this grave situation all the Member States owe it to the interests if peace and humanity to use their good offices and to exercise their influence with the Government of the Union of South Africa to bring about a peaceful and just solution to the problem in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and to persuade the Government of that country to abandon this policy of apartheid and its implementation.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow the Charter to become a solemn mockery. In the interest of peace we must insist that the high principles enshrined in the Charter should become living truths. The

<Pg-242>

United Nations way is the way of peaceful method and persuasion. Our whole background in India has instilled in us a faith in peaceful methods and in a friendly approach to the solution of the problems. In the name of the millions of India, my delegation appeals to the Government of the Union of South Africa to abandon its present policies. This appeal also comes from millions and millions of the people of so many other countries of the world. We do hope this appeal will not go unheeded.

My delegation reserves the right to speak again, in case we find it necessary to do so.

On 29 October Shri Pathak spoke on the continuance of the United Nations Emergency Force. He said:

The Delegation of India is happy to cosponsor, along with the Delegations of Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Norway and Pakistan, the resolution contained in Document A/S.P.C./L./26.

This resolution, as was pointed out yesterday by my distinguished colleague from Ceylon, is a simple one. It notes with satisfaction the progress report made by the Secretary-General and embodied in Document A/3899 and expresses its appreciation of the manner in which the work of the UNEF is being conducted. The continuance of the UNEF being necessary, the only logical step is to transmit for consideration the financial questions consequent thereon to the Fifth Committee. And this what the Resolution seeks to do.

Mr. Chairman, Members of this Committee do not need to be reminded of the circumstances in which the UNEF was established. It is the view of my Delegation--and I am sure that no one in this Committee will disagree with this view--that the UNEF has proved useful and continues to be required to perform its functions. We have ourselves participated in the UNEF with the specific agreement of the U.A.R. We do not believe that it is possible for any organisation or any country to send its forces into the territory of another State, unless it is at the express request of the latter and under conditions which are also mutually agreed.

We are glad to note that even with its varied composition, with officers and men from nine different countries, UNEF has managed to be a well-knit body engaged in a highly co-operative endeavour. This

happy co-operation between the contingents of the armed forces of different countries, the composition of which was entirely agreed to by the government in whose territory they are stationed, is in no small measure due to the very efficient handling of its problems, both by those in command as well as by the Secretary-General and the Headquarters of the United Nations. We, in the General Assembly, have therefore every reason to be happy at the success of the UNEF. It is a special situation. It is of course not possible for us to draw any conclusions of a general or universal nature from this one experience which was of a very special kind and caused by peculiar and special circumstances.

In view of the effective manner in which the UNEF has functioned, as well as in view of the fact that this was set up by a decision of the United Nations, my delegation is glad to commend this resolution to the committee for, we hope, unanimous approval.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA FALKLAND ISLANDS GERMANY INDONESIA BRAZIL CANADA COLOMBIA NORWAY PAKISTAN

**Date**: Oct 13, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. S. Pathak's Statement on Report of the International Law Commission

Shri G.S. Pathak, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following speech in the Sixth Committee of the United Nations on Oct 01, 1958 on the Report of the International Law Commission:

Mr. Chairman,

I have listened with great interest to the speech made by Judge Pal at the time of presentation of the Report and to the speeches made by the distinguished delegates in this Committee. I shall make only a few observations in relation to the methods of working of the International Law Commission as set out in Chapter V of the report. These observations are not intended to detract in any manner whatsoever from the value of the work produced by the Commission. Indeed my delegation yields to none in the praise for the contribution made by the International Law Commission and for the high value of the work produced by it. The Commission is engaged in a noble task which it has fulfilled and is fulfilling with remarkable success. Codification and progressive development

of law are both steps conducive to the achievement of the great aim of the United Nations--securing of peace in the world. For this reason we attach the highest importance to the work done by the International Law Commission. We appreciate the difficulty and complicated nature and the immensity of the task the Commission is engaged in. It is a tribute to the independent and dispassionate approach of the Commission to the various problems it has had to deal with that its conclusions have commanded universal respect. My delegation expresses its gratitude and offers its congratulations to the Commission for the excellent work it has produced.

In this age of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons aud ballistic missiles, when space exploration has opened new vistas for military strategy and the very existence of the human race is threatened, the rule of law is the last hope for the survival of mankind. International law was already in parts fragmentary and in parts uncertain. Now that science has completely out-distanced law, new fields has come into existence and new problems have presented themselves with the result that some old concepts have to be revised, some new chapters have to be added. There are stubborn problems even in the already existing customary law of these three-mile limit for the territorial sea may not be an inappropriate example.

The interests of peace and the necessity of early settlement of certain doubtful points may themselves afford a reason, among others, for increasing the peace of progress of the work of the Commission. It was with full appreciation of the immensity of the task before the Commission that a few years ago some delegations felt concerned to examine the question of the speed of progress in the work of the Commission. Not unnaturally this concern increased when the strength of the commission rose from 15 to 21 members. Among the proposals made with the object of speeding up the work of the Commission of sub-commissions. This scheme was set out with admirable particularity in Mr. Zurek's report to the Commission. My delegation was encouraged to join in making this proposal by the fruitful results achieved in my country by the Indian Law Commission which was established a few years ago to examine the judicial system in the country and to revise its laws. In its working this body has followed a scheme which bears a very close parallel to the scheme of sub-commission as mentioned above. In the view of my delegation, the scheme, when employed would increase pace of progress without inspiring the quality of work. It is gratifying to note that the International Law Commission has accepted the suggestion, though on an ad-hoc basis. In doing so, it has acted with caution and wisdom. Trial and experience will show whether the apprehension envisaged in paragraph 62 of the report is justified. We appreciate that the Commission is the best judge of the suitability of the time and the occasion for the suitability of the time and the occasion for the formation of sub-commissions. The present strength of the Commission makes it possible that subcommissions may be so forward as to represent all the important legal

systems of the world. When the full Commission has once examined the report of the Rapporteur and discussed the general principles, where necessary, before sending the report to the sub-commission for detailed discussion, the area of controversy and the range of discussion before the full Commission, before which the proceeding of the sub-commission, will ultimately come up for final approval and adoption, will be narrowed down considerably; and instead of the 21 members devoting their whole time to the entire work, only half the number--where for example a sub-commission consisting of 10 or 11 members is framed--would be occupied with one subject and the other half with another. Indeed, the Commission in its report has remarked that the experience of the present session has shown has shown that during the later stages at any rate the work could proceed quite sufficiently quickly in the full Commission. This work may proceed even more quickly when the work of the sub-commission which has already intensively discussed the whole subject in detail comes up before it. Thus the chances of reopening the whole discussion at the last stage will be considerably minimised, if not eliminated. In the view of my delegation the scheme, if followed, will result in the saving of time and the consequent increase in the output of work. We emphasise however that in this matter we entirely trust to the judgement and wisdom of the Commission itself.

With regard to the question whether the governments and the Assembly itself would be able to keep pace, if the drafts were produced by the Commission quickly, we feel that the reports of the Commission representing the considered views of the most eminent jurists of the world, in themselves possess an intrinsic value of their own, and in matters of urgency if the reports are ready, the governments and the General Assembly may, in their own interest take quick action.

### <Pg-244>

Subject to these observations, Mr. Chairman, my delegation agrees generally with the conclusion reached by the International Law Commission in Chapter V of the report.

On 13 October Shri Pathak spoke on the problem of arbitral procedure. He said:

The history of the problems arising under this item has been so fully stated in the reports of the International Law Commission; in the remarks of the Chairman of the Commission and in the speeches made by the distinguished delegates it is not necessary for me to reiterate the facts or the various positions taken by the countries represented here, at the earlier stages, in the discussion of this matter. It will be sufficient for me to state that my delegation adheres to the position taken by it in regard to the principles applicable to the problem of arbitral procedure. My delegation maintains that the undertaking to arbitrate entered into by sovereign states is based on the autonomy of the will of the parties and that the introduction of an element of obligation is foreign to the traditional concept of arbitral procedure. In particular, we maintain the position that the

powers of the International Court of Justice or of its President cannot be enlarged without amendment of the Charter. It is true that the statement made to the above effect by my delegation on the previous occasion related to the question whether the draft then before this Committee was suitable for a convention, and that the present draft rules are not intended to be incorporated in a convention, but are merely designed to serve as a guide to the State which may adopt some or parts thereof at the time of entering into International treaties and special arbitration agreements. It is further true that the choice of the Member States in regard to the adoption of this model set of rules or any part thereof is not restricted in any manner. But we must bear in mind that if the rules receive the imprimatur of the General Assembly or are made the subject matter of recommendation to the Member States they would possess a moral value. If these draft rules are open to legal objections, it is, we feel, our duty to study and examine those objections in this Committee, and we cannot pass over matters of principle on the ground that it is open to us to follow or not to follow the draft rules prepared by the International Law Commission.

It is clear from the Report that in view of the opposition evidenced in the speeches made in this Committee, the Commission abandoned the attempt to frame rules with the purpose of incorporating them in a convention. The Commission took the view that the question of the autonomy of the States was not affected as the draft rules were intended to be a mere guide. We have great admiration for the work of the Commission and we express our gratitude to the efforts made by it in the matter of codification of international law and its progressive development. We agree that when consent is once given the parties are obligated to carry out the undertaking to arbitrate. We also agree that an undertaking to arbitrate necessarily involves certain inescapable consequences. But we submit, with respect, that we cannot agree that the parties are under an obligation to take steps necessary to enable arbitration to take place, even though such a procedure involves a breach of some fundamental principle of international law or marks a departure from traditional international law, beyond which in the present political atmosphere, a fairly large number of States is not prepared to go. We have the highest respect for the noble ideals which have inspired the work of the Commission. We have abiding faith in the principles of the Charter and in the securing of the high aims and purposes of the UN in the manner laid down therein. We are firm believers in the principle of the settlement of disputes peaceful means. There are, however, certain aspects of a fundamental character in relation to these draft rules to which it is necessary to refer.

It can be said, I hope, without any fear of contradiction that the draft rules have introduced some innovations in the customary international law on the subject of arbitration. For example, the principle is embedded in traditional international law that, in arbitration, it is the right of the parties to choose their own judges. This right has been the distinguishing feature of international arbitration. The draft rules have clearly departed from

this fundamental principle. The Commission has combined traditional arbitration with judicial settlement of disputes. Is the International community prepared today to accept this fusion of these two different principles in the sphere of Arbitral Procedure? If not, the practical utility of the draft rules will be, if not completely, substantially reduced. We cannot forget that consensus or consent of sovereign states is the basis of international law and if there is a considerable body of opinion not in favour of a proposed practice, the proposal may well serve as an ideal to be reached at some future date, but could not be the basis of international law. It may be a goal, but will not be a step in the progressive development of law.

There must be correspondence between international law and international life and international

<Pg-245>

law must, in order to be effective, adapt itself to international life. Law has a social purpose and it can fulfil that purpose only when it is in accord with the demands and the conditions of the society.

Let us examine the trends in the sphere of the judicial settlement of international disputes and let us see what evidence is furnished by those trends. The object of the Optional Clause in Article 36 of the Statute of the Court of International Justice, was, inter alia to promote between the parties a general system of compulsory jurisdiction by employing the method of declarations by individual states as envisaged by that article. In this connection it is well to remember that at San Francisco the principle of compulsory jurisdiction was not directly introduced. By the introduction of the Optional Clause in Article 36 it was intended that when the majority of the States would make declarations within the limits indicated therein, the Court would possess compulsory jurisdiction to that extent. Has this purpose been achieved? In the year 1952-53 the number of States which were bound by the Optional Clause was 37. In the year 1954-55 this number was reduced to 32. Of these many have qualified the declarations by a variety of reservations. This trend has a material bearing on the question of the attitude towards innovations in the traditional international law. In has to be accepted as a fact of international life that on the stability of the international situation must depend the confidence of the States in international action.

Prof. Waldock, a distinguished British Jurist, has referred to the rapid deterioration in international relations resulting in a general waning of confidence in international action. In his article on "Decline of Optional Clause" contributed to the British Year Book of International Law in 1955-56, at page 24, Prof. Waldock observed: "There is the absurdity of a system of compulsory jurisdiction which permits the right of immediate termination of the obligation by unilateral act" According to him, "The revolutionary political changes in some parts of the world, and greater fluidity of

international law itself, have combined to create an international climate unfavourable to the development of the Optional Clause system.

This is the present factual position as viewed by Jurists who are not connected with politics. We have full confidence in the impartiality and the integrity of the Court and its Judges. But it would be unrealistic not to take note of the trends evidenced by the acts of the international community. These unmistakably point to the conclusion that the international community is observing great caution, in conferring powers even on an august body like the International Court of Justice. The question is whether in an attempt to prevent the possibility of the so-called 'loopholes' the Commission has created compulsory jurisdiction and gone beyond the rules of international law as they exist and as can be recommended as a step in the progressive development of international law.

The task of appointing an arbitrator is a delicate one and in the event of the nominee of the President being not acceptable to a State it would be placing the President of the Court in an embarrassing position, particularly where the matter is one of grave and vital importance to a State. We should be very careful in not placing the President of an organ like the International Court of Justice in a position which may affect the prestige and dignity of the Court.

There is more fundamental objection which deserves serious consideration. The International Court of Justice is the creature of a constitutional document, namely, the Charter read with the Statutes of the Court. From the very nature of the case the Court cannot exercise any function or any powers not expressly or necessarily implied in its constitution. The members of the Court too can perform only such functions as have been expressly conferred upon them by the Constitution. This function is either judicial or advisory. Any other function cannot be exercised by the Court or its members unless the constitution itself is amended. My delegation is not unmindful of the large number of cases where powers have been conferred on the President of the present Court and were also conferred on the President of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the matter of appointing arbitrators, but so far as we are aware, the validity of such action has never been the subject of an authoritative decision by the court. Notwithstanding those instances where, without objection, the Presidents of the Courts have assumed the power of appointment and have exercised it, the question of the validity of such action in the view of my delegation is still at large. The power of appointment of arbitrators is not ancillary to either the judicial function or to advisory function. Such a power is completely outside the constitution of the Court and the powers exercisable by its members. Therefore even apart from any express prohibition on the members of the court as contained in Article 16 of the Statute, my delegation feels that the powers conferred on the President of the Court in the

matter of appointment of arbitrators have not been validly given and the provision contained in the rules in this respect would be ultra vires.

The prohibition contained in Article 16 of the Statute also calls for serious consideration. A member of the court, including the President is incompetent to exercise any political or administrative function. The question therefore arises: What is the nature of the function which the President is to exercise in appointing arbitrators? The appointment of an arbitrator is essentially an integral part of the process of arbitration. Being an integral part of that process, it must partake of the true nature and character of the action composing arbitral process. The nature of the function cannot change simply because the personnel of the functionary is changed. Such action must necessarily consist of a treaty or agreement between two sovereign States. It cannot be gainsaid that the action of entering into a treaty is a political function exercised by a designated authority of a sovereign State. The subject matter of a dispute would, very often, be a political matter and if action is taken in connection with a dispute of a political character between two sovereign States, such action must necessarily possess the nature of political action and any function exercised in connection therewith must necessarily be a political function. Anyone who appoints an arbitrator in connection with a dispute would have to consider the suitability of the arbitrator with reference to the nature of the dispute, and also with reference to the position he (the arbitrator) and his country hold vis-a-vis the parties concerned.

My delegation, therefore, feels that it would be a breach of the constitution of the Court if an agreement is entered into whereby certain powers and functions are conferred upon a member of the court which he is enjoined by the constitution of the Court not to exercise, until and unless this question, which is a vital question of juridical importance, is settled beyond any doubt, it will not be proper to give any assent or approval to such a procedure. We have grave doubts about the validity of the draft articles concerning this matter.

As stated above, a number of States have, in making declarations in the optional clause, put a number of limitations. This the sovereign States were quite competent to do. To confer absolute and unlimited power on the International Court of Justice as contemplated by Article 1, would be inconsistent with what a number of States have done and are entitled to do under Article 36 of the Stature. Article I, of the model draft articles is obligatory in character. According to article 7 such preliminary question (the arbitrability of the matter) shall, at the request of any of the parties failing agreement between them upon adoption of another procedure, be brought before the International Court of Justice for decision by means of its summary procedure." This would amount to conferment of compulsory jurisdiction upon the Court.

It will be dangerous to push analogies drawn from the municipal law too far. Arbitration in municipal law is always subject to the overriding powers of the Court in certain matters. In the International community there is no such superior authority. The choice of arbitrator by parties is a fundamental feature of arbitration under International Law. It would not be right to destroy that fundamental character of the arbitral process. In the result, my delegation is not prepared to express its agreement with the model draft articles, as they stand at present.

We have ventured to make the above observations of a general character and we reserve our right to deal with the model articles in detail later, if necessary.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU

**Date**: Oct 01, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Chalapathi Rau's Statement on Report of the Economic and Social Council

Shri Chalapathi, Rau, Representative of India in the United Nations, made a statement in the Third Committee of the United Nations on Oct 03, 1958 on the Report of the Economic and Social Council. He said:

Madame Chairman,

The economic and social provisions of the United Nations Charter, have been assuming increasing importance throughout the world and it is but appropriate that this committee should take up for discussion first the report of the Economic and Social Council. The sixth and seventh chapters deal with the social and humanitarian aspects which are complementary to the economic aspects of the work of the United Nations. My delegation, while reserving its right to intervene hereafter in the discussion and to deal separately with those parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council which are to be discussed as separate items on the agenda

<Pg-247>

of this committee, expresses its appreciation, in general, of the manner in which the council has addressed itself to the questions dealt with in the sixth and seventh chapters of its report.

My delegation having taken note of the section, in the report, on the United Nations Children's Fund and of the statement made by the chairman of the fund's Executive Board, expresses its appreciation of UNICEF's growing activities. The chairman of the Board has correctly stated the UNICEF's economic and social importance is steadily increasing. The fund is currently assisting more than three hundred and twenty-five (325) programmes in more than one hundred (100) countries and territories, a fact which illustrates the universality of the fund's activities. During 1957, some forty-eight (48) million children and mothers benefited from the fund and it is expected that in 1958 some fifteen (15) million children and mothers would benefit from it, particularly from the programmes and mass campaigns against various diseases.

In India great importance is attached to maternal and child welfare programmes. It may be recalled that we are intimately associated with the work of UNICEF Executive Board and it is with satisfaction that my delegation notes that the present Executive Board is not only concerned with planning for the immediate future but is looking forward to possibilities beyond the next several years. It is to examine at its next session the possibilities of UNICEF aid for social services for children and for certain aspects of primary education as a logical extension of the present aid for school health and nutrition. For its present work and for its future possibilities, India is interested in supporting and strengthening UNICEF's work. UNICEF and is, of course, given on the understanding that primary responsibility for the care of children rests on individual countries, with UNICEF supplementing and stimulating the use of local resources. In India the emphasis is on long-term work, apart from the normal day-to-day work. This has been confirmed by Mr. Keeny, Director of UNICEF's Regional Office of Asia. While presenting this report to the last session of the Executive Board, Mr. Keeny said that India and the Philippines in particular had increased their activities in the fields of maternal and child welfare. Mr. Keeny also said: "In spite of its continuing economic difficulties, Asia is determined to improve the health and welfare of its children at an accelerated pace and looks confidently to UNICEF for continuing help."

My delegation shares the concern expressed by the Economic and Social Council and by the chairman of the UNICEF Executive Board at what has been called the decline in the rate of growth of UNICEF funds, particularly in view of the increasing number of requests for aid and the rising cost of supplies. This was in respect of the resources for 1957 in comparison with the resources in earlier years. The problem of funds requires immediate attention. Fortunately, the position has improved, at least to a little extent, for 1958. The total resources in 1958 are estimated to be 22.9 million dollars as compared with 20.7 million dollars in 1957. The annual rate of growth thus compares well with the rate in the earlier years of 1955 and 1956.

My delegation expresses its deep appreciation of the generosity of

the United States in increasing her contribution by one million dollars, that is, from ten million to eleven million dollars. If the Government of other countries make a matching contribution, UNICEF will be able to meet the obligations expected of it. I may state that India has done her bit in this respect by increasing her contribution from Rs. 16 lakhs in 1957 to Rs. 18 lakhs in 1958, that is, from three hundred and thirty-six (336) thousand dollars to three hundred and seventy-eight (378) thousand dollars. This represents an increase of 12 1/2% in our contribution. The problem of funds, however, will arise for next year. It is estimated that the total allocations in 1959 will amount to 26.3 million dollars. It clearly demonstrates that the underdeveloped countries have plans ready for utilizing increased funds and aid from UNICEF. This is a very good omen. But if the expectations are to be fulfilled, too much cannot be taken for granted, as pointed out by the chairman of the Executive Board, and it is necessary to stimulate the greater growth of UNICEF's funds. The giving, receiving and self-help aspects of the work of UNICEF have developed a sense of participation and of unity among all peoples of the world, and my delegation shares the hope expressed by the Secretary General, in his introduction to his annual report, that all Government and peoples would wish to do their share for the world's children--in a spirit of dedication to a great task. Before I turn to other sections of the Report, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Director-General of the Fund and his Secretariat for their devoted work.

In the field of International Control of Narcotic Drugs, my delegation takes note with satisfaction of the observation made by the Central Opium Board, in its report for 1957, that diversion from licit to illicit markets are now insignificant

$$<$$
Pg-248>

and that the purposes of the Conventions of 1925 and 1931, to that extent, have been broadly achieved. This is, indeed, an achievement insofar as it goes. Much, however, remains to be done in this field and I may add. Madame Chairman, my delegation as a member of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for an indefinite period, has no illusion about it.

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs has completed its task of drafting a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. Without going into the substance of the draft convention, I may say that such a convention will be a milestone in the field of international control of narcotic drugs.

My delegation extends its warm appreciation of the courageous and self-sacrificing action taken by the Government of Afghanistan in prohibiting opium production. It is necessary that this action should be supported by measures on an international scale to meet the economic consequences which Afghanistan has to face. My delegation supports other delegations in the plea they have made for technical and financial assistance to Afghanistan from the United Nations and from the programmes of individual governments and private

organizations.

I come next to the seventh chapter of the report of the Economic and Social Council and confine myself at this stage to the first section and the third section of the chapter. It is not necessary to take the time of this Committee for emphasizing the supreme importance of human rights or for assessing the progress which is being made in promoting and encouraging respect for them. The tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Human Rights in near and the Economic and Social Council has rightly recommended that the anniversary be observed in appropriate' and effective manner. It has been pointed out by some delegations that we are yet far from establishing human rights, but it has to be conceded that the Declaration is becoming widely known through the efforts of the United Nations, member and non-member governments, the Specialized Agencies and interested non-governmental organizations. The Declaration has been translated into fifty languages and has been disseminated among large sections of the world's population. The influence of the Declaration has been reflected in the work of the United Nations and other bodies. The Indian delegation, while supporting the wide observance of the anniversary, would like to stress that it would be an effective means of making known widely the purposes and principles of the United Nations, particularly in the schools.

The Yearbook on Human Right has been a useful source book and has served as a vehicle of international co-operation. The recommendations of the Human Rights Commission about the size and contents of the Yearbook, approved by the Economic and Social Council with minor modifications, represent, if I may recall, a compromise and my delegation expresses the hope that implementation of the recommendation will improve the Yearbook without diminishing its usefulness.

My delegation expresses its satisfaction at the increase in the number of countries in which women enjoy full political rights on equal terms with men. It is gratifying to note that, according to the latest report of the Secretary General, there are seventy countries in which women may vote in all elections and are eligible for elections on an equal basis with men. The women of India enjoy full and equal social, economic and political rights, occupy high public positions and, as this Committee may recall, provided the General Assembly with a President. To us, therefore, the progress made in raising the status of women anywhere in the world is a matter for great satisfaction.

Permit me Madame Chairman, to say a few words on the last section of chapter VIII of the report. India's sustained interest in international co-operation in the fields of science, culture, and education is a matter of faith, apart from her obligations as a member state pledged to serve the purposes of international co-operation under the second and third paragraphs of Article 1 of the Charter. UNESCO, which is the specialized agency mainly concerned

with this aspect, is doing very useful work and has now been invited by the Economic and Social Council to prepare a survey of international relations and exchanges in education, science and culture based on the communications received from Governments of Member States, including any recommendations for separate and joint action to promote further international co-operation in these fields. My delegation believes that the survey will go a long way in suggesting means and ways of strengthening international relations and exchanges.

India has actively participating in cultural exchanges. These exchanges are not exclusive; they embrace different regions and divergent ideological systems. Every nation has its own culture, ancient or modern, and all nations stand

<Pg-249>

to gain by exchanging information and experience and thus achieving co-operation in education, science and culture. Such co-operation helps understanding and understanding leads to good-will. It is a necessary foundation of international peace. There are, of course, difficulties in the way. There are many artificial barriers. But we believe, these difficulties can be overcome, these barriers can be removed. International co-operation in science, in particular, is now an important aspect of the problems of the world. The conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy are recent examples of this. My delegation, therefore, welcomes all steps for promoting international co-operation in education, science and culture.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PHILIPPINES FRANCE AFGHANISTAN

Date: Oct 03, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. Venkataraman's Statement on Report of the Advisory Committee

The following is the text of a statement made by Shri R. Venkataraman, Representative of India in the United Nations, on Oct 21, 1958 in the Fifth Committee of the United Nations on the Report of the Advisory Committee:

The Delegation of India desires to pay its tribute to the Secretary General and to the members of the United Nations staff for the admirable manner in which they have carried on the duties and functions entrusted to them during the past year. One has only to look at the magnitude of the tasks performed to realise the excellent work turned out by the staff of the United Nations Organisation in the various fields such as servicing the conferences relating to Atomic Energy, the Conference on the Law of the Seas, carrying out the administrative task connected with the UNEF and other related questions. Similarly, in the field of economic development, and in the regional economic commissions and Technical Assistance Administration, the Organisation has undertaken heavy responsibility and discharged them to the satisfaction of member States.

The Delegation of India is grateful to the Advisory Committee and to its Chairman Mr. Aghnides for the excellent report that he has furnished to the Committee. The task of examination and scrutiny of the Budget heads becomes very much easier in the light of the thorough appraisal made by the Advisory Committee. I am sure I am voicing the feelings of everyone--all the members of the Committee when I say that we look to the Report of the Advisory Committee as a guide for the appraisal of the Budget Estimates.

It is unfortunate that on account of the non-receipt of the various reports in time the schedule for examination of the Agenda items this year has become somewhat clumsy. In the past we used to consider the financial reports and accounts for the previous years and follow up with an examination of the Supplementary Estimates for the current year and then take up the Budget Estimates for the next. Such a procedure ensures a comparative study of the actuals of the year that has ended and of the obligations of the current year with the appropriations requested for the next year. This is indeed the normal budgetary procedure which by experience has been found to be of great value in the examination of the budget estimates in all countries. In this connection I would like to refer to the point raised by the distinguished representative of the Philippines last week when he requested information on the total appropriation including supplementary estimates for the current year on each item for comparison with the amount requested under the same item in the budget estimates for the next year. I wonder whether it would not be possible for the Secretariat to furnish the Committee with the final appropriations for each budget head after the supplementaries have been voted, either before or at the time when the budget estimates for the next year are taken up. My Delegation trusts that usual procedure would be invariably adopted in the future to enable the members to take an intelligent interest in the discussion of the budget estimates.

When the suggestion for changing the form of budget was made by the Secretary General at the 10th Session of the General Assembly in 1955, the Delegation of India expressed its doubts on the relative advantages of the new form of budget. My Delegation then felt that a consolidation of amounts such as travel costs or salaries and wages is not likely to give a clear picture of the costs involved projectwise and that the advantages of the new form would be negligible. However, when the budget was presented in the new form at the 12th

Session, the Delegation of India gave its cautious support to the new form and hoped that the expectation of the Secretary General and of the Advisory Committee of a more flexible utilisation of the staff resources and of better administrative management and control will be reflected in the 1959 budget. The Budget for 1959 does not reveal that these expectations have been fulfilled.

### <Pg-250>

We do appreciate the points made by the Secretary General in his opening statement that the new form of budget has been in force only for 9 months and that it could not be expected that the advantages of consolidation could be exploited to the fullest extent in that short period. Though we recognise that the form of Budget will be subject to review at the 14th Session of the General Assembly, we feel that it is worthwhile recording the few impressions created in our minds on the form of budget at this stage. It is necessary for me to reiterate that we do not wish to pre-judge the issue and that our purpose in making the point is to record our interim thoughts on this matter. In our view it has become increasingly difficult to understand and appraise the Budget Estimates in their new form especially where requests for additional posts to meet new projects are involved. For example, the Secretary General has submitted in Document A/C.5/741 a request for certain additional posts in respect of projects approved by the Ecconomic and Social Council during 1958. Specifically there is a request for five new posts in connection with the strengthening of work in the field of industrialisation and 4 posts for expanding the activities in the field of water resources. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult to judge the validity of the request for these new posts against the only real information we have on the situation in regard to the establishment, namely, that in 1958 the Secretariat has 3993 posts for all departments and offices together as mentioned in page 8 of the Advisory Committee Report document A/3860. Though the allocation of posts to several departments is given in the annex to the Budget, there is not enough information available in the Budget document or in the subsequent revisions to the estimates to base a study of appraisal of the staff needs. Clearly, more information on the staff allocation in relation to programme requirements would help the delegations to judge for themselves whether the staff requirements are adequate or excessive. I shall not, however, dilate on this subject since we have to revert to it at the next session. I shall, however recall to this Committee the observations made by the Chairman of the Delegation of India at the 522nd meeting of the 5th Committee regarding the proposal to amend the form of the Budget. He said: "The proposal was, however, open to grave objections on the part of governments for it would defeat the main purpose of budget presentation which was to enable members to scrutinise the estimates given in all the details."

The Secretary General has proposed that the Working Capital Fund should be increased from 22 million dollars to 30 million dollars. The Advisory Committee while endorsing the views of the Secretary General has, however, recommended that the Working Capital Fund may

be raised to 25 million dollars. It is found that the cash position of the Organisation as on 30th June, 1958, has become a matter of concern. At the same time from the annex to document A/C.5/743 it is found that the arrears due from members is mounting and that if the members co-operated in payment of their contributions the situation can easily be met. The advisory Committee in its Report document A/3939 states that "on 30th september 1958, more than one-third of the contributions to UNEF for 1957 and some 55% of those for 1958 remained unpaid". Here I may state in parenthesis that my Delegation understands that there is some delay in working out the cost recoverable from the United Nations in respect of the pay and equipment of the forces contributed to UNEF by the participating countries and hopes this matter will be settle soon. To continue, I venture to submit that if the members made an endeavour to observe financial regulations 5.4 and paid their contributions in time and also if some of the larger contributors make their contribution either in full or in substantial instalments in the early part of the year, the need for any increase in the Working Capital Fund would disappear. My Delegation hopes that this problem would be solved without further imposition of financial burden on the smallar and less developed nations. More increase in the size of the Working Capital Fund may not ease the situation as greater financial burden on member States might lead in turn to greater default in payment.

In this connection my Delegation would like to recall resolution No 1233 of the 12th Session of the General Assembly. The resolution authorised the Secretary General to conclude an agreement with the United States for modifying the terms of the Headquarters Loan Agreement of March 23, 1948, so that the instalments due on 1st july of each year may be paid on the 1st september of each year. The cash position of the United Nations Organisation shows that nearly 75% of the contributions are recieved by september of each year and if the payment of instalments due on the Headquarters Loan Agreement was shifted to 1st September the strain on the resources of the Organisation during the middle of the year may be eased. I do not know what steps have been taken in this regard and whether the steps contemplated would not render the increase in the Working Capital Fund unnecessary. I would

<Pg-251>

appreciate if the representative of the Secretary General could enlighten us on both these points.

At its 11th Session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses on an experimental basis for a period of two years. That resolution imposed limitations on the authority of the Secretary General to incur additional expenditure beyond those contained in the initial estimates. The extraordinary politic situation created in the years 1957-58 calling for emergency expenditure for maintenance of peace and security have not in any way caused difficulties to the Secretary General in the discharge of his obligations. The provisions relating to unforeseen

and extraordinary expenditure have been quiet satisfactory and my Delegation would support the continuance of the same principles for the future.

Several delegations have commented on the mounting expenditure of the United Nations and pleaded for economy. Those delegations pointed out that the United Nations Budget for the year 1959 will reach a new high figure of 65-66 million dollars and that the overall total expenditure to be met by the members of the Organisations will be of the order of 200 million dollars. While everyone would desire to bring down the United Nations Budget as much as possible, I am sure no one would suggest reduction of expenditure at the cost of vital services and programmes. During the 11th Sessions of the General Assembly certain delegations tried to fix the ceiling for the budget of the United Nations and suggested a total of 50 million dollars. A number of delegations, including India, opposed the proposal on the ground that such an overall ceiling might cut into the economic and social programmes and hamper services to the less developed countries. No one realised at that time that within a few months the budget of the United Nations will go far beyond the ceilings suggested by those delegations.

An analysis of the increase in expenditure in the recent past shows that the Organisation has been called upon to shoulder responsibility in an ever increasing measure for the maintenance of international peace and security and that member States have been called upon to share the burden consequent thereon. It has been already suggested in the debate that there should be a basic reappraisal of the principles of sharing the burden of United Nations Organisations. While my Delegation fully endorses the steps that have been taken by this great Organisation for the furtherance of peace and security, my Delegation feels that the burden of such endeavour is becoming increasingly heavier on the smaller and less developed nations and that it restricts their larger participation in the Economic and Social programmes of the United Nations Organisation. Even as large voluntary contributions are made to United Nations Economic and Social programmes by the advanced countries, large voluntary contributions may be made in respect of those measures intended to secure peace and security and thereby relieve the financial burdens on the smaller and less developed countries.

The distinguished representative of Japan stated that some of the special missions listed in Session IV of the Budget Estimates could be abolished and that it would have a favourable effect on the Budget. The suggestion is a very valuable one and merits serious consideration. My Delegation feels that a periodical review of the resolutions passed by the Political Committee with a view to reappraisal of the need for continuance of the special missions and committees may be undertaken by the General Assembly with a view achieving economy. At present there is no such reappraisal and committees and commissions once appointed go on indefinitely entailing considerable expenditure to the United Nations Organisation. These special missions were appointed under resolutions

of the General Assembly and the Security Council to meet emergency situations and it is worth cosidering whether the same conditions exist warranting the continuance of these missions. In any event a review of the strength and staffing pattern of these missions appear to be called for in the light of the changes in the conditions and circumstances since those decisions were taken.

Similarly in the field of social and economic activities it is necessary to re-examine whether any economy is possible by a reappraisal of the working of the various commissions and sub-commissions. In his report to the XXVI Session of ECOSOC, the Secretary General raised the question of the frequency of meetings of the subsidiary commissions. At a casual glance one finds that the following commissions, viz. the Human Rights Commission the Status of Women Commission, Narcotics Commission on International Commodity Trade and Sub-Commission on Minorities meet annually while the Statistical Commission, the Population Commission and the Social Commission meet once in two years. It is a matter for invastigation whether some of these commissions which meet annually should do so and whether their effciency cannot be improved and economy achieved by their meeting at longer intervals. Reference of this question to the

#### <Pg-252>

Economic and Social Council has not improved matters as the ECOSOC in its turn referred the matter to the respective commissions, with obvious results. The continued existence of some of these functional commissions and sub-commissions is open to question. For instance, could not the work of the Population Commission be easily divided between the Statistical commission and the Social Commission? Could not the work done by some of the functional commissions be entrusted to the Secretariat using, if necessary, special rapporteurs for preparing studies of specific questions? For a precedent, my Delegation would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the abolition of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the appointment of special rapporteur to draw up a report. It is not the purpose of my Delegation to go minutely into the details of the work of the various commissions and committees at this stage but my Delegation is interested in pointing out the possible sources of economy consistent with efficiency and the need for-pursuing this matter. It might well turn out that on such examination the suggestions put forward may not prove, in all cases, practicable, but, nevertheless, my Delegation feels they are worth study and examination.

We are thankful to the Advisory Committee for statement of the United Nations Organisation and specialised agencies for the quinquennium 1954--59. The total cost to the member nations has increased from 83 million dollars to 111 million dollars, representing an increase of over 33-1/3%. If the voluntary contributions to the programmes of Technical Assistance, UNICEF, Refugee Fund etc. are added to the 1959 Estimates, the Advisory Committee expects that the total obligation

would be in the order of 200 million dollars in 1959. In view of the mounting costs my Delegation wonders whether a co-ordinated examination of the budgets of the United Nations and the specialised agencies should not be undertaken with a view to bring about reduction in the total volume of expenditure of these organisations. For instance, the administrative budget of the Atomic Energy Agency is estimated at 5,225,000 dollars while the operational programme which is financed by voluntary contributions amounts to 1,500,000 dollars. If the work entrusted to the International Atomic Energy Agency were dealt with by a Department of the United Nations the greater part of the administrative budget of the Agency could be reduced. Again, there is an elaborate programme of Technical Assistance in the field of Productivity organised by the International Labour Organisation. National and Regional Councils of Productivity are organised on a tripartite basis with the help of I.L.O. experts in several countries including India. At the same time the Economic and Social Council has recommended programmes in the field of Industrialisation and productivity. There appears to be overlapping and duplication of functions in this direction. My Delegation realises that the specialised agencies have a measure of autonomy with legislative and budgetary procedures of their own and that the United Nations cannot interfere with their fields of activity; but at the same time when one finds that the membership of the various specialised agencies is co-terminus with the membership of the United Nations a greater measure of co-ordination of all these activities with a view to achieve overall economy should be welcomed. The specialised agencies themselves may be persuaded to agree to a thorough reappraisal of their budgets together with the budget of the United Nations for ensuring efficiency and economy. If the suggestion commends itself to the members of the Committee, we may then proceed to formulate concrete steps.

My Delegation has been one of the countries which had taken keen interest in the past in the departments of Public Information. Jointly with Canada, Ceylon and United Kingdom my Delegation took the initiative at the 11th session of the General Assembly to refer the matter to the Advisory Committee. At the 12th Session, the Delegation of India pleaded for a thorough appraisal of the activities of the Department of Public Information. The Report of the Experts Committee together with the comments of the Secretary General have been circulated to us two or three days back. Since this question forms a separate item on the Agenda, my Delegation will refrain at this stage from making detailed comments on the subject. My delegation feels that the Experts Committee have made a very thorough, detailed and bold examination of the basic principles and wide and varied operations relating to the Public Information activities of the United Nations, and raised a number of important issues. The comments of the Secretary General contained in document A/3945 appear to be rather the initial reactions of the Secretariat to the report of the Experts Committee. Undoubtedly the 5th Committee would like to give its most careful consideration to the Report of the Experts Committee on its merits taking into account all the aspects of the matter. A further scrutiny of the financial implications of the Report of the

Experts Committee by the Advisory Committee also appears to be necessary and useful. In view of the magnitude of expenditure on this

<Pg-253>

department, my Delegation is anxious that no hurried decision is taken.

My Delegation wishes to compliment the Secretary General on the initiative he has taken for the formation of an International Administrative Service. That more than 16 Governments had voluntarily indicated their intention of requesting assistance of this kind even at the stage of offering their comments on the suggestion proves the validity of the proposals. My Delegation would be very happy to support such a move.

It is an anciet dictum of public finance that real economy consists not in spending little but in spending wisely. Were the reduction of expenditure the sole aim of the Budgetary Committee, the object can be easily gained by voting down all activities and programmes. But it is only in the task of achieving maximum actions on minimum investment that the 5th Committee should succeed. I have no doubt that with a brilliant array of distinguished representatives from countries with various system of budgeting and accounting practices all over the world, these purposes would be fully realised.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA PHILIPPINES FRANCE JAPAN CANADA

**Date**: Oct 21, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Akbar Ali Khan's Statement on Arbitral Procedure

Shri Akbar Ali Khan, Representative of India in the United Nations, made a statement in the Sixth Committee of the United Nations on Oct 22, 1958 on the question of Arbitral Procedure.

The following is the full text of his statement:

Mr. Chairman,

At the 559th meeting of this Committee, while expressing its views on the second Chapter of the International Law Commission Report relating to Arbitral Procedure my Delegation made it abundantly clear that it is of the view that in International disputes recourse should be had to arbitration in an increasing measure. But it was also expressed in unequivocal terms that the "Model Form" prepared by the International Law Commission is against the established conventional notions of arbitral procedure and it introduced an element of obligation and compulsion which is likely to prejudice the further progress of disputes being settled through arbitration. Three resolutions have been submitted in this connection. Resolution No. L. 422 sponsored by the distinguished representative of Greece goes against the fundamental principle enunciated by my Delegation as regards the essential basis of arbitration. For this reason, my Delegation cannot support the Greek draft resolution. As regards the revised draft--I think substantially there is no difference except that it requires the comments of the Governments to be communicated to the Secretary-General.

As regards the second resolution sponsored by the distinguished delegate of Turkey, it also suggests to the member states to give a trial to the model prepared, as far as possible.

Mr. Chairman, my Delegation, for reasons given in the previous speech, is not prepared to support any of the two resolutions as they either expressly or impliedly suggest the approval of the draft prepared by the International Law Commission. Some of the distinguished representatives, who partially agree to taking note of the model draft, are also not prepared to recommend its acceptance unless the draft is discussed in detail, article by article. Taking into consideration the views expressed by us as well as the views of the most distinguished delegates of the member states in this Committee, the draft resolution which could be accepted is the one sponsored by the five member states, contained in document No. L. 424 and (add one) India also feels that in the present circumstances of International conditions, this resolution may be accepted. We support these resolutions with firm conviction that in the interest of the progress of arbitral method of settlement of disputes, it is essential that it would remain voluntary at important stages relating to the arbitrability of the disputes and the choice of arbitrators and similar other matters, and be elastic. It is also our considered view that the arbitrary proceedings be kept distinct from the judicial proceedings and the President of the International Court of Justice, for the reasons given earlier by my Delegation, should not be involved.

Mr. Chairman, as regards the last draft referred to, I will however suggest that the words (if appropriate) should be added after the first paragraph of the preamble because there are other methods of settlement such as conciliation etc. which in the circumstances may be more suitable. I think this may meet to a certain extent the criticism made by the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom.

With the additions suggested, I support the resolution sponsored by the five member states. My delegation reserves the right to intervene later, if the circumstances require.

INDIA GREECE TURKEY USA

**Date**: Oct 22, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shrimati L. Dutt's Statement on Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights

Shrimati L. Dutt, Indian Representative in the United Nations, made the following statement in the Third Committee of the United Nations on Oct 09, 1958 on Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights:

Madame Chairman,

May I add my personal voice to the congratulations which have been extended by the Delegation of India to all the Officers of the Committee, especially to you, Madame Chairman, and our distinguished Rapporteur.

In view of the fact that only two meetings have been allotted to this item, it will be very brief and give the views of my Delegation as India was not represented on the Economic and Social Council this year.

This item is before the current session on the basis of the last paragraph of resolution 926(x) of the General Assembly. Thus we have two important aspects of the question before us-firstly the evaluation of the projects so far undertaken and secondly the future programme in the fields.

As for the first aspect, the ECOSOC has expressed its appreciation of the efforts already undertaken. During 1957 and 1958, three seminars on regional basis were held. The Government of India participated in the two seminars held in Thailand and in the Philippines. In our opinion, these programmes have proved useful. The General Assembly has already noted with satisfaction the success of the seminar at Bangkok. The representatives of some of the countries who participated in the seminar at Santiago, have given their views and we have heard with satisfaction their appreciation of the seminar. It is therefore fair to say that the efforts so far undertaken have proved very useful and successful. So far the emphasis has been on

seminars. I am sure that other aspects of this programme will also be given due consideration.

As to the future programme, it is proposed to hold three seminars in 1959 on regional basis. The council has already approved this programme and, in the opinion of my Delegation, the General Assembly should endorse these.

This programme is just a beginning. It will have to be expanded gradually. In this connection my Delegation takes note of the recommendation of the ECOSOC for organising an international seminar on a subject of universal interest, in the future. The subjects for the various seminars under the programme should be more general so that various aspects of the same subject could usefully be discussed in one seminar.

The purpose of these seminars and other aspects of this programme is to promote respect for human rights--an aim given the greatest importance in the Charter. My Delegation yields to none in emphasising the importance and promotion of Human Rights in all spheres.

Before concluding my general remarks, Madame Chairman, I should like to make it clear that this programme cannot, should not and is not intended to take the place of or supersede the programme envisaged in the draft International Covenants. Actually the system of assistance under this programme may on a future day be replaced by the machinery envisaged in the draft Covenant as and when adopted and finalized.

A few words in respect of the joint draft resolution before the Committee--the provisions of the resolution are in accordance with our general views. My Delegation will, therefore, fully support it and vote for it.

INDIA USA PHILIPPINES THAILAND CHILE

**Date**: Oct 09, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

### PONDICHERRY

#### Fresh Elections

The Government of India issued the following press note at New Delhi on Oct 28, 1958 on the situation in Pondicherry.

<Pg-255>

The Government of India have carefully considered the situation that has arisen in Pondicherry following the election of the President of the Representative Assembly on the 25th August after the Assembly had been adjourned earlier in the day by the oldest member presiding at the time. Government are advised that the subsequent proceedings of the Assembly on that day relating to the election of the President and on the other days during the session with the elected President in the chair are of doubtful validity. The frequent change in the alignment of the parties in the Assembly has also made it impossible to secure effective and continuous representation of the elected members in the Council of Government at Pondicherry. For all these reasons Government have decided to dissolve the present Representative Assembly and order fresh elections. The date of the new elections will be announced by the chief Commissioner.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

**Date**: Oct 28, 1958

# Volume No

1995

#### **RUMANIA**

Indo-Rumanian Oil Agreement

India and Rumania signed in Bucharast on Oct 20, 1958 1958 an Agreemen for the setting up of an oil refinery in India. The Agreement was signed by Shri K.D. Malaviya, Minister for MInes and Oil, on behalf of India, and Mr. Marcel Popescu, Rumanian Commerce Minister, on behalf of Rumania.

Under the Agreement India will get from Rumania a long-term credit of Rs. 5.24 crores and the necessary technical assistance for the erection of the refinery.

<Pg-256>

**INDIA** 

Date : Oct 20, 1958

### November

# **Volume No**

1995 **CONTENTS** Foreign Affairs Record 1958 November Volume IV No. 11 **CONTENTS CANADA** Canadian Prime Minister's Visit ... ... 257 Mr. Diefenbaker's Speech ... ... ... **CEYLON** Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha COMMONWEALTH TRADE AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCE Shri Morarji Desai's Statement in Lok Sabha ... ... COLOMBO PLAN CONFERENCE Shri B.R. Bhagat's Statement on Annual Report 265 **DENMARK** 269 Indo-Danish Agreement Signed GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC Supplementary Trade Agreement Signed 269 HAGUE CONVENTION India's Ratification 269 **IRAN** Instruments of Ratification Exchanged 270 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shrimati Maimoona Sultan's Statement in the Trusteeship Council 270 Shri K. George Thomas' Statement on the Unification of Korea 274 Shri Akbar Ali Khan's Statement on the problem of Arab Refugees from Palestine ... ... ... Shri R. Venkataraman's Statement on Working Capital Fund 278 Shri G.S. Pathak's Speech in the Legal Committee on Law of the sea ... ... ... ... **NORWAY** 285 Norwegian Prime Minister's Visit ... ... ...

Mr. Gerhardsen's Speech 286
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Indian Territories Shown in Boundary Map 288
POLAND
Protocol on Trade Exchange Signed 288
PAKISTAN
Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on the
Implementation of Agreement on Border Problem 289
Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on
Developments in Pakistan 290
Jehad Campaign 293
Canal Water Dispute 293
RUMANIA
Shri K.D. Malaviya's Statement in Lok Sabha on Oil Agreement 293
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement Signed 295
UNESCO
Dr. Radhakrishnan's Inaugural Speech 295
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Financial Aid 297
<pg-i></pg-i>

CANADA SRI LANKA DENMARK INDIA IRAN USA KOREA NORWAY CHINA POLAND PAKISTAN

**Date**: Nov 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### CANADA

### Canadian Prime Minister's Visit

The Rt. Hon'ble, John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, accompanied by Mrs. Diefenbaker visited India during November 1958. Mr Diefenbaker arrived in New Delhi on the Nov 18, 1958 November Prime MInister Nehru held a Banquet in his honour. Speaking on the occasion Mr. Nehru said:

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: Nearly four years ago we welcomed the Prime Minister of Canada in this room. And now it is our privilege to welcome another Prime Minister of Canada here. We welcome you Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Diefenbaker, not only as eminent representatives of you country and as friends but also, if I may say so, we welcome you and of course through you we welcome Canada.

You have been here just for a day now and no doubt you have gathered some impression of Delhi City and its citizens. We are gathered here, rather if I may use the word, a select crowd, but a little while ago you saw others who perhaps were not so quite select but also equally perhaps more representative of the citizens of Delhi, and I think that whatever I might say cannot equal the impression you must have got from those people whom you saw in the streets of this old city and in that Audience Chamber of the Emperors of old days here. You may have noticed a friendliness in them, even a touch of affection. It is true that we are normally a friendly people and it is not an easy matter for us to become unfriendly. Some times we misbehave no doubt, but it is a passing phase, a phase which does not last.

Now in the course of the last few years our relations with your country which is far from us and in some ways very different have grown. I remember wherever Canada is mentioned in such a connection, this old memory comes back to me of how fifty years or so ago when I was a student in London, there were some people in London, some of them leaders of today in this country, who put forward some modest demands for self-government. The then Secretary of State for India in London, a famous person, Lord Morley, reminded us that Canada and India were not the same type of countries, that they were very different. In Canada people used to go about with heavy fur coats, we do not require them in India, he said. Well, as a matter of fact, we do require fur coats in certain parts of India. But even without the fur coats there are some things which people require anywhere and everywhere. And so a time came when we joined that family of nations of which Canada was one of the preeminent ones and in which indeed had played a very important part in that dynamic evolution which is characteristic of the Commonwealth. It was Canada really which led the way to independent nationhood within that family of nations.

So, when we attained independence, we gladly agreed to continue in that family, and while I do not wish naturally to differentiate, nevertheless I think I can say that we found it easiest of all to get on with the representatives of Canada, chiefly because they were receptive and they went out of their way to be friendly. It is, I believe, a fundamental rule or law of life that if you give friendship, you get friendship in return, just as if you give the opposite of friendship, the reactions are likely to be the same. So, a little later another change come over this Commonwealth when we took a lead in another direction and became a Republic. That was a novel position which the Commonwealth had not faced till then.

Again, it may not be perhaps improper for me to say something that might be considered secret. It was the Canadian representative at the Prime Ministers' Conferences in London who helped us greatly in finding a way out in this new position because we were anxious, in spite of being a Republic, to continue in that close relationship, and the Canadian Prime Minister of the day also was anxious that we should continue, indeed others were too; but he did play perhaps a more important part in those talks than some others. Then again, whenever we have met, whether in the Prime Ministers' Conference or

in the United Nations or elsewhere, because we have had many common dealings with each other, we have found this bond of friendship uniting us and understanding, even though we did not always agree. In Eastern Asia, in Indo-China, Canada and India undertook a responsibility which is partly continuing still. Elsewhere also. So, we worked together in these many fields and got to know each other a little better. But above all it was the friendly approach, the approach where one respects the other even though one does not always agree, which brought us together and which keeps us together and which will no doubt hold us together for a long time.

### <Pg-257>

So, it is a very special pleasure to all of us here to welcome you Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Diefenbaker, and I hope that when you go back, you will convey our greetings and friendship and comradeship in many common causes to your people. I have referred to common causes. We in India ever since we became independent have struggled hard to better our conditions, to improve the lot of the common man, to raise him, to give him self-assurance, self-confidence mainly through his own efforts, because no individual or nation rises except through its own efforts. But we have welcomed assistance and help from others, and in that category also Canada has played a notable part for which we are thankful. But apart from our own domestic problems which naturally tend to overwhelm us, we cannot escape the problems of the word, although we have no desire to get entangled in them. But the world is too small today and each country has become the neighbour of the other country however far it may be. And above all we feel, as you know, Mr. Prime Minister, very strongly about peace in the world. I suppose every sensitive person does so, because everyone realises that without peace there is no hope, there is no future, there is no progress, and there may well be a disaster which is almost beyond human imagination. For us who are bent on working out the destiny of our country, the very idea that this peace would be shattered by war is terrible to contemplate, because it puts an end to all our hopes and aspirations and efforts. So peace becomes, apart from an ideal which we aim at, apart from something which is necessary, absolutely essential for us, and indeed I suppose it is so for the world. It is a very difficult problem in the state of the world today, and it is curious that while everyone, every country, I believe, really desires peace, because it knows the consequences if peace is shattered, yet difficulties arise and they are not easy to surmount. I have no doubt they will be surmounted because there must be ultimately some basic commonsense in humanity which will not permit these terrible disasters to occur.

One thing struck me, and I ventured to mention it to you this morning, that quite apart from the intricacies of these problems, peace, disarmament and the rest, is it not possible at least for countries to approach each other in a somewhat more friendly way? It is easy enough for friends to approach each in a friendly way, it does not require any effort to do so. The point is when you are approaching those who are not apparently friends in a friendly way,

that requires an effort. But I have no doubt if an effort to that end is made, if an attempt is made, the problems are not necessarily solved, but the problems become easier of solution, and this frightful suspicion of each other, fear of each other, distrust of each other lessens. When these problems are discussed, these great problems of the world today, peace and war and problems of disarmament, all kinds of formulae are evolved and discussed. It has often struck me that the problem really has no doubt to be dealt with by experts, politicians, scientists and others. But perhaps the basic thing is the psychological approach and not purely the political approach, the approach of trying to win over the other party, trying to be friends with the other party, because if that is done, then what I ventured to describe as the law of nature and science would come into play, that is to say, what one gives to others is likely to get back from them. We are a very big nation in terms of size, yours in terms of size is a bigger one. In terms of population we are much bigger than yours. But in this matter of course bigness does not count, other factors come in which are important, and we are not presumptuous enough to imagine that what we say or do would make such difference to the destiny of the world--a little it might occasionally, as it really does no doubt. Anyhow whether it makes any difference or not we try to the best of our ability to promote an atmosphere of friendliness among all nations so that at least these barriers might be removed.

I welcome you again Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Diefenbaker, and I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to drink to their health.

### Mr. Diefenbaker's Speech

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I need not tell you that the moving word just uttered by the Prime Minister make it difficult to reply, but I can simply say this that while repetition is one of the rights and privileges of those of us who are in public life, at least it is one of the major criticisms that we indulge in continuously. I can only say what I have said several times since arriving here. Very deeply my wife and I have been moved by the warmth of the reception that has been accorded to us which had its culmination this evening as we went to the civic centre. I thought that the gathering here would consist of the Mayor, the Councillors and a few people. Well, it turned out to be a multitude and with so many there one was rather carried away on occasion by the size of the audience. It was only with the utmost restraint

### <Pg-258>

that I was able to maintain myself within ten minutes. And to say the same thing over and over again is unnecessary. But I am going to tell you the story that happened in the Province of Novascotia. In that province in order to qualify for a vote you must not only register but among other particulars that you have to give is your age. There was a young lady who in the 1921 election registered herself as twenty-one years of age. When the 1925 elections came along, the same

Registrar asked her "How old are you?" She said "Twenty-one". Then came the 1926 election, and the same answer. Then the 1930 next general election, and the same answer. And finally came the 1935 election, and it was the same Registrar who had performed the ceremony in 1921. And he asked "How old are you?" And she said "Twenty-one years." Now he said "How is it Madam? It is not for me to frighten you. The course that you are following is most dangerous. Under the law, to falsify the facts is a serious electrol offence. But I would point out that ever since 1921 you have continuously registered under oath as being of the age of 21." She said Don't worry about me. I am not one of those girls who say one thing today and another thing tomorrow." "That is exactly my position on this occasion as I have to say what I have said over and over again". The warmth and the kindness that has been shown to us is something that we realise has been shown to us because of the country we represent, and it is indeed deeply warming.

May I say this, Sir, speaking of Birth-days. There is somebody sitting not too far away from me--I hope she will pardon me saying this--no matter how long ago her birth-day was, I hope she would never pass over 21. And to her the warmest of good wishes and congratulations. May the next year be still happier.

Having said that, may I say, Mr. Prime Minister, how helpful it has been for us to talk together, I have had the opportunity during the last two or three weeks of meeting with various representative leaders, first in the United Kingdom with Mr. Macmillan, then in France with Gen. De Gaulle, in Germany with the Chancellor. And incidentally I should tell you about the Chancellor, one who never ages. We were talking about plans for the future, and he said "Now what I have in mind for 1964 is this." He said there may be some changes in the world by 1968 "But I think that by 1968 I would be in a position to do this, that and the other." I said "will he remain Chancellor? By that time I would be 73." He said "That reminds me that I would be 92 at that time." In other words, ever young in spirit.

my purpose in coming has been simply this, to visit in particular countries in Asia, the Commonwealth countries. Last evening, you most kindly accompanied myself to the Exhibition. That is a place where one sees graphically expressed something of the greatness of India, its potentialities, its future, the Five Year Plan in agriculture and industry, the achievement of improved social standards and opportunities. You were kind enough to refer to Canada's co-operation in connection with the Colombo Plan. For a small contribution that we have made, in return we have received from you and from others in your country that feeling of fellowship and comradeship to which you referred. That is unexplainable. I was speaking today with Rt. Hon. Macdonald. He says the Commonwealth has no meaning. It is a strange and a complex thing, that it has no organisation, that it has no basis in fact. All that may be true. We in Canada, as you have said, took long years. It was in 1867 that we were constituted as a Dominion. Then came the first War. The Prime Minister, Sir Robert

Gordon took the stand respecting the right of Canada having contributed in the days of war as well as the other countries who did so with equality not only of opportunity but of equality within the family of nations. One of the greatest leaders in 1917, when I was overseas, was Mr. Jan Christian Smuts. His main idea was to bring to life the expression `Commonwealth Nations' borrowing it from the period many years back. I think the original term goes back to before 1818.I saw three something that gave me a concept of what this family of nations might achieve. In that year I saw representatives attending the monarch on his way to the opening of Parliament, all of whom had some time or other served against Britain in time of war. And yet they were joined together in this strange, mystical family. When you speak of peace, Mr. Prime Minister, I could not but think today that if we could just develop that psychological composite reaction to which you referred among t

he peoples of the world, we have amongst ourselves, how different the world would be. That we should ever be at war with you or you at war with us is beyond our comprehension and beyond the realms of possibility. And so it is within this family of nations, separate and independent nations, and yet in us all that feeling, that fellowship, that common dedication to some of the principles that we realise in the fulness of the spirit we unite.

Mr. Chief Justice this morning, when I surreptitiously crept into your court, I took the most backward seat in the court so as not to

<Pg-259>

inconvenience any others who were listening with interest. It was tremendously interesting to me that on the day that I visited that court, the subject that was being dealt with was that of fundamental freedom, the maintenance of those things which above everything else must be maintained if we are to achieve that degree of peace with freedom that all of us ask for. Indeed I am looking forward, Mr. Chief Justice, to securing that judgement. And one of my fond memories of this visit to India will be when in the House of Commons early in January I introduce a Bill of Rights for Canada. I shall at that time read your words, the judgement on this occasion as exemplifying something of that unity of purpose and that common dedication to hereditary principles, as it were, that have a common heritage. And I do hope, and all of us pray, that in the years ahead this concept brings us together, of all different races and religions, that brings us together in this unity of purpose which I emphasise and reemphasise that we have a message for all mankind to do that which you referred to a moment ago, to deal with one another in that spirit of conciliation without appeasement, fair discussion, with each retaining his own independence to think and say as he feels while at the same time accepting the other man's view point in the same way in which you and I, representatives of different nations, all comprising this family are able to sit down and discuss their common problems in a community of diversity and then arrive at a degree of unity. That has been unusual among the nations of the

world.

This has been a great opportunity, a magnificent privilege. When you say that the people of India are warm-hearted, well, that is an understatement. The manner in which they have shown to my wife and myself those feelings of friendship have had a corresponding effect on us and we have for you and for your people a deep and abiding affection which we know in the years ahead will be intensified. If for no other reason than to feel that bond of unity this visit on my part has been worth-while, and I hope that growing out of that there will be still closer relationship. And I can tell you on behalf of the Canadian people that we admire the degree to which with your eyes on race relations you lift your people to higher and higher opportunities and privileges. Anything we can do to co-operate in that regard I can assure you will be done, because after all we are joined together in a fellowship, the like of which the world has not seen.

Thank you, Sir, for the toast.

CANADA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE GERMANY SRI LANKA

**Date**: Nov 18, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **CEYLON**

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister, Ministry of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on Nov 25, 1958 on the problem of the people of Indian origin in Ceylon.

Last Month there were reports in the Press that a Minister of the Ceylon Cabinet had stated that Ceylon Government had decided to give citizenship rights to about one and a half lakh of plantation population in all, and that the next step would be to find means of encouraging the gradual return to India of the remaining "Indians", as he chose to call them. These press reports have caused anxiety and concern to the members of the House and Government are glad of this opportunity to make a statement clarifying their position on this essentially human problem of treatment of persons of Indian origin who have chosen to make Ceylon their home.

The plantation population of Indian origin, to whom the press reports

referred, must be distinguished from two other categories of persons in Ceylon with whom they are sometimes confused. The first category are those known as Ceylon Tamils. They speak Tamil but they have been Ceylon nationals for hundreds of years and they are part of Ceylon in the same way as any other nationals of Ceylon. Then there are Indian nationals who have gone to Ceylon for professional or business reasons. We are responsible for these Indian nationals and look after their interests as best as we can. Hundreds of these, who had been in Ceylon, have returned to India or been sent back to India by the government of Ceylon. Nearly half a lakh (48,303) came back from the beginning of 1954 to the end of 1957. The government of Ceylon have the right to decide whether, and for how long, they would allow the nationals of India or any other country to remain in Ceylon. These Indian nationals can

<Pg-260>

remain in Ceylon only for the period of the visas given to them by the Government of Ceylon.

The plantation population of Indian origin constitutes a third category of Ceylon residents. They are about nine lakhs. They have been in Ceylon as plantation labour for a long time. Most of them were born there. The so-called Indo-Ceylon problem is the question of Citizenship Rights for this estate labour which has contributed greatly to Ceylon's prosperity and which according to our views is entitled to Ceylon citizenship. It is about these persons residing in Ceylon that negotiations have taken place between the Governments of India and Ceylon. An Agreement, as the House knows, was signed between the two countries in January 1954 and further elaborated in October 1954. Since then, there have been differences of opinion between the two Governments over the interpretation of certain clauses of the Agreements and further discussions have been held from time to time. They wish to be Ceylon citizens as evidenced by the fact that almost all of them applied for Ceylon citizenship.

The Government of Ceylon issue periodical statistics on the progress of registration of these persons as Ceylon citizens. According to the latest statistics received, out of a total of 2,37,034 applications, covering an estimate of 8,29,619 persons, filed by persons of Indian origin for Ceylon citizenship, only 24,509 applications covering 96,923 persons had been accepted until the end of August 1958. 1,96,063 applications covering 6,96,252 persons had been rejected. 7,397 applications are reported to have been withdrawn and 9,020 applications are still pending disposal.

The press reports about the Ceylon Minister's statement do not apparently represent the policy of the Government of Ceylon. In fact, the following day, the Prime Minister of Ceylon stated that his colleague had been misreported and that the Government had not decided the number who should be granted citizenship. In his discussions with our Prime Minister in December 1957, he made it clear that his attitude like ours was based on the recognition that

this is a human problem which calls for a human approach. In Parliamentary debates on this subject in August 1958, he ruled out any inhuman methods as both impracticable and undesirable and declared that he was hopeful that "reasonably the problem could be solved". He also recognised that there was a lot of goodwill in India towards Ceylon.

In effect, the persons who have been refused Ceylon citizenship have been rendered "stateless". They cannot become Indians unless they are registered as such. They could only be registered if they apply for Indian citizenship of their own free will and if they are qualified for such registration under our laws.

Our stand continues to be that these people have, by decades of their residence in Ceylon and their contribution to Ceylon's development, earned the right to continue their way of life in the country of their adoption. Those of them who wish to become Indian citizens of their own free will, can apply to our High Commissioner in Ceylon for registration and, it they qualify under our citizenship law, our High Commissioner will register them as such. We have made this position clear in all our discussions with the Ceylon authorities. Our High Commissioner in Ceylon naturally discusses this and other matters with the Ceylon authorities. The Ceylon High Commissioner in Delhi also discusses this and other matters of mutual interest with our officials here. These talks and discussions continue and no new developments have taken place recently.

There is thus measure of agreement in our outlook. Ceylon authorities, who are directly concerned with the problem, and we who are indirectly concerned with it, are both conscious of our long common tradition of good neighbourliness and friendship and neither of us would like this friendship to be affected by any wrong or hasty step. We are both aware that no quick solution is available. We are both exploring possibilities of a just and fair solution of this essentially human problem.

INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 25, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### COMMONWEALTH TRADE AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Shri Morarji Desai's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai made a statement in Lok

Sabha on the Nov 19, 1958 on his visit to the United Kingdom, U.S.A. and Canada.

<Pg-261>

The following is the full text of his statement:

I left Indian on the 27th August and returned to New Delhi on the 1st October. In the U.K. and in the U.S.A., where I spent a week each, I had discussions with the principal Ministers and officials regarding problems of mutual interest, I met also a number of non-officials in these countries--political leaders, businessmen, bankers and journalists, and addressed a few important Associations connected with trade and industry. In the U.S.A., I had discussions with the heads of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank. A large part of my stay was at Montreal in Canada where I led the Indian Delegation to the Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference (September 15 to 26).

I wish, first of all, to record my warm appreciation of the courtesy and friendless with which I was received in all these countries. I was particularly struck by the interest that India's developments effort has created in these countries and the readiness on their part to help to the extent possible towards the fulfilment of the Plan. My discussions covered, of course, a fairly wide range of subjects, but the main focus of interest was our foreign exchange needs. I explained both to officials and to non-officials the essential objectives of the Plan, the factors which led to the emergence of a large gap in our balance of payments, the efforts we ourselves are making to mobilise our resources and to restore balance to our economy and the need for external assistance to fill the gap. In the course of some of the discussions, issues regarding the scope for private investment, especially foreign investment in India, were raised and I was able, I believe, to clear some of the doubts and misapprehensions that were prevalent in certain quarters on these subjects. I must say that in all countries I visited I noticed there was a sincere desire to help us in our programmes of economic development.

I should like, first of all, to outline in brief the work of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference at Montreal (September 15 to 26). The Conference was concerned mainly with the problems of trade, economic development and technical assistance within the Commonwealth. It was called at he suggestion made last year by the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker. It was preceded by a meeting of officials in London in May last. There had thus been a great deal of prior preparation and it was possible at the Conference to concentrate on the main issues.

The Conference reviewed the economic situation especially the balance of payment of the sterling area, country-wise and on the whole, with the rest of the world against the background of the world economic situation, and discussed in the light of this the broad lines along which further advance towards convertibility and freer payments could be made. The ways and means of promoting inter-Commonwealth trade as well as the trade of the Commonwealth with the rest of the world were also examined in some detail. The discussions were characterised by utmost friendliness and a sympathetic understanding of one another's problems.

The major topic of interest for us was the question of development of the less developed parts of the Commonwealth, I took the opportunity in this connection of highlighting the need for special effort on the part of the more developed countries of the Commonwealth to promote the flow of resources to the less developed members. Our presentation on the subject was very well received and it evoked general support not only from the less developed countries but from the more developed ones as well. The report places this problem of promoting the economic development in the less developed countries in the forefront. It was, of course, recognised that the resources of the Commonwealth were insufficient in relation to the needs of the developing countries. Action, both national as well as international, was necessary in order to promote the flow of capital to these latter. The U.K. announced its readiness to make more funds available through the machinery of the Export Credit Guarantee Department. It was also agreed that the resources of the Commonwealth Development Finance Company should be enlarged by contributions from Government or Central Banks of member countries. Canada also announced its readiness to make larger contribution through the Colombo Plan machinery as well as in other ways. There was general support for the proposal to raise the resources of the Fund and the Bank. The proposal for starting a Commonwealth Development Bank did not find much favour as it was felt that the resources necessary for the purpose might not be forthcoming in the near future on a sufficient scale and that in any case the matter would need further examination in the light of the decisions that might be taken at the World Bank Conference, in New Delhi early in October.

It was emphasised throughout that the object of the Conference was to promote an expanding Commonwealth within an expanding world. In other words, the Commonwealth was not in any

## <Pg-262>

sense an exclusive bloc and had no intention of following restrictive policies either in terms of Imperial preference or in terms of the membership of the U.K. in the proposed European Free Trade Area. The need for liberalising trade policies, reducing the discrimination against dollar imports, mitigating agricultural protectionism and devising measures in concert with other countries of the world to secure more stable prices for primary producers was accepted. The U.K. and canada also agreed to provide more technical training and educational facilities for the other members of the Commonwealth. The U.K. proposes to call a conference some time next year to formulate a scheme of Commonwealth Fellowships and Scholarships to this end.

There was some discussion on the means to strengthen the machinery of Commonwealth consultation, and while it was emphasised that care should be taken to avoid any rigidity or formality in these matters, it was agreed that the existing machinery should be coordinated under what is to be called the Commonwealth Consultation Council comprising the Finance and Economic Ministers to the Commonwealth.

I do not propose to go into further details which are set forth in the report of the Conference. It is heartening to be able to record that the U.K. is fully seized of the role it has to play in promoting economic development within the Commonwealth. Canada too, although it is on net a capital importing country, is eager to assist increasingly, and all countries recognise the vital importance of promoting economic development and raising standard of living in the underdeveloped countries within the Commonwealth.

I shall now deal with the developments relating to our foreign exchange situation. On the 13th of August 1958, I made a statement in this House on "Foreign Exchange". I referred therein to the Conference to be convened by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to discuss the Indian situation in respect of foreign exchange and the manner in which India could be helped. This Conference took place on August 25 to 27 under the Chairmanship of the President of the Bank and was attended by the representatives of Canada, West Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States. The International Monetary Fund was also represented by an Observer. Although we did not participate in the Conference, our Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs was present in Washington for making such information available to the Conference as was necessary for a proper appraisal of our position. Hon'ble members would no doubt

like me to refer briefly to the development following from this Conference.

Although we did not participate in the discussions at the Conference, I am assured by the President of the World Bank Mr. Black and this has been corroborated spontaneously by many others who attended the Conference, that the discussions at the Conference were characterised by the greatest of understanding and appreciation of our developmental efforts. There was general recognition that the tempo of development that has already been built up in this country over the past few years should be maintained with due regard to financial and economic stability. I wish to mention here that the World Bank played a crucial role in bringing to successful fruition the discussions regarding our immediate requirements of external assistance. We are grateful both to the World Bank and to the participating countries for the assistance they have offered. I am glad to say that no conditions have been attached to this offer of assistance, and the House will no doubt wish to join with me in recording our appreciation.

The friendliness shown at the Conference was backed by concrete

indications of the assistance to be extended to us for carrying forward the second five-year plan. In the main, these indications related to the credits to be made available over the immediate period ahead ending March 31, 1959, though our needs for the rest of the Plan period were taken note of. There was also general recognition of the fact that an effective contribution towards India's economic advancement could be made only if the assistance forthcoming from international institutions and friendly countries could be made available sufficiently on a long-term or continuing basis. During the last two to three months we have been negotiating bilaterally with the countries and institutions represented at the August Conference with a view to arriving at specific agreement in regard to the assistance to be made available to us in pursuance of the decisions taken at the August Conference.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which had agreed to a loan of \$25 million for the D.V.C. in July, 1958 has now given us another railway loan of \$85 million in September this year. The Bank will give continuing consideration to our further requirements.

The United State has agreed, in principle, to give us a loan of \$100 million from the Development Loan Fund and negotiations are now in

<Pg-263>

progress about the distribution of this sum between different programmes of development. Hon'ble members will recall that early this year the Development Loan Fund had agreed to give us a loan of \$75 million. Both these loans from the Development Loan Fund would be repayable in rupees. Apart from this, the Government of the United States have already indicated to us that they would defer the interest and amortisation payments due on the 1951 Wheat Loan over the next nine years. This will save us something like \$7 million in foreign exchange every year over the next nine years. Further, the latest PL 480 agreement with the United States Government enables us to purchase wheat and other agricultural commodities in the United State of a total value of some \$238.8 million against rupees. In presenting our foreign exchange needs for the Plan, we treat the arrangements for the purchase of commodities under the U. S. PL-480 programme on a some-what different footing from assistance in other forms. Thus, for instance, in my last statement on this subject, I explained that the estimate of our foreign exchange requirements of Rs. 560 crores was on the assumption that food imports found necessary above the basic level of normal marketing would be found under PL 480 arrangements. But, it is important to remember that the availability of agricultural commodities from the U.S. on special terms contributes materially to the success of our developmental programme by reducing the pressure on our foreign exchange reserves and enabling us to hold in check domestic inflationary pressures.

The United Kingdom has agreed to give us a credit of \$108 million. The details of this are under negotiation. The credit will be made up

of two parts. Approximately \$28 million is by way of advance repayment of the amount due to us in lieu of the settlement of pension claims of U. K. nationals who had served in India. The remaining \$80 million or so will be available for meeting the payments due to U. K. suppliers.

The Government of Canada has announced an allotment of \$17 million for assistance to us in the current fiscal year by way of Colombo Plan allocations. An agreement has already been reached in regard to the utilisation of this \$17 million. In addition, Canada has agreed to grant us a loan of \$8.8 million for the purchase of Canadian wheat.

The West German Government have agreed to make a sum of \$40 million available to us in in the near future. The details of this loan are new under negotiation. The German credit would be in two parts, with own part--and the

smaller part--being of a somewhat shorter duration than the other.

The Government of Japan who had earlier given us a line of credit of \$50 million through their Export-Import Bank have now agreed to provide another loan of \$10 million through the same agency for purchases made or to be made in Japan. The details of this line of credit are also being negotiated.

I would like to bring one particular aspect of our recent negotiations regarding foreign assistance to the attention of Hon'ble members. I am referring to the considerable flexibility that is necessary in procedural and other details regarding the credit being extended to us. Hon'ble members will recall that to a considerable extent our recent foreign exchange difficulties have been on account of the large volume of orders already placed for the furtherance of our Plan. For a variety of reasons, the assistance made available by credit institutions in foreign countries if often available only for fresh orders. In many other respects, the procedures generally followed by Governments and institutions abroad are often such as to make it difficult for us to utilise the assistance given by these institutions promptly and in a manner which might make the most direct and fruitful contribution to our Plan. One of the constant efforts that we have to make, therefore, in our negotiations with other countries, is to try and bring to their attention the specific aspects of our problem and needs so as to impress upon them the desirability of making suitable changes in their normal procedures and policies. I am happy to say that quite apart from the scale on which assistance has been made available to us in recent months, the negotiations which we have conducted in the past few months and those which are now under way have been characterised by considerable flexibility in regard to procedural and other matters. I would like to emphasise that in future, as in the past, the usefulness of external assistance will depend almost as much on the procedural and other details as on the volume or amount of the assistance available.

The external resources which we have thus been able to secure should make it possible for us to avoid any serious decline in our foreign exchange reserves during the current fiscal year. The rate of decline of sterling balances has come down significantly of late. While, as I reported on the last occasion, the average weekly drawal on our sterlings during the first 7 months was approximately Rs. 4 crores, the corresponding average weekly drawl during the three months August to October 1958 has been about Rs. 1.1 crores. But

## <Pg-264>

it is to be borne in mind that we are now in the relatively favourable season for exports and further it must be emphasised that with our foreign exchange reserves already at about Rs. 180 crores, the need is to conserve them zealously and if possible, to build them up again.

Looking to the future, and particularly to the last two years of the present Plan, we would require further external assistance during these years if we are to go ahead and complete the core projects. We are at present engaged on a fresh appraisal of our needs during the last two years of the Plan. On a rough basis, it can be said that the requirements of foreign assistance during these two years will be of the order of \$650 million. This is exclusive of assistance for the purchase of agricultural commodities. Negotiations in respect of the assistance required for the last two years of the Plan will have to begin early next year. I might mention here that we have already indications from several friendly countries about their readiness to participate in our developmental efforts constructively and on a continuing basis. The West German authorities have, for example, already indicated that over the last two years of the Plan they would make available to us credits totalling some \$60 million. This is in addition to the \$40 million they have promised to make available in the near future. It is, of course, too early to strike any balancesheet at present about the total needs and the availabilities over the last two years of the Plan. But I think it can be said with confidence that during the last few months we have advanced in regard to our negotiations for external assistance to a point where our needs have been appreciated in general and where a proper forum exists for organising discussions with other countries and international institutions efficiently and expeditiously.

I have referred so far to the external assistance coming to us from friendly countries who are members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Simultaneously, we have been receiving valuable technical and capital

assistance from other friendly countries who are not members of the World Bank. Hon'ble members are already aware of the assistance we have received from the Soviet Union who, following upon the arrangement for a credit to cover the Bhilai steel plant, have also extended a credit of approximately Rs. 60 crores for certain industrial projects. The House may also be aware of the recent

deferred payment agreement with the Government of Rumania for the supply of an oil refinery at an approximate cost of Rs. 5.2 crores and with the Government of Czechoslovakia for the Forge Foundry Project costing approximately Rs. 8.5 crores. Negotiations for similar arrangements are under way at present with the U. S. S. R. regarding a new project for drugs. Hon'ble members would no doubt wise to join with me in recording our appreciation of all this assistance.

I need hardly add that valuable and necessary as external assistance is at the present stage of our development, it is ultimately on our own efforts in mobilising resources and in releasing the latent energies of the people that the success of economic planning in Indian will turn. One obvious implication of the credits that we get from abroad is that they impose a corresponding obligation on us to conserve and enlarge our foreign exchange resources so as to be able to repay the debts in the years to come. This, in itself, will require efforts both in terms of harder work and austerity, and we have, in addition, to meet the claims of further development. I think, it is self-evident that efforts to earn and conserve foreign exchange can succeed in the long run only in an environment where the utmost effort is made to enlarge all resources whether internal of external, whether of capital or skill, whether man-made or the gift of nature. In the ultimate analysis, the problem of resources for development is one whole, and it is only as we bring to bear in every sphere of economic activity a keen sense of urgency and a firm determination to go forward that we can succeed in promoting rapid development without sacrificing internal stability or external viability.

CANADA USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM SRI LANKA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI GERMANY JAPAN NORWAY SLOVAKIA

**Date**: Nov 19, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### COLOMBO PLAN CONFERENCE

Shri B.R. Bhagat's Statement on Annual report

Shri B.R. Bhagat, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Colombo Plan Conference held at Seattle, made the following statementon Nov 11, 1958 on the draft annual report of the Conference:

Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration an excellent draft of the Annual

Report. It follows the same pattern as in previous years and I am happy to say that the high standard which has now become a feature of the Colombo Plan reports has been maintained. May I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to the team of official who have worked hard to produce this draft.

Part I of the report deals with a review of economic progress in the region and refers to some of the more important tasks ahead. Further progress was made with economic development in the area but in general at a rate somewhat less than in the previous years. It is a little disturbing that the rate of progress has slackened and as the report states, the growth in per capita real income mentioned in previous reports has not been maintained. The situation, I submit, evidently deserves close attention because as all of us know many countries in this area are in the position of the Red Queen in Alice in Wonderland: they have to run as fast as they can in order to stay where they are.

Basically, the problem that faces us today is the problem of mitigating poverty from vast areas of the world and the problem of accelerating the development of the countries of this region, which are yet struggling to achieve the momentum required for making the process of economic expansion, in large measure, self-sustaining. You will permit me, Sir, to mention a few figures to indicate the magnitude of the problem. I quote these form the Rockfeller Report on United States Foreign Economic Policy. According to this document, in 1956 the average per capita income in the underdeveloped countries was \$118 as against \$1159 in the industrialized countries. The rate of growth was about 2 1/2 per cent a year in the underdeveloped world and about 4 1/2 per cent a year in the industrialized portion of the world. In 20 years, therefore, if present trends continue the disparities between the richer and the poorer parts of the earth will become even more glaring.

I was happy to find that the draft report before us takes cognizance of the fact that while economic development--or lack of it--is a national process, its effects are international. As the report vividly states--I am referring to paragraph 12 of Chapter 2--"in an era when means of transportation and communication reduce miles to minutes, lack of progress in one country is of concern to its neighbour", I would submit, Sir, that inadequate progress of an area which comprises some one-fourth of the human race ought to be the concern of the whole world. Economic developments and political developments--and the two are inter-connected--in this vast land mass of Asia in the coming decade are going to affect vitally the course of world history for a long time; and it is this perspective which lends a certain primacy and urgency to the problem of development.

Chapter 2 of the report--the tasks ahead--deals with a number of outstanding problems. It emphasizes the need for flexibility in

working of the development programmes. It mentions the importance of internal financial stability as a necessary concomitant of accelerated development.

A reference is also made, I find, to the problem of fluctuations in commodity prices. The report also refers to the external resources which are available for utilization by countries of the region; subject, of course, to adequate stabilization measures being pursued. Everyone present here will have no difficulty in endorsing the outline of the tasks ahead; but I would submit, Sir, that while economic development must rely primarily on domestic effort, the availability of external assistance in an adequate amount is of crucial importance to the Colombo Plan region at the present juncture. We would be deceiving ourselves if we take up the position that the countries of the region can achieve with their own efforts and the present flow of external resources, the rate of economic progress which will be fast enough to make sufficient impact on the living standards of the millions who live in these countries. In the initial stages of development a substantial inflow of investible resources from abroad is essential. This flow of resources, I may add, cannot be a mere short-term phenomena to tide over temporary difficulties. In the nature of things the flow will have to continue for a pretty long period. This means that we must augment the availability of these resources from every possible source; through encouragement of private foreign investment, through government to government assistance and from the relevant industrial agencies. It is in this context that the five-point programme of the President of the U.S.A. appears as a heartening message of hope to the Colombo Plan countries. In particular we are greatly in favour of the Development Loan Fund idea which has great advantages for underdeveloped countries in that, firstly, it enables planning of projects to be undertaken on a long term basis, and secondly, provides for flexibility for re-payment.

No doubt, even in the capital exporting countries, capital is scarce. Capital in the world as a whole is scarce. The advanced industrial countries need and will need more capital for investments in economic and social

## <Pg-266>

betterment. And yet, if I may so, there are differences of degree. I think it is important for us to recognize clearly and without any reservation that the capital needs of the underdeveloped countries are on a different footing from the capital needs of the more advanced countries. The objective of all economic development ultimately is the improvement of the individual. As everyone present here knows, the living standards in most parts of Asia are so abyssmally low that life to many millions of Asians is literally at a subsistance level. At the same time the capacity of the countries to save is limited. Unless the better-off countries of the world agree to transfer a part of their savings to the underdeveloped countries through the earlier period of their development which would be more

or less selfsustaining.

The flow of capital from the more developed to the less developed countries should, I may add, bring in results of great value to the capital exporting as well as to the capital importing countries, for as these investments bear fruit, they will set up a cumulative process of higher production, higher consumption and higher investment. The vast markets of Asia and Africa can be opened up through such canalization of savings from the industrially advanced countries. This was in a sense the process, as I understand it, through which the great industrial advance of the 19th century were financed. I do not think, we could say in retrospect that prior savings existed somewhere in some identifiable pool out of which all these developments were financed. Investments expand markets and create the conditions for more savings. The initial stages of the process are difficult and this is where the developing countries have to exert their utmost. It is also in this stage that investment from outside is most urgently needed.

I do suggest therefore that the time has come for making the most earnest efforts we are capable of to make more funds available to the less developed countries to raise their investment levels and to give them hope for some improvement in their living standards. At the same time all reasonable facilities should be made available in these underdeveloped countries so that private investments from abroad may be utilised in useful activities without unnecessary hindrance.

Turning to the Chapter on India, Sir, there is little I would like to add by way of further information. The draft chapter discusses in some detail the trends in the Indian economy during the last year. It also indicates in broad outline the measures that have been taken so far to enable the process of development to proceed without endangering economic stability.

On the whole, last year was a difficult year for us. Agricultural production was adversely affected by drought in large parts of the country and industrial production rose but at a much slower rate than in the past years. Mainly on account of the decline in production of foodgrains there was pressure on prices, especially since March 1958. Foreign exchange reserves which had declined sharply in 1956-57 fell further by Rs. 2,600 million. By the end of 1957-58 the reserves had declined to a level which was about the minimum required and any further drawal on reserves was no longer feasible.

The recent trends in prices and balance of payments underline the central problem which any developing country has to face--the problem of resources. During the year the objectives of our economic policy were three-fold. Firstly, to reduce the strain on the balance of payments, secondly to keep a check on prices particularly prices of foodgrains and thirdly, to augment, to the extent possible, resources available for development by mobilizing domestic resources and securing additional loans and credits from abroad. Special attention was paid to the promotion of exports; the restrictions on imports

which had been in force since the end of 1956 were intensified and further cuts in imports of consumer goods were made.

Steps were taken simultaneously to rationalize and reduce to the extent possible, the foreign exchange requirements of the Plan. It was decided that only the "core" of the Plan consisting of the steel mills, coal mining development, railway and port development programmes and certain power projects should be put through. Secondly, only such of the projects outside the core of the plan as had reached an advanced stage of completion were to be completed. Finally, only those new projects outside the core would be commenced for which foreign aid was forthcoming, or which earned or saved foreign exchange.

In the light of the existing situation the question of the total outlay of Rs. 48 billions estimated to be undertaken in the public sector during the period of the plan was reviewed. Only projects belonging to categories I have mentioned and involving the total outlay of 45 billion should

be implemented first. The remaining schemes would be included in a second part with the total outlay of Rs. 3 billion. Projects in the second part would be undertaken only to the extent to which additional resources became available.

The various measures we have taken so far have had some impact on the economic situation. I do not want to go into any detail but I would like to mention one or two things which give an indication of the extent of our efforts. Take the field of fiscal policy; as you are aware, Sir, during the last two years we have made considerable additional tax effort. As I mentioned to this meeting last year, the budget proposals for 1957-58 raised taxation by as much as one-eighth of the total tax revenues of government. Since the commencement of the Second Plan, the additional tax measures adopted by the Central and State governments are expected to yield Rs. 9 billion over the Plan period. This figure I may add is slightly more than the original estimate of Rs. 8 1/2 billion of additional tax resources envisaged in the Second Plan.

The effects of the restrictions on imports are now becoming evident. Imports on private count in the first half of 1956-57 were 3.2 billion, and rose to a little over Rs. 4 billion in the second half of the year. They declined by about Rs. 210 million in the first half of 1957-58 and further by Rs. 850 million in the second half of the year. Another indicator of rigorous restrictions on imports is the data regarding import licenses. In October 1957--March 1958 import licenses issued amount to Rs. 3.5 billion which is about half the level of licensing in the first half of 1956. Even licensing for capital goods has been drastically curtailed. In October--March period capital goods licenses were only a little over 1 billion as compared to 3.7 billion in January--June 1956. I may add, however,

that our present import policy which permits no imports except those required for maintaining industrial production cannot on internal production and prices. The restrictions on imports are beginning to affect the level of fixed investment in private industry and yet we have drastically curtailed imports because we are determined to see that expenditures including development expenditures keep in line with available foreign exchange resources.

We in India realize that we face a difficult task. Nature has provided our country with a fair amount of resources. We have not only large potential resources but also certain other advantages; a degree of technical know-how, an experienced administrative service, considerable experience in business and industry, fairly well developed financial and monetary institutions, and above all, the necessary enthusiasm and the readiness among the people to forge ahead despite difficulties.

Sometimes I think that our difficulties have tended to distort the perspective of our achievements. We cannot afford to under-estimate our difficulties, particularly foreign exchange difficulties but it would be a pity if the present difficulties make us insensitive to the real progress that has been achieved in the last few years. The annual rates of public expenditure on development and of private industrial investment have been during the last two years nearly doubled the average of the first Five Year Plan. Large new investments have been undertaken in vital field such as irrigation, transport, fuel & power and iron & steel. The range of engineering and chemical goods manufactured in the country is being rapidly extended. Agricultural production also has shown a slow but steady upward trend. More children are going to school. Old habits are breaking down and new ambitions are stirring. It is from theses accomplishments of the past that we can draw courage for the future.

We in India today find ourselves in a position to launch upon a wide variety of inter-dependent activities which together will produce a substantial forward movement in all major sectors of the economy. The main cause of our present difficulties is in fact to be found in the process of development. The drain on our foreign exchange reserves is not on account of expansion in domestic consumption or due to a large decline in our export earnings; the drain has occurred primarily because investment in the economy, both private and public, has gathered momentum. The problem facing us today is how this momentum can be preserved. The substantial volume of assistance from abroad which has been forthcoming, particularly in recent months, is a measure of the understanding in friendly countries of our present problems. It is a measure of the soundness of our development projects that so many of them have been covered by allocations from the IBRD and from the Development Loan Fund of USA. It is also a measure of their trust and confidence in the future of our country--a sentiment which we appreciate deeply and for which we are grateful.

**Date**: Nov 11, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **DENMARK**

## Indo-Danish Agreement Signed

Following the talks which took place in New Delhi for the last few days between a two-member Danish delegation and officials of the Ministry of Finance, an agreement was signed on Nov 04, 1958 on the draft of a convention between the Governments of India and Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation on incomes.

The convention has to be ratified after which it will come into effect in both the countries for and from the assessment year commencing on April 1, 1959. It is hoped that when the convention comes into force, it will contribute to the further development of economic relations between the two countries.

### DENMARK INDIA

**Date**: Nov 04, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Supplementary Trade Agreement Signed

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued after the signing of a supplementary Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of German Democratic Republic in Berlin on Nov 03, 1958

From October 30, 1958 to November 3, 1958, negotiations took place between the Government of the German Democratic Republic, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Inner German Trade, and a Trade delegation of the Government of India, about the trade between the two countries in 1959.

The negotiations were successfully brought to an end on November 3, 1958 with the signing of a Supplementary Agreement to the Trade Agreement of October 8, 1956, the validity of which was extended up to December 31, 1959.

The new agreement provides for an increase in the exchange of commodities for the following year on a balanced basis. The German Democratic Republic will specially supply to India machine tools, polygraphic machinery, products of precision of the mechanical and optical industries, electrical equipments, textile machinery, as well as fertilizers, films and a number of other industrial raw materials and equipments.

The payment arrangements have been modified to provide for a Central Clearing Account so that the Rupees, earned by exports of goods from the German Democratic Republic, are utilised for the import of Indian products.

The foreign trade organisations of the German Democratic Republic will import from India tea, coffee and preserved fruit, raw materials, semi-processed and finished products of the textile and leather industries, as well as other consumer goods and handicrafts in 1959.

The Trade Agreement was signed for the Government of the German Democratic Republic by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade and Inner German Trade, Mr. Julius Balkow, and for the Government of India by the Director General of Foreign Trade, Shri K.B. Lall.

INDIA GERMANY USA

**Date**: Nov 03, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

## HAGUE CONVENTION

## India's Ratification

The Government of India have recently ratified the convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict which was drawn up at the Hague in May, 1954. The convention and the protocol have come into force in respect of India with effect from Sep 16, 1958, according to a press communique issued by the

Government of India in New Delhi on November 26, 1958.

The Hague Convention, which met under the auspices of the UNESCO, seeks to improve

<Pg-269>

the provisions of the earlier conventions; it aims at protecting all cultural property in the event of armed conflict. It is based on the faith that cultural property, to whatever nation it might belong, is an integral part of the heritage of humanity.

Under the provisions, signatories to the convention are required to respect cultural property and protect it from theft and vandalism in their own as well as in occupied territories belonging to another signatory. During peace time, the parties are obliged to develop services and agencies for the protection of cultural property in times of emergency. Military regulations are also to be amended and instructions provided so as to ensure the observance of the convention and to foster among members of the armed forces respect for the culture and cultural property of all peoples.

INDIA USA

**Date**: Sep 16, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

**IRAN** 

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

The Instruments of Ratification of the Cultural Agreement between the Governments of India and Iran were exchanged at Teheran on Nov 03, 1958. The Instruments were exchanged between Shri T. N. Kaul, Ambassador of India in Teheran on behalf of India and Dr. Ali Asghar Hekmat, Foreign Minister of Iran, on behalf of the Government of Iran

The Agreement which was signed in New Delhi on December 1, 1956, consists of 14 Articles and declares that the two Governments desire to establish and develop closer cultural relations between the two countries. It seeks to promote and develop in every possible way and on sound basis such relations and understanding, specially in the realm of science and education.

**Date**: Nov 03, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shrimati Maimoona Sultan's Statement in the Trusteeship Council

Shrimati Maimoona Sultan, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on Nov 10, 1958 on the Report of the Council:

India is a member of the Trusteeship Council, and our representatives in the Council, naturally, express our detailed views on the administration of trust territories, in its winter and summer sessions. It should not, therefore, be necessary for us, to set forth our views, once again in great detail before this Committee. There are, however, certain matters of importance of which we would like to draw the attention of our colleagues in this Committee, during this general debate.

First of all, from Chapter III of Volume I of the Report under review, distinguished delegates would have seen that the Council was not able to examine a number of petitions from the cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under British administration on account of the non-cooperation of the administering authorities concerned. We believe that it is an inalienable right of the inhabitants of a trust territory to address petitions to the Trusteeship Council concerning political, economic and social conditions obtaining in the territory. We also believe that it is both the right and the obligation of the Trusteeship Council to examine such petitions in accordance with its rules and regulations. We find it difficult to accept the position taken by the administering authorities, that they will not recognise or consider documents prepared by organisations or by persons claiming to belong to organisations that were prohibited by Law; that they will not, for that reason, assist the Council in the performance of one of its basic functions. In our view this attitude is not in conformity with the obligations of a Member State of the United Nations administering its trust. The failure of an administering authority to assist the Trusteeship Council in the examination of petitions on pretexts of this kind can only be regarded as tantamount to denying the freedom of expression to those individual inhabitants or political groups and parties of a territory, whose views may happen to diverge from those of the

administering authority, on matters of policy or detail. Such an attitude may result in the repression of certain freedoms. It can hinder the growth and spread of ideas and democractic practices and thereby retard a territory's peaceful progress--towards the ultimate goal of self-government or independence.

Members of this Committee will recall that both the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council have carefully defined and reiterated their views in several resolutions concerning the establishment of intermediate and final targets for the achievement of the objective of self-government or independence of trust territories. It is, in our view, most unfortunate that the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Trusteeship Council should have evoked little or no response from the administering authorities in this matter. It is common knowledge that the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreements do not contemplate trusteeship, over any territory, to continue indefinitely. What they do, clearly and definitely, envisages that these territories will, sooner rather than later, become self-governing or independent. The purpose of the system is to carry them forward, through various stages of political, social and economic development, to the ultimate goal of independence. It will be in the interest of orderly development and stability, to plan these stages in advance. We, therefore, hold the view that the administering authorities should anticipate the pressure of events by formulating plans of political, social and economic development, with dates for their fulfilment, with a view to helping create the preconditions for the attainment of selfgovernment or independence. My delegation, in co-sponsorship with other distinguished delegations, has submitted a resolution on the subject, and we hope, Mr. Chairman, that this will receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the work of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories. After some years of preparation and contemplation, the Committee has recently produced two very interesting and useful reports on the pace of rural development, in the trust territories of Ruanda-Urandi and New Guinea. These reports focus attention on some of the problems which face the rural populations of the territories, such as the scarcity of cultivable land, land-alienation, the lack of credit facilities, the problem of community development and of landuse planning. We hope that the administering authorities concerned will give due attention to the observations of the Committee and the Trusteeship Council concerning them, and do their utmost to ameliorate the conditions of the rural populations. My delegation earnestly hopes that the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the trust territories will continue to pursue its useful work with full vigour.

The Committee will recall that at its 6th session, the General Assembly had established a programme of scholarships and fellowships

for the inhabitants of Trust Territories. Ever since the Trusteeship Council has reported regularly to the General Assembly on the progress of that programme. The Council's Report under review shows that during the academic year 1957-58, Member States had made available over 100 scholarships for the inhabitants of Trust as well as Non-Self-Governing Territories. Out of these only a total of 38 scholarships have actually been utilised by students from Trust Territories, and a large number of scholarships have remained unutilised. Now, in many Trust Territories educational facilities, especially in the technical fields, are not available in any satisfactory degree. The need for providing such facilities to the inhabitants of these territories is also unquestionable. It is, therefore, a matter of deep regret to us that, for one reason or other, the facilities offered by Member States should not have been utilised fully. My delegation would request the Secretary-General to go into the matter carefully and list the causes which are responsible for this state of affairs. We also hope that the administering authorities concerned will, in the immediate future, take whatever steps may be necessary, to enable students from their territories to avail of the facilities offered by Member States.

By its resolution 1210 (XII) of December 13, 1957, the General Assembly had invited the administering authorities concerned to submit information to the Trusteeship Council on the association of Trust Territories under their administration, with 'the European Economic Community' and on the possible effects of the Treaty on the economic development of those territories. Mr. Chairman, the United Nations interest in the economic future of Trust Territories needs hardly to be re-emphasised. We had, therefore, hoped that consequent upon the adoption by the General Assembly of its resolution 1210(XII) of December 13, 1957, the administering authorities concerned would inform the Trusteeship Council of the significance of the association of their Trust Territories with the European Economic Community. We regret to say that the administering authorities should have thought it fit or proper to withhold from the Trusteeship Council information in this regard.

### <Pg-271>

We hope that the General Assembly will take note of this situation and will urge upon the administering authorities, once again, to comply with its resolutions on the subject.

So much for some of the general aspects of the Trusteeship Council's report. I should now like to seek your permission, Mr. Chairman, to comment briefly on some of the problems affecting particular Trust Territories. It is a source of considerable gratification to us that five of the Trust Territories, namely, the British Cameroons, the French Cameroons, French Togoland, Somaliland and Western Samoa, have already entered the final stages of their advancement towards the goal of self-government or independence. It is also a source of satisfaction to us that the transition of these territories from their dependent to fully independent or self-governing status is

taking place smoothly and peacefully in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned and in full consultation with the United Nations. These are accomplishments for which the Government of France, Italy, New Zealand and the United Kingdom deserve our gratitude and congratulations. Equally worthy of our admiration and felicitations are the peoples and governments of these territories. We wish them all a great future of progress, prosperity and self-realisation. Now that the independent statehood of these territories is in sight, the United Nations and the Trusteeship Council may look back over these 12 years with a sense of pride and satisfaction over the success of the Trusteeship System. Much of the credit for this success goes to the Administering Authorities; and we sincerely hope that it will encourage them to bring more of their non-self-governing territories under the Trusteeship of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, as the year 1960 approaches, the political and constitutional problems of the trust territories which are moving towards independence, will recede into the background. It seems to us that the economic and administrative problems which face these territories, are now, and will be in the future, of infinitely greater significance. We, therefore, hope that these territories will direct all their efforts and energies to find solutions of these problems. Political freedom is not secure unless it is accompanied by economic stability. Independence loses some of its meaning without economic and social prosperity. It is encouraging to note that among the population and leaders of these territories, there is an awareness of the importance of these issues. It is to be expected that the paternal interest of the United Nations in the progress and well-being of these territories will not cease with their accession to independence. We urge that the United Nations give careful consideration to the technical and financial requirements of these territories, and give them all possible assistance from its resources, such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund.

We have watched with considerable interest and some satisfaction the developments taking place in the territory of Tanganyka, which is the largest among Trust Territories. Basically, progress in that territory is in the right direction; and it seems to us that there is every intention on the part of the administering authority that Tanganyka should become an independent or self-governing state, in accordance with the wishes of its people. However, there are one or two things to which we would like to draw particular attention. The principle of parity in political representation is not in conformity with democratic principal and purposes, and the grant of more adequate representation to the African people in the legislative, executive, social and economic spheres of the territory's life is called for and need not be delayed unnecessarily. We are encouraged to think that essentially, there is no difference of view between the Administering Authority and ourselves in this regard. The other day the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom quoted the following from a speech made by the Governor of Tanganyka to the

Legislative Council: "It is not intended, and never has been intended that parity should be a permanent feature of the Tanganyka scene". Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to note this encouraging trend and we look forward to its implementation. My delegation feels that the high degree of political consciousness displayed in the recent elections in Tanganyka warrants the introduction of a liberal measure of reform in the territory. In our view, the broadening of the franchise, a more rapid development of the Legislative Council, and the extension of direct elections to all representative bodies ought not to be delayed much longer.

There is need for the expansion of educational facilities, especially, facilities for technical education in the territory. But above all, it is necessary that whatever facilities exist--whether in the field of primary, secondary or technical education--these ought to be open to students of all races and colours. The best form of developing a multi-racial society is not the one in which you start by creating division at the base. We would therefore, urge the Administering Authority to put an early end to racial segregation or racial

<Pg-272>

discrimination in the sphere of education in Tanganyka.

I regret that we should once again, have to express our disappointment over the slowness of political progress in the trust territory of Ruanda-Urandi. The picture of the great continent of Africa is changing from day to day, and it is our considered view that no one territory in this great land mass can exist in isolation. To us it does not seem that the division between the peoples of Ruanda and Urandi is so basic that it should be allowed to retard the political progress of the territory as a whole. So far as we have been able to judge, little has been done to foster a sense of nationhood in the territory. It is necessary that the Administering Authority should, without losing any more time, introduce comprehensive political and social reforms to satisfy the growing political consciousness of the inhabitants of the territory. It is necessary also that political progress in this territory--as in other territories, such as Tanganyka and New Guinea--should be planned according to an adjustable time-table with targets and effective dates. Such a method of development would be far more rational and successful than the present one of progress under the pressure of events and circumstances. In the social field, we find that racial separation and certain discriminatory practices, such as the obligation to obtain transport passports in the case of indigenous inhabitants still persists in Ruanda-Urandi. The continuation of these practices cannot lead to the strengthening of peace in the territory, and we, therefore, look forward to their early abolition. It is encouraging to note that a beginning has been made in interracial education, and we hope that this experiment will be developed to its utmost possibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat disconcerting to know that public order in Ruanda-Urandi is maintained by a contingent of the police of Belgian-Congo. This, in our view, is not a very healthy state of affairs. We would urge the Administering Authority to take steps to develop a police force for the territory, from among its own inhabitants, so that when the objective of trusteeship is reached, the territory will be in a position to maintain law and order within its frontiers without assistance from outside.

I now come to the trust territory of New Guinea, under Australian administration. I would like to say at the outset that, in our view, the joint statement issued by the Governments of the Netherlands and Australia, concerning West Irian, Papua and the trust territory of New Guinea, outlining co-operation between the two Governments, is unacceptable to my delegation for the reasons which we have already stated last year.

The picture we have formed of the trust territory of New Guinea is a picture that does credit, in some ways, to the administering authority. For example, some considerable measure of progress has been achieved in the field of Legislative Councils and the extension of health-facilities. On the other hand, the representation of the indigenous population in the legislative councils and other representative organs is somewhat inadequate. The land-situation in the territory is also disquieting. The Indian Delegation sincerely hopes that the administering authority will expand its efforts to exploring the unexplored parts of the territory and to develop further, as rapidly as possible, more adequate educational facilities for the indigenous inhabitants of New Guinea.

The trust territory of Nauru under Australian administration faces a peculiar problem. The phosphate resources, which represent the one and only source of income of this territory, are likely to be exhausted in about 40 years, when its population may have to be removed from Nauru to another part of the world. It seems to us that the inhabitants of Nauru have not yet been made aware of the grim future that awaits them. Whatever that future be, it seems necessary that this small island community should be more adequately trained in the ways of democratic self-government, so that when they are transported into the midst of another community, they shall be able to take their rightful place in the life of that community. They should be given a more representative voice in the management of their island and also in the control of their resources. Education, especially University education, is sadly lagging behind in this territory. We urge the administering authority to make adequate opportunities available to the people of Nauru in political, social and economic fields.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to the end of my statement. I would like to say that the remarks I have offered should not be construed as criticism of the records of the administering authorities. We offer these remarks in a constructive spirit to assist these authorities in their great task of training the people placed under their trust, for

the responsibilities of self-government or independence, and we hope that these will be received in that spirit.

<Pg-273>

INDIA USA CAMEROON CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GUINEA MALI WESTERN SAMOA FRANCE ITALY NEW ZEALAND CONGO AUSTRALIA THE NETHERLANDS NAURU

**Date**: Nov 10, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri K. George Thomas, Statement on the Unification of Korea

Shri K. George Thomas, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Special Political Committee on Nov 07, 1958 on the Unification of Korea. He said:

We have before us the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/3865). The delegation of India has followed carefully the debate during the last three days. It is not our intention to introduce into the debate at this stage any further element of acrimony and I shall make my statement brief.

Before I deal with the main political aspect of the question before the Committee, I have to inform the Committee the position relating to the remaining eleven Korean ex-prisoners now in India. As the Committee is aware, at one time there used to be a specific item on this question; but since the position in regard to the ex-prisoners has been settled satisfactorily to a large extent, it only remains for my delegation to give the latest information regarding the exprisoners so that it may be read into the record.

As regards five of the ex-prisoners who opted for India, the Government of India has already given and is continuing to give them training in useful occupations, which will enable them to earn their livelihood. In the case of each exprisoner, not only has some employment been offered, but in addition the Government of India is endeavouring to assist them to improve in their technical skill and to earn a satisfactory livelihood. Three of the ex-prisoners who opted for Maxico, and one who opted for the Argentine Republic, are also in India for the present pending the completion of the formalities required before they are sent to these countries. The two remaining ex-prisoners have not yet opted for return to their homeland or for a neutral country. They will ultimately have to

select one of these alternatives.

I now come to the political aspects of the situation. As I mentioned earlier, we have before us the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and we have also a draft resolution submitted by Australia and twelve other countries contained in document A/C. I/L. 217. As has been emphasised by all the speakers before me, the most important aspect of the question is that relating to the Unification of Korea. The main objective of the United Nations in Korea remains the bringing-about by peaceful means of the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea. It is apparent from the report of the Commission that this main objective has not been achieved. In fact, there is unfortunately no indication even that the objective will be reached in the near future. My delegation regrets very much that there has been no progress in this matter, particularly as we feel convinced that, given the goodwill and cooperation on the part of the parties directly concerned, it should be possible to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this problem.

The views of my delegation on this question have been explained on previous occasions. We continue to believe firmly that a peaceful solution of the Korean question is vital to the preservation of peace in the Far East, and that the United Nations must undertake to promote such a solution. The solution must aim at a unified and independent Korea. To this end there must be an all-Korean Government freely elected under international supervision by the Korean people:

The draft resolution submitted by Australia and twelve other countries, which is the only draft resolution before the Committee, is in essence a repetition of earlier resolutions of the Assembly and, as my delegation has pointed out at the time this question was discussed during the twelfth session of the Assembly, we do not think that a resolution of this kind will take us any nearer to a solution of this problem.

The delegation of India has no doubt that the unification of Korea on the basis of principles which we all uphold is possible. It is possible to erase the dividing line at the 38th Parallel and bring North and South Korea together, on the basis of understanding and cooperation and on the basis of free elections. As I mentioned a moment ago, my Government is in favour of elections under international supervision. We feel, however, that a realistic view should be taken in the matter of the part the United Nations can play in this matter. The United Nations has, it is true, a special responsibility in this area because it declared North Korea an aggressor. The war was waged on this account and we supported the action of the United Nations at that time. It must, however, be remembered that in the present context the United Nations, while it is undoubtedly

the custodian of the Charter, was one of the combatants and is at present one of the parties represented by the United Nations Command in Korea. It should also be remembered that at no time did the United Nations exercise supervision over all Korea.

The principle of carrying out elections in Korea under international supervision has received wide acceptance. "International elections" do not in any way necessarily mean elections under the supervision of the United Nations. The underlying principle is that the international element should be maintained. I should, in this connexion, like to refer to the suggestion made by the Foreign Minister of France in 1954 at Geneva. The Chairman of the Indian delegation to the twelfth session of the Assembly referred to this in his intervention during the discussion of the Korean question at the twelfth session. I make bold to repeat it now because the delegation of India considers that the suggestion made by the French Foreign Minister in 1954 is extremely pertinent and constructive. He suggested at that time that elections for the purpose of the unification of Korea should be held throughout the whole Korean territory to set up a single and truly representative Government for the whole of Korea, and that such elections should be carried out "in conditions of genuine freedom under international supervision" and that once the unification of Korea had been achieved under proper conditions, the United Nations should be called on to give their approval to the settlement thus reached. The delegation of India feels that this approach is the one that must be satisfactory and practicable. We are convinced that a solution of this problem can be achieved only with the agreement of both sides and this principle of agreement between the two sides should not be abandoned in this case.

An important development during the year was an announcement by the Chinese Government of the withdrawal of the Chinese Volunteers from North Korea. It is stated by the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, contained in document A/C. 1/810, that the Chinese People's Volunteers had completely evacuated Korea by 26 October 1958. My delegation welcomes this development which should be responded to by the other side, and which, we are convinced, will facilitate reaching a solution of this problem.

The draft resolution submitted by Australia and twelve other countries is, as I said earlier, unrealistic, and my delegation will not be in a position to support it.

Before I conclude I should like to make one remark on the Report of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea which relates to the assistance rendered by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. Without disrespect to the activities of this agency, my delegation would like to put it on record that in our view any such measures of assistance should be directed to the whole of the country, and should not reach only half of it.

It is the sincere hope of the delegation of India that ways and means

will soon be found to make it possible to establish the objective of the United Nations, namely, the unification of Korea.

INDIA KOREA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI AUSTRALIA NORTH KOREA FRANCE SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Nov 07, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Akbar Ali Khan's Statement on the Problem of Arab Refugees from Palestine

Shri Akbar Ali Khan, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following Statement at the Special Political Committee on Nov 13, 1958 on the Problem of Arab Refugees from Palestine:

My Delegation would first and foremost like to join with other delegations in paying tribute to the work carried out by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. Several other delegations have referred to the outstanding work done by Mr. Henry Labouisse, who retired from his post as Director of the organisation after four years of unstinted and valuable service. I would like to join those delegation in expressing our warm appreciation of his work as well as that of the Acting Director, Mr. Carver, and all members of the staff of the agency.

My delegation had studied carefully the report submitted by the Director as well as the statement made before the committee by the acting director on the 7th November 1958. My delegation was certainly impressed by the complete frankness with which both the report and the statement have been presented.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the world has seen the sad plight of many millions of refugees in various areas over the last fifty years. To uproot a family from their home, remove

<Pg-275>

them from their native lands and have them try to settle their lives in some other part of the world is very painful and long-term process. During the very years that this problem of the Palestine refugees has been before us, my own country has faced a refugee problem Which is nearly ten times as large. This problem unfortunately appears to be a continuing one, and my Government has

to face an influx of refugees every month as the years go by. We have for this simple reason been compelled to devote a large part of our national resources to the problem of rehabilitation of these refugees--a problem which is perhaps bigger both in its dimensions, as well as in its full implications, for my country than any similar problem faced by other member states. This has unfortunately led to a situation where we have been unable to make more than very modest contributions for the relief and rehabilitation of the refugees from Palestine in spite of our very great sympathy for these refugees and their plight. In view, however, of the grave financial situation that has been pointed out by the acting director, my Government has authorised me to inform the Secretary-General that we will this year contribute goods to the value of Rs. 1,00,000 in Indian currency for the agency. Though this is a very modest sum, it is nevertheless an increase on our previous contribution--this at a time when due to problems which are common knowledge, my country is not in a position to increase its commitments.

Normally we would feel very diffident indeed to participate in this debate in view of our own very modest contribution to the relief and rehabilitation of the refugees. However, I do feel that there are two reasons which enable us to make some contribution in the direction of this matter. Firstly, the problem of the refugees is a part of the political problem which exists in the area which is generally referred to as the Middle East, but which we prefer to designate as West Asia. No one can possibly feel that there is a practical longterm solution to this problem, without an overall solution to the political problem of the Middle East. Therefore it follows logically that until such a political solution is reached, we will have to continue to help the refugees in the manner in which the United Nations have been helping them in the past. We are of course greatly appreciative of the generous manner in which some member states, both large and small, have contributed so much in order to enable this agency to continue to function even in its very modest form of operation. For, when you think of all these 900.000 human beings, when you realize that five U.S. cents per day are being spent on feeding each of them, one does not feel that any word other than modest can be applied to the operation. We sincerely hope that it will be possible for those member states, which have in the past shouldered the responsibility of the United Nations in this matter, to continue to do so in the future, and we earnestly appeal to all member states to realize that the responsibility in this matter is certainly, if not entirely, in a major part, the responsibility of the United Nations.

I say this advisedly. For if India has refugees, the refugees have come to India as a result of partition of a country carried out with the consent of all major political parties in the country--a fact which implies consent of the majority of the population. The same is, however, not true of the division of Palestine. In Palestine a majority of the United Nations decided to partition the country, against the wishes of the large majority of the population. In doing so, the United Nations automatically took responsibility for the

future of those Unfortunates who were affected by this partition. One cannot impose solutions and then refrain from taking the responsibility for the consequence of such solutions. My country was among those which were opposed to the partition of Palestine. We had advocated a federal state in Palestine, but unfortunately at the time it was not considered possible to accept our recommendations. Nevertheless, the United Nations having once taken the position to partition Palestine, it is up-to the United Nations to look after those who suffered the loss of their homes as a result of the partition.

The second reason why my Government feels that it is perhaps competent to contribute something to this discussion is because we have had some experience in the relief and rehabilitation of refugees as well as considerable experience in the return of refugees who left India, but subsequently decided to come back and live in India. We feel strongly that any work of relief and rehabilitation, if it is to have any meaning, must necessarily concentrate on the needs and future of the younger generations of refugees. No matter what the political future of the refugees, it is essential that the younger generation should be provided with education and skills which will enable them to follow useful vocations wherever they may settle when they are older. We are happy to note that a considerable effort is being made in this direction, and we are confident that the organisation will continue to bear this in mind in the future. We are particularly glad that the director has said in

## <Pg-276>

his statement before this committee that education is "the essential first step in preparing the younger generation of refugees to take their place in a highly competitive world."

I said earlier that the responsibility for relief and rehablitation of these refugees is the responisbility of the United Nations because the refugees would not have become a homeless people had it not been for a political decision taken by the United Nations, and in spite of their opposition. We hope and trust that these consequences of partition will be borne in mind by the member states mainly responsible for the partition. As the Chairman of my delegation said during the general debate, in the past the maxim appeared to be 'divide and rule', but now it appears to be 'divide and leave'. It is all very well to divide and leave, but the consequences, to those who are divided, and the human misery that is caused to them, is not felt by those who have left. To think therefore at this time in terms of winding up the tasks of relief and rehabilitation without an overall political settlement, which is the only possible permanent solution, which is the only possible permanent solution, is highly dangerous, because any such step will entail a very grave and dangerous situation in a part of the world that is indeed near to us, not only for the sake of the refugees themselves, but also for the sake of the peace in that troubled region known as the 'Middle East', and as such, peace in the world at large, we would appeal to member states

to continue the work that is being done by UNRWA, for it is, I think, fairly obvious that a political settlement cannot be reached immediately. Everybody recognises the fact that a political settlement would take time. That is true because the extreme bitterness and resentment which has been caused due to the partition of Palestine cannot obviously be overcome in a short while. My country, has always had very great sympathy and admiration for the Jewish people in the world, who have suffered so terribly during many years at the hands of others. We could understand the conscience of the world being exercised due to these sufferings; we ourselves were deeply moved at the sad fate of millions in concentration camps and gas chambers. Nevertheless, we did not feel in 1947 and 1948, nor can we agree now, that it was desirable for the world to assuage its conscience by the partition of a land which was not responsible for the sufferings of the Jewish people, and at the expense of people who did not have any responsibility for the torture and martyrdom of the Jews in Europe. It may be comforting to assuage one's conscience and at the same time not to have to give up any territory in one's own state and to dispose of other people's territories: it was not, however, and could not be, a solution to any problem.

It is all very well for some to say that the refugees should do this or should do that. To force a solution on the refugees would be tantamount to repeating an early mistake committed when the refugees were forced to become refugees. You cannot ask a man to become integrated in a country unless he is willing to become integrated in that country. We therefore feel that it is absolutely essential to allow the refugees a choice in the matter. A choice which will enable them to decide where to go, always with the understanding that wherever they go, they will go as citizens of that state, with due respect for its laws and constitution. We are all committed to United Nations resolutions on this subject, for General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, states: "The refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date." A man would only be willing to go back if he wishes to live in peace and accommodation with his neighbours. We therefore feel that this possibility should be explored, and if, as many say, the refugees would be happier to settle in other lands then undoubtedly they should be allowed to have that opportunity. It is up to the good sense of the Governments concerned to think in terms of some solution which could give a right--a natural right--to all refugees to turn to their own lands, and also a right to governments to insist that citizens entering their country should follow the laws and the constitution of the country.

In this connection, I would also like to mention the problem of compensation for the refugees. We feel that compensation is not a benefit to be conferred by someone on someone else--we feel that compensation is a natural human right which never can be denied, irrespective of political considerations. If, therefore, these refugees are to receive compensation on account of the loss of their homes and the lands, we feel that this matter should not be tied in

with any political considerations, but should be dealt with in itself.

Whatever the bitterness--which is unfortunate-whatever the difficulties and the various positions taken--which we all understand--we are certain that it is not beyond the ability of the Arab States and Israel to work out some arrangement whereby it will be possible for the refugees to have the right to go back as citizens of Israel or be compensated in order to begin their lives elsewhere. We are aware that such a solution will take time, particularly after the

<Pg-277>

bitterness due to the events of two years ago, but we sincerely hope that the United Nations will continue to assist in finding some such solution by refraining from taking any action which could only make matters worse. Such abrupt actions would include the sudden conclusion of the activities of UNRWA, or an attempt to impose a political solution on people who are not as yet ready for such solutions. We would therefore support the continuance of UNRWA activities, with stress on vocational and educational needs, and appeal to all governments to contribute to the funds of the agency.

May l, in all humility, state that my country has for centuries been a cradle of all religions, and peoples of all faiths have lived and are living there with perfect amity and goodwill; we have the deep conviction, strengthened by the teachings of our sages, and fully borne out by the lessons of history that justice and fair play should be done to all concerned in this matter, particularly to the refugees. In view of this, our deep religious conviction, may I appeal to the distinguished representatives of member states, and particularly to those who are mainly responsible, to come out with a bold but just and equitable solution which will satisfy the conscience of world public opinion and enhance the prestige of this great world organisation.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA ISRAEL

**Date**: Nov 13, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. Venkataraman's Statement on Working Capital Fund

Shri R. Venkataraman, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Fifth Committee on Nov 03, 1958 on Working Capital Fund. He said:

My Delegation indicated its position regarding the increase in the Working Capital Fund during the general debate on the budget estimates. My Delegation feels that a real and permanent solution to this problem of inadequate cash balances at peak periods of expenditure can be found only through a more prompt and regular payment of contributions by member states and not by an increase in the size of the Working Capital Fund, however justified this may seem on an a priori consideration of the facts of the situation. The Advisory Committee has in its usual wisdom underlined this same point in para 8 of its Report. The Advisory Committee has gone further and pointed out that the adherence to Financial Regulation 5.4 would indeed be in the interests of member Governments themselves since it would obviate the need for an increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund, which in effect represents an immobilization of a large amount of the member-country's resources. My Delegation would commend this point for the most earnest consideration of the members of the Committee. In agreeing to an increase of the Working Capital Fund we would not only be shying away from tackling boldly the basic cause of the problem, but would indeed be encouraging indirectly the existing tardiness in the payment of contributions and thereby aggravating and perpetuating the problem of inadequate working by balances. We cannot hope to cure the disease by treating merely the symptom. The record of the last two years has brought out substantially the risk we run, in undertaking such symptomatic treatment. Faced with a similar situation and persuaded by the same arguments as now put forward in favour of an increase in the Working Capital Fund, we agreed in 1956 to an increase in the level of the Fund from twenty million dollars to 22 million. The Fund was increased accordingly during 1957--but the dependence of the Organisation on the resources of the Fund has increased more than proportionately. Thus, we are faced with a situation today in which the strain on the augmented Fund is even greater than in the past, in fact, greater than ever before in the history of the Organisation. This is so, primarily because the additional demand on the member countries has encouraged greater delay and default--in the payment of contributions. While the rate of receipt of contributions has improved since 1956, the total of the contributions received during the first 6 months of the current year forms a smaller percentage of the total assessment than in the year 1955. The increase in overall arrears is even more glaring: From 6.1 million dollars at the end of December 1955 it has increased to 8.8 at the end of December 1957, and judging by present trends the total outstandings at the end of the current year may be even larger.

My Delegation is in entire agreement with the Advisory Committee when it describes the situation as "an essentially seasonal problem." In para 3 of its report the Committee has set out briefly the basic criteria to be adopted in determining the level of the Fund. The various arguments put forward by the Secretary-General in support of an increase of the Fund from twenty-two million to thirty million

have to be examined in the light of these basic criteria. After such an examination and a careful review of the pattern of past utilization of the resources

#### <Pg-278>

of the Fund during the successive periods of the financial year, my Delegation is led to the conclusion that the existing level of the Fund is not unreasonably low or inadequate in comparison to the requirements of the organization during the entire financial year. Such inadequacy has been experienced only during the critical months of May to July. We concede that a good case exists for strengthening the resources of the Fund during this critical period. But, it is equally true (and here the Advisory Committee also agrees) that during the other months of the year a substantially lower level of the Fund should be more than adequate for meeting the demands made on the Fund. On balance, therefore, the case for an increase in the level of the Fund appears weak--on the contrary, the argument seems to be greatly in favour of maintaining the status quo, with regard to the level of the Fund and seeking a remedy in spreading out the drain on the Working Capital Fund more evenly during the year so that the "seasonal" crisis is averted.

With this end in view, my Delegation would make the following suggestion. The pattern of receipts of contributions may be gradually and consciously modified in such a way that a larger percentage of contributions are paid in the first half of the year rather than in the second half. All member states may make a determined effort to pay their contributions in the earlier part of the year as far as practicable. Larger contributors may also consider the feasibility of making at least the major part of their contributions in the first half of the year. This in itself would make a fundamental difference to the financial position of the organisation.

My Delegation is deeply sensible of the duty to provide the Secretary-General with enough resources to carry out the obligations which we ourselves impose on him. It is our clear intention not to embarrass the Secretary-General. But the increasing burden on smaller and the less developed nations to find extra resources for their international obligations is equally a matter of concern to this great organisation. The less developed countries have themselves launched on programmes of economic and industrial developments which tax their resources in an acute measure. Besides, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the less developed countries to find adequate foreign exchange for these purposes. Even where the burden is not too heavy, the difficulties of foreign exchange faced by the less developed countries make it impossible to accept additional commitments in this behalf.

My Delegation would therefore earnestly plead with the advanced countries to make their contributions in the first half of the year itself and thus relieve the burden of the less developed countries. My delegation would also appeal to the Secretary-General to defer the

proposal to increase the Working Capital Fund for another year and explore all avenues of meeting the situation.

#### INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE

**Date**: Nov 03, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G.S. Pathak's Speech in the Legal Committee on Law of the Sea

Shri G.S. Pathak, Member of the Indian Delegation to U.N., made the following speech in the Sixth Committee of the United Nations on the question of a Second Conference on the Law of the Sea on Nov 28, 1958:

The UN conference on the Law of the Sea found that it had not been possible to reach agreement on the breadth of the territorial sea and to "settle certain aspects of a number of inherently complex questions" relating to the regime applicable to fishing and the conservation of the living resources of the high seas, and for that reason, on 27 April 1958, it requested the General Assembly to study, at its Thirteenth session, the advisability of convening a second international conference for further consideration of the questions left unsettled. I have referred to the resolution of the conference at this late stage of the debate, as there has been some controversy in this Committee as to the intentions of the Geneva Conference with regard to the holding of another conference. In the view of my delegation, the language of the resolution is quite clear. It is here in the General Assembly that we have to decide the question of the advisability of the holding of a second conference. The General Assembly, which was seized of the matter on a report from the International Law Commission, had referred it to the conference. The General Assembly alone is competent to consider the question. The matter has come back to the body which had referred it and which would normally have decided it. It is now for this body to make an appraisement of the situation and either to arrive at its own conclusions on the procedure and substance or to refer the matter of substance to another conference.

The first question that arises is: Why did the conference fail in arriving at an agreement

<Pg-279>

and in settling certain aspects of a number of questions, as

mentioned above, while it succeeded in preparing four conventions and one protocol, and in adopting 9 resolutions? There was no lack of goodwill or desire on the part of any participant to reach agreement. It has been said that a healthy spirit of compromise was evident throughout the proceedings. The delegations consisted of eminent persons, possessing high degree of skill and ability. There was ample opportunity for negotiations and this opportunity was fully availed of. The Secretariat had made the fullest preparation and had placed before the conference all relevant material Biological, economic and technical aspects were examined and expert advice of every description was available.

The summary record of the conference shows that the question of the breadth of the territorial sea was discussed in a number of meetings by those who were fully conversant with the history of the subject. The conference did not take the view that the discussions had not been adequate, or that there were some dark or obscure corners on which, if light had been thrown, agreement would have been reached. In fact, there do not appear to be any dark or obscure corners. From the proceedings which have been so clearly detailed by the distinguished delegate of Ecuador, it does not appear to my delegation that a few more meetings would have enabled the conference to reach an agreement. The continuance, therefore, of the conference for a further period could not have yielded any results. The resolution of the conference does not say that it was because of lack of time or inadequacy of consideration that the problem could not be solved.

The controversy about the width of the territorial sea is an old one. The Hague Codification Conference of 1930 was convened for the purpose of the codification of international law on this subject. Several years were taken in preparing the groundwork. In spite of strenuous and protracted efforts, no agreement was reached. The International Law Commission started the consideration of the subject in 1949. When the draft Articles were prepared in its Seventh session, the Commission could not take any decision as to the breadth of the territorial sea within a limit of 12 miles. There must, therefore, be something inherently complex in the very nature of the problem--to use the language of the resolution of the conference-which has defied a solution so far. In the view of my delegation the conference failed in reaching an agreement on the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and the allied questions because they were of great complexity, and because the claim to 3 miles-limit, in spite of the fact that it had been clearly proved to be untenable, was persisted in with tenacity! The result was that the gulf was not bridged and no agreement was reached. The question--very natural in the circumstances--has been raised in this Committee: Is there any supervening event which has sprung up after the close of the conference and which had unexpectedly drawn us closer to the desired end?

I have listened with great interest to the various reasons assigned for thinking that a conference, if held at an early date, will solve all the problems. With the utmost respect we feel that the question posed above still remains unanswered. There is nothing new which has come into existence. The position is the same as it was when the conference concluded its labours. The three-mile rule has been insisted on even in this Committee and so far no concrete and constructive proposal which could be acceptable to the majority of the nations has been offered.

All the governments affirm that they share the desire to promote peace and possess the common will to achieve settlement, and there is no government which wants that these problems should remain unresolved. Everyone of the Member Nations shares the belief that codification and progressive development of international law are the foundations of world peace. No one says that the questions left undecided, should not be decided, nor does any nation minimise the importance of the subject. That the task is immense or difficult does not detract from the necessity of its fulfilment. The only question is whether in the background of the history of the problem of the breadth of the territorial sea and in the light of the discussions in the conference and in this Committee, are we prepared to say, today, that it is advisable to have a second conference as proposed in L. 435?

In an article entitled "Freedom of the Seas" appearing in the October 1958 issue of `Foreign Affairs', Mr. Arthur H. Dean, the distinguished Chairman of the delegation of the USA to the Law of the Sea conference, while referring to that conference, says: "The desire of the United States to maintain a relatively narrow territorial sea and, more particularly, to prevent any extension to 12 miles was based not merely on the fact that the three-mile limit has long been recognised in international law, but also on compelling military and commercial

#### <Pg-280>

considerations. To reduce the area of the high seas by transforming important waters into territorial seas, closed to free navigation (and with the airspace above closed also) would decrease the security of the United States by reducing the efficiency of its naval and air power and increasing the risk of surprise attack".

We offer no comments on this statement. It, however, highlights the importance of the problem. But whatever the reasons which lie behind the view of some states that the so-called three-mile rule be retained, we feel that when a legal problem tends to become enmeshed with other problems, a heavy responsibility lies on the jurists of the world to determine the question on a juridical basis, so that the rule of law may govern the actions of the states.

The conference has examined biological, economic and technical aspects. My delegation does not minimise the achievements of the conference; in fact, my country participated in the deliberations of the conference and made every effort to arrive at a solution of the

problem. We shall continue to make efforts until the problem is solved. It is for this very reason that we are anxious that we should give full consideration to the question after complete preparation, and should not rush through this matter which has defied all solution so far.

As regards the views of my Government and the importance of this matter to my country, I would request reference to the speech made by my delegation on 6 December 1956 in this Committee. There I had stated: "To adopt the language of the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, among the basic considerations inherent in the nature of the territorial sea is its close dependence on land domain and the coastal state must therefore be allowed the latitude necessary to adapt its delimitation to practical needs and local requirements. There is also the important consideration of economic interests peculiar to a coastal state. These considerations are bound to vary in the case of different states. There is the security reason also. Every state possesses a special interest in all these considerations. World conditions have changed. In particular, the food problem has become deeper--more serious in the case of some states than in the case of others. In the view of my delegation, the three-mile rule has become obsolete. It has lost contact with the realities of the situation. Every law must respond to existing facts, otherwise it loses its utility and possesses only a historical value. The reasons which necessitated the observance of the rule of threemile limit have ceased to exist. The rule cannot therefore survive. It would be highly unreasonable if the old three-mile rule is imposed upon the states whose practical needs and changed conditions necessitate a wider extent of the territorial sea".

A practical solution that was suggested by my delegation was to accept the 12-mile rule as the maximum, giving the freedom to the maritime states to choose within the range and fix the limit generally according to their vital needs, economic and security considerations.

My Government introduced a resolution at the conference, No. A/Conf/13/C. I/L. 79 along with Mexico, wherein the same position was taken. The reason why my country has adopted this position is that we believe that it is strictly in accord with international law. In the draft Articles the International Law Commission laid down that-

the Commission recognised that international practice is not uniform as regards the traditional limitation of the territorial sea to three miles:

In other words, the Commission came to the conclusion that the three-mile limit was not a uniform practice, and that under international law, 12 miles was the maximum limit. In the comment appended to the above-mentioned Article (3), the Commission said that "in the first paragraph the Commission recognises that the international practice is not uniform as regards the traditional limitation of the territorial sea to three miles and the Commission regards this as a

statement of incontrovertible fact". The traditional custom of the three-mile limit as a general practice--even if there was such a custom--has fallen into desuetude. The three-mile limit is thus not a universal practice and cannot be treated as a customary rule of international law binding upon the entire international community.

It is certainly open to these states which believe in the 3 mile limit to retain it for their own shores, as international law does not compel them to extend it, if they think that their security and other interests are best served thereby. But the 3 mile limit not being a general rule of international law, cannot be imposed on other states, who are entitled to determine the limits of their territorial sea according to their own notions of security and food and other requirements.

The principle of territorial waters is based

<Pg-281>

upon the theory of self-preservation and protection. Out of this theory have stemmed a number of rights, including the right to exclusive fishing and all the rights necessary for the security of the coastal state. It is the inherent right of every state to protect its sovereignty and also to make suitable provisions for the existence of its people. It is in the exercise of this right that big maritime powers originally declared the limit of the territorial sea. Thus the territorial sea became appurtenant to the land territory and it became part of the territory of the coastal state. It was necessary for defending the sovereignty to claim the right to territorial sea and to maintain it, as otherwise the shores would have remained undefended. The right therefore to declare a territorial sea as appurtenant to land territory is a part of international law. The right to declare a part of the sea as territorial sea carries with it the right to declare its extent. Of its needs and requirements, the coastal state alone can be the judge. Where conditions change it would be within the right of the coastal state to declare the extent afresh, as otherwise the right itself becomes illusory.

I shall not elaborate the point and discuss the substance at length. But as in the course of the debate here, reference has been made more than once to the decision of the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, I wish to make a few observations. The following passage has been quoted from that decision:--

"The delimitation of the sea areas has always an international aspect; it cannot be dependent merely upon the will of the coastal state, as expressed in its municipal law. Although it is true that the act of delimitation is necessarily a unilateral act, because only the coastal state is competent to undertake it, the validity of delimitation with regard to other states depends upon international law".

It is clear from this statement of the law that the act of delimitation or definement of the width is, from the very nature of the case, a unilateral act, and therefore belongs to the municipal law. This act has to be in the shape of legislation or proclamation or has to be performed by other constitutional means. Naturally the coastal state alone is competent to perform this act. The dictum that the validity of delimitation with regard to other states depends upon international law merely means that the coastal state should, in defining the width of the territorial sea, observe international law. The above dictum does not and cannot mean that there can be no definement of delimitation by unilateral declaration of the coastal state. That the opposite is the correct meaning of the above passage would also appear from another passage in the judgement of the Court where it said: "In this connection certain basic considerations inherent in the nature of the territorial sea bring to light certain criteria which--though not entirely precise--can provide Courts with an adequate basis for their decisions which can be adapted to the diverse facts in question. Among these, some reference must be made to the equal dependence of the territorial sea upon the land domain. It is the land which confers upon the coastal state the right to the waters of its coasts. It follows that while such a state must be allowed the latitude necessary in order to be able to adapt its limits to practical needs and local requirements, the drawing up of base line must not depart to any appreciable extent to the general direction of the coast". It is true that the ultimate question involved in the case was not the question of the width of the territorial sea, but was one of drawing up of the base line. But one principle of law may decide more than one question. In the view of my delegation the principle laid down in this passage governs the question of the width of the territorial sea also and is fully applicable thereto. That principle is: The state must be allowed the right to adapt its limits to practical needs and local requirements. If therefore such needs and requirements demand a breadth of territorial sea wider than three miles, it is the right of the state to extend it. Of course, as found by the International Law Commission, the extension cannot be beyond 12 miles. But within 12 miles, the right to adapt its limits clearly belongs to the coastal state. This also, as shown above, represents the current international practice. This is the international law to which the declaration of the coastal state or its municipal law should conform and which the coastal state has to observe when exercising its right to delimit and define the width of the territorial sea. International law itself confers the authority to define and delimit the territorial sea, adapting its width to its needs and requirements, and there is no point then in the argument that there cannot be a unilateral declaration as its validity depends on international law. As I have shown above, and as the Court says, "the act of delimitation is necessarily a unilateral act, because only the coastal state is competent to undertake it". These practical needs and local requirements are represented by the economic, security and other interests of the coastal state. The above being the current position, any protests made by states to declarations of coastal

#### <Pg-282>

accordance with international law as stated above, are invalid and cannot be recognised, being contrary to that law. Thus it is the protests which are against international law and not the declarations of the coastal states. If the above is the existing law--which we maintain that it is--no question of recognition by other states arises.

Too much emphasis on the freedom of the High Seas will not avail, as the law as stated above strikes the balance, striking it correctly, between the special rights of the coastal states and the general rights of the international community, including the coastal states. The international community is under the obligation to preserve and protect the special rights of the coastal states and these special rights of the coastal states are superior to the general rights of the international community in the High Seas and must be given priority.

The conclusion therefore is that the rule of international law is that a state possesses the discretion to extend and define the limits of the territorial sea when justified by the practical needs and local requirements.

Even if the above had not been the customary international law, the demands of its progressive development would have justified the laying down of this rule for the general international community in the interests of world peace and harmony. This rule is also in consonance with justice. Because what could be more unjust than that growing populations in underdeveloped countries should live almost at starvation levels and the weaker states should not be able to protect their shores adequately, but the three-mile limit must continue. The above rule is also in line with the development of international law in other branches, particularly with the basis of law relating to Continental Shelf. It is for the preservation of the special interests of the coastal state that the law relating to the continental shelf has been evolved. This rule will also be in consonance with what has been described by the International Court of Justice as 'elementary considerations of humanity, even more exacting in peace than in war'.

Since 1930, two international conferences have failed: the International Law Commission--an expert body representative of the learning, ability and skill of the entire international community in the legal sphere--has also failed; but as pointed out above, the General Assembly has never made a single attempt to solve the problem itself. It is high time that it should take upon itself the responsibility of examining this vexed question and arriving at a conclusion acceptable to all. The distinguished delegate of Iceland has suggested that the Sixth Committee is the most suitable body for this purpose. We are in sympathy with this idea, as there are good

reasons to support it. If we lose faith in the competence or the efficacy of the work of the Sixth Committee, we lose faith in the UN itself. On our part, we affirm that we are firm believers in the principles and purposes of the Charter and in the methods and machinery of the United Nations. Experience has also shown that the General Assembly has, on a number of occasions, proved equal to the task, has averted many ugly situations and has solved very difficult problems. During the thirteen years of its working the United Nations has created in its halls an atmosphere where the spirit of independence based on equal sovereignty of nations reigns and where the impact of world opinion is most felt and where rigidity has been seen to soften and realities taken into account. It is true that at the conference, non-member states will also be parties, but their contribution appears on the records of the conference and we have the benefit of that contribution. There are six hundred million people in another part of the world who are not represented here and on which the decisions of the General Assembly are not binding. So far as the peoples of the countries represented in the General Assembly are concerned, neither the place--Geneva or New York--nor the name given to the Assembly of the Member States--Conference or General Assembly--would matter. The decision will turn the approaches and attitudes of the governments of the Member States, and they are not affacted by the difference in place or name. Conventions can be prepared as a result of the deliberations of the General Assembly and have been so prepared before. What is needed is the agreement between the Member States.

The biological, economic and technical aspects were thoroughly examined at the last conference. It is well-known that if expert advice is needed, the delegations to the UN have the assistance of advisers sent by their respective governments. The matter is of such a vital nature to those countries whose coasts are exposed and who have no strong and large navies and whose food problems are acute that we cannot take any risk of failures. The last conference ended on a note of frustration and another failure will be nothing short of disaster. We must therefore observe the utmost caution.

The rule of law is the main protection of under-developed and smaller states, particularly

#### <Pg-283>

those who have won their freedom recently. These are the states most interested in the establishment of the rule of law. The rule of law is their bulwark. So far as India is concerned, the entire fabric of its democratic structure is based upon the rule of law which forms an essential part of our way of thinking.

If a conference is held in August 1959, two delegations would be working on behalf of each state at the same time--one at the conference, the other at the UN--and by reason of the importance of the matter, the government of each state has to be adequately represented at the conference. The question of expense is also a

matter with which the under-developed and smaller states are bound to be concerned. If some states are not able to send their delegations to Geneva and not allowed to represent their point of view fully and competently, their case may go by default. That will not be justice. We feel concerned with this aspect of the matter.

We take the view that it is advisable that this matter be inscribed on the agenda of the Fourteenth session of the General Assembly on a priority basis and as soon as a decision is arrived at on the procedure, the item should be taken up and disposed of by the Sixth Committee, if it is so decided, and in that very session.

Before I conclude, I must say a few words about the work of the Geneva Conference. We attach great value and importance to that work and also express gratitude for the preparatory work done by the Secretariat which facilitated the task of the delegations. The question of the breadth of the territorial sea has been rightly described as the bedrock, as the corner stone, as a fundamental factor, etc. We agree that the breadth of the territorial sea is the very foundation upon which almost the whole superstructure of the convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone was to rest. In that convention, as it stands, we have an edifice without foundation and corner-stones. The very essence of every agreement-whether on a national or international plane--is certainly its terms. In the convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, Article 1 purports to define `territorial sea' and it defines it in terms of the sovereignty of the coastal state. The extent and area of the belt of sea is unknown. That is no definition. The various provisions, naturally depend upon and are related and apply to a territorial sea, which is unknown in dimensions. The convention is like a statute relating to a subject-matter but without the definition of the subject-matter, or like a conveyance without the extent of the property conveyed. At best, it is a provisional arrangement which will come into existence if and when the subjectmatter becomes capable of definition.

The provisions relating to the `Contiguous Zone' also suffer from the same defect, as that zone is contiguous to the territorial sea. From where the contiguous zone begins is not known. It is like a line with one end if that is physically possible. The other end is problematical.

By reason of this gap and by reason of the very great importance of the matter, my delegation has devoted anxious thought to the consideration of this question, and after mature deliberation has arrived at the conclusion that in the present circumstances there is a serious danger that the conference as proposed in document A/C.6/L. 435 may end in failure. We feel that it is necessary that there should be a thorough preparation of the various view-points expressed in the last conference and in this Committee and there should be diplomatic negotiations so that the differences be narrowed down and there may be reasonable chances of their being resolved. Prior preparatory work can alone make an agreement possible. Our anxiety is

to secure conditions which may prevent the danger of another failure and which may ensure success in bringing about an agreement. It is this anxiety that has impelled us to co-sponsor the amendment in document L/440. We do not desire that a decision on the substance should be postponed after this Committee has determined what is the best procedure in the circumstances of the case. As soon as the question is decided, whether the General Assembly or the conference is the suitable forum, the discussion on the substance can be taken up in the Fourteenth session in the Sixth Committee--if the decision is in favour of the Sixth Committee--or in the conference to be held at the earliest reasonable date--if the General Assembly decides in favour of the conference. In the long and tedious history of this problem, a few months time, if it promotes chances of success, will be most usefully spent.

In paragraph 3 of the operative part in document L/440 it is stated that "efforts be made to reach agreement thereon". It is clear that this sentence includes agreement on the substance of the matter. It is really agreement on the substance of the matter which is most important and our efforts must be directed towards that end. The rest of the amendments are intended to aid in the disposal of the matter on the substance.

<Pg-284>

My delegation therefore earnestly urges on the Committee to support the amendment.

My delegation reserves the right to speak again, if it considers it necessary.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA ECUADOR MEXICO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ICELAND

**Date**: Nov 28, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **NORWAY**

Norwegian Prime Minister's Visit

Mr. Einar Gerhardsen, Prime Minister of Norway, visited India in November 1958 at the invitation of the Government of India.

A State Banquet was held in his honour on Nov 28, 1958 The Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru speaking on the occasion said:

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It gives me peculiar pleasure to welcome our distinguished guests, Prime Minister of Norway and Madam Gerhardsen for a variety of reasons. A purely personal one is that I visited Norway recently a year and a half ago, and the welcome I had there from you, Sir, and from the people of Norway is an abiding memory to which I refer very often.

Our country is a lovely country, but in many ways Norway and the other countries of Scandinavia have so many things that appeal to us and so many things that we would like to see in our own country that inevitably we feel drawn to it. When we have to consider great countries, great powers, one likes many things there, one admires many things, but one is also a little overwhelmed by them and one does not quite know where one is, and it takes time, I suppose, for a feeling of intimacy to grow up when one visits these great countries. That was not so in Norway or the other Scandinavian countries, because there was an element of simplicity there and friendliness which immediately affect one's thinking and one's heart.

You have been here, Sir, just for a day, and a day is a very short time for you to gather impressions. Yet, I suppose you have gathered some impressions. I am a little afraid of one thing, that staying in this noble mansion in which we are at present, looking at these, if I may call them, relics of imperial glory and splendour, the President's Body Guard, tall and stately, looking very impressive, and some other things that you might see in Delhi and also that very beautiful Diwan-i-Khas in the Red Fort where you received a welcome from our Corporation of Delhi, you might get, what I think, rather false impressions of India. First of all, of course, New Delhi and this mansion are really not India, we have inherited them and, naturally, we use them. But they do give, as they were meant to give when they were built, a sense of pomp and circumstance of imperial power.

Now, we, in spite of all this, in India are simple people and the great majority of our people, of course, are very simple indeed, lacking even the ordinary necessaries of life which we seek to give.

So, I might with all respect give this little warning to you, Sir, not to be misled by this pomp and circumstance, but realise that even though we are a very big country with a great deal of potential capacity to become big and great in the normal sense in which they are used today, namely, wealth and power, we really are, I believe, in our minds not so much attached to them. It is true that the immediate needs of India today and for a long time to come will be to progress in material things, so that the millions of our people, who have been denied so long for ages these ordinary necessities and simple material comforts, should have them, because unless they have at least those simple things, life becomes rather intolerable and too great a burden to be borne.

This has been the lot of most of our people for a long time and so naturally, it has been our strong and passionate desire to better their lot, to raise them to higher standards of living, so that they might think of other things also not merely for the sake of those material things which undoubtedly are important in life to a certain extent, but even more so, so that they might have the leisure of mind and opportunity to think of other things which might be even more important.

India is a very big country in size and our population is not only big, but perhaps too big. As I said, we have a great deal of potential resources which no doubt will gradually become

$$<$$
Pg-285>

actual and bring some results in their trail in the way of better living standards for our people, but however big we may be on the map and in numbers, we have absolutely no desire, at least most of us I believe have no desire, to become what is called a great power to flaunt our might, to have big armies, navies and air forces and generally, you may use it in colloquialism, to throw our weight about in the world.

What the future will bring, I do not know. We are struggling today in our five year plans and others for the material betterment of India. It is a hard struggle, because our people are many and they have long been oppressed by poverty. But while we may struggle for this betterment, we do not think that is the end of our struggle. I do not know what in different peoples' minds India represents. But every free country has an individuality, has some kind of soul and spirit and unless it retains that, if it loses the special virtue it had, I do not think any country can become uprooted without losing something of its infinite value. It is not by mere imitation that an individual or a country progresses. Certainly, the individual or the country learns from others. There is much to learn for us and we want to learn from other countries, other great countries--great not in size or power but great in the things of greater value, cultural values, values of the spirit as well as material values. We want all those. But, perhaps, India like other countries had its own special individuality, and something which in spite of all kinds of disasters has persisted. Through these long ages, no doubt, it was covered up, and it has been covered up with all kinds of, well, all the dust of ages, and it is often hidden, hidden even from us. But, I imagine, if there was not that some kind of basic strength or value in it, it would not have persisted.

How to find some kind of equilibrium between these varying desires which sometimes conflict with each other? That is our problem. Perhaps, it is not a problem for us only but for the world, how to combine what might be called material progress with the deeper things of the spirit.

In another sense we talk in the world of freedom, and freedom is precious for a country, for an individual. We talk of social progress, and in the world today with the advance of science and technology the individual becomes oppressed by the big things, the big machine. Now, I do not wish to decry the 'big machine'. Nevertheless, the problem remains of freedom, democracy if you like, the freedom of the spirit and, at the same time, the organised social progress. How to combine the two is our problem and other people's problem.

Today we talk with apprehension of the possibility of war with the terrible weapons that the world possesses. Well, war, anyhow, is not good, and is much worse now than it was in the past. If it comes, of course, it puts an end to everything, freedom and all the other things, material things as well as the things of the spirit.

Therefore, it becomes the primary aim for you, Sir, your country and us, and, I believe, for people in every country, to struggle against these tendencies, so far as we can, which tend to push the world towards this type of disaster. But, while we avoid that or just keep away from it, living at the brink, meanwhile another aspect, and I think an evil aspect of it, surrounds us, and that is `war in people's minds', the hatred in people's minds, which is perhaps as disastrous in the end as outward war.

I do not know how we should get over all this, except that we should try to do so. And in trying, we seek the comradeship of others who think likewise. And, in this, we feel we have good friends, good comrades in your country. Therefore, we are drawn to your country in more ways than one.

It is, as I said, a great delight to us to have you here as our honoured guests and we hope that during your stay here, you will have some glimpse of what we are and what we are painfully trying to do.

May I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of Norway and Madam Gerhardsen.

NORWAY INDIA USA **Date**: Nov 28, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

**NORWAY** 

Mr. Gerhardsen's Speech

I should like to thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, for the kind words you have spoken to us, and for the good wishes you have expressed for Norway and the Norwegian people.

When last year, during your visit to Oslo, you extended an invitation to Foreign Minister Lange and myself to visit India, we were both delighted to accept your kind invitation. We have looked forward with the keenest expectation to this visit,

<Pg-286>

and we are profoundly touched by the cordial welcome we have received here in Delhi

We are delighted at the opportunity we have, not only of visiting the Capital of India, but also of seeing other parts of your country. Thanks to the excellent preparations and well-planned programme we shall have a chance of seeing many interesting examples of modern and ancient India. India, however, is so vast a country, and has so much to offer a visitor, and for this reason we should like to have had an opportunity of spending more time in your country. Unfortunately, however, duties at home prevent us from being absent any longer.

In their old story-books Norwegian children got to know India as the strange and distant land of fairytale. It was so far away that one imagined that a flying carpet would be the only possible conveyance with which to reach it. India, we learnt, was the country with the world's highest mountains, with jungles and vast plains, with elephants and tigers, with temples and enchanting buildings such as the Taj Mahal. And above all it is the land of eternal sunshine and warmth. To people, in a land of ice and snow such as Norway this, perhaps, more than anything else, made India the land of fairytales.

Today the airplane has taken over the role of the flying carpet of the fairytales. And to the Noewegian people, India is no longer a remote and strange country. Names such as Gandhi and Nehru are well known and respected in our country, You yourself, Mr. Prime Minister, and a great many of your countrymen have visited Norway, and many of my countrymen have been to India. Practically every day we read about India in the papers, and world politics have given us common ??? solve and, fortunately, many common goals.

This is the first time a Norwegian Prime Minister is visiting India; this is also the first time a Norwegian Prime Minister has travelled to Asia. We have not come all this way merely as tourists; we have come because we believe that personal contact between people, and not least between politicians, is of great value. We have also come to pay our tribute to India, and to Asia, the continent which today is playing an increasingly important role in the affairs of the world.

Of the nations which signed the United Nations Charter in 1945, ten were Asiatic states. Today there are 23 member-countries from Asia. This gives a picture of the tremendous political development which

has taken place in Asia in the course of the last 13 years.

The Norwegian view has always been that the United Nations should provide a forum for all the nations of the world. It has therefore been a source of great pleasure to us that the development has been in the direction of greater universality. We hope this trend to continue, and that the voice of Asia in the United Nations will become still more representative in the future than is the case today. We know that the Asian nations have made and continue to make a great and constructive contribution to the co-operative efforts made in the various spheres of activity within the World Organisation. We have ourselves the best experiences from our cooperation there with the Asiatic countries. This applies not least to co-operation with India, a country which is playing such an outstanding role within the United Nations. We are happy that in so many matters our two countries have stood side by side, and that we have jointly been able to make some contribution to the peaceful and constructive solution of a number of problems. We are convinced that only on the basis of a co-operation founded on mutual respect and understanding between the various groups of member nations, will it be possible to achieve those constructive compromise solutions which alone will enable the United Nations to solve its problems.

The visitor from abroad who comes to India, and sees and hears of the countless problems that have been solved, but also learns of the many problems still to be solved, might well believe that the work on the national plane would absorb the entire surplus energies of the population. India has, however, realized her responsibility on the international plane, and has undertaken great tasks in this sphere. The United Nations and other international organisations have been quick to employ the services of a great many of the outstanding and conscientious men and women fostered by the land of Gandhi. On this occasion I should therefore like to express the respect we Norwegians feel for India's contribution in the international field.

The world today is living in the shadow of the catastrophe which a nuclear war would mean. We all know what is at stake. It is quite natural that India has been particularly committed to the work of international disarmament and the easing of international tension. This work is truly in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi.

Your country has chosen to stand outside existing power blocs. We fully appreciate the

views which prompt India's policy of neutrality, because it is not a passive policy, but is based on the view that a position of neutrality between the power blocs commits your country to the active role of arbitrator and mediator. We hope that you in India will understand and respect the fact that we in Norway, on the basis of our particular circumstances, have come to the conclusion that, in view of the world situation today, we can best promote the same goal

in a regional arrangement in addition to our membership of the United Nations. We, too, consider it a primary goal to work tirelessly for real relaxation of tension and disarmament under effective control. The important thing in my view is that our two countries are working towards the same goal, even though we do not always choose to follow the same road towards the goal.

Today the people of India are devoting their energy to a peaceful campaign to develop their country, and thus create a better and richer future for generations to come. In this work the tasks facing them appear well nigh insuperable, but the challenge is one that calls forth their best qualities. In their ancient cultural traditions they have an immense source of strength on which to draw. In addition to this ancient heritage India has also made use of the aids which the technical civilisation of our age has placed at man's disposal. In this country we are witnessing an outstanding attempt to create a fruitful union of ancient culture and modem technology, an attempt which opens the widest perspective to the future, and which the world is watching with anxiety. With the role India is playing in Asia and in the world, we know that the outcome of the social transformation which is now proceeding will be perhaps of decisive importance not only to the country itself, but to the social development in an entire continent.

Ever since India achieved her national independence, she has enjoyed a stable government under leaders for whom democratic ideas have been and still are the guiding principle of political life. This has proved a blessing not only to India, but to the whole world. Not least has it been a blessing that throughout these years a great democratic statesman--who stands as the very symbol of the new and free India--has stood at the helm of the political life of India. I ask you to drink with me a toast to the Prime Minister of India and to the future of the Indian people and to friendship between Norway and India.

NORWAY USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 28, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Indian Territories Shown in Boundary Map

In reply to a question whether the Government of India had received any reply to their note to the Government of Chinese People's Republic with regard to certain Indian territories shown in the map as being within the borders of China, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on Nov 29, 1958 that the Chinese Government in their reply handed over to the Indian Embassy in Peking recently had stated that in the maps currently published in China, the boundary line between China and its neighbouring countries, including India, had been drawn on the basis of the maps published in China before the liberation, that the Chinese Government had not yet undertaken a survey of China's boundaries nor had they had consultations with the countries concerned and that the Chinese Government would not make changes in the boundary on its own. The reply further stated that with the lapse of time and after consultations with the various neighbouring countries and the survey of the border regions, the Chinese Government proposed to re-draw the boundary of China in accordance with the results of their survey and consultations with the neighbouring Governments.

CHINA INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 29, 1958

# Volume No

1995

#### **POLAND**

Protocol on Trade Exchange Signed

India and Poland signed a new protocol on trade exchange for 1959 in Warsaw on November

<Pg-288>

15, 1958, amending the Indo-Polish Trade Agreement of April 1956.

The Protocol provides for payment for exports and imports between the two countries with effect from Jan 01, 1959 to be effected only in non-transferable Indian rupees. Details of the necessary banking arrangements to facilitate payments and to maintain the flow of trade will be finalised by the Central banks of the two countries.

The schedule of commodities which will be exported from or imported into the two countries has been agreed upon and the two delegations have discussed the concrete steps to be taken by the two parties for promoting the further development of trade. These include an agreement to strengthen contacts and business relationships between the Polish Foreign Trade Corporation and the Indian State-owned

organisations.

The main commodities likely to figure in imports from Poland include industrial equipment, machine tools, coal mining machinery, electrical equipment, rolling stock, steel and steel products, fertilisers and chemicals. Indian exports to Poland will include iron ore, mica, hides and skins, tea and pepper, and also manufactured items such as coir products, gunnies, shoes and other leather manufactures.

Shri K.B. Lal, Director General of Foreign Trade, signed for India and Mr. Josef Burakiewicz for Poland.

POLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1959

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on the Implementation of Agreement on Border Problem

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, mad the following statement in the Lok Sabha on Nov 29, 1958, regarding implementation of the agreement arrived at between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan at their meetings in September 1958:

A number of questions have been tabled by Hon'ble Members in regard to the implementation of the Agreement reached at the meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan held from 9th to 11th September, 1958. One Hon'ble Member has also tabled a notice under Rule 197 asking for a statement to be made in this regard. In view of the interest evinced by Hon'ble Members, I take this opportunity to explain the present position.

- 2. The Agreement between the Prime Ministers dealt with the following problems and the lines of settlement to be adopted in each case:
- (i) Demarcation of boundaries held up because of differences between India and Pakistan over the interpretation of boundaries as fixed by the Radcliffe and Bagge Awards, or because of differences over the basis of demarcation.
- (ii) Exchange of territories consequent on demarcation carried out in accordance with the Radcliffe and Bagge Awards along certain sectors

of the boundary between East Pakistan and West Bengal.

- (iii) Difficulties created by the existence of Indian enclaves (old Cooch Behar State enclaves) in Pakistan and Pakistan enclaves in India.
- 3. Agreement was reached on the settlement of the problems of the first type which were holding up demarcation in the following regions:
- (i) Hilli.
- (ii) Berubari Union No. 12.
- (iii) Two chit lands of old Cooch-Behar State adjacent to the Radcliffe line.
- (iv) 24 Parganas district of West Bengal and Khulna and Jessore districts of East Pakistan.
- (v) Bholaganj in Assam; and
- (vi) Bhagalpur village in Tripura State.

To implement these arrangements, boundaries have to be demarcated on the ground, and boundary pillars erected. The field season for boundary demarcation starts in November.

<Pg-289>

The State Governments are taking steps for demarcation of boundaries in accordance with these agreements. There have been meetings between the Directors of Land Records of the two sides for drawing up programmes of demarcation.

The above also applies to disputes regarding basis of demarcation settled at the meeting in respect of the Assam-East Pakistan boundary along stretches of the Surma river and the Piyain river.

Date of exchange of wrongly held areas, if any, will be fixed in consultation with the State Governments concerned after the demarcation work is completed.

No agreement was reached on differences in interpretation of the Radcliffe and Bagge Awards in case of two areas along the Assam-East Pakistan boundary and on differences in interpretation of the Radcliffe Award in case of four areas along the Punjab-West Pakistan boundary. In addition, there was a difference of view regarding the basis of demarcation along the Indian-West Pakistan border in the Cutch-Sind region. The Prime Ministers agreed to consider further methods of settling these disputes about areas in the vicinity of Hussainiwala and Suleimanke Headworks of the Punjab-West Pakistan border, the Foreign Secretary of the Government of Pakistan and the

Commonwealth Secretary of the Government of India should in consultation with their engineers, submit necessary proposals to the Prime Ministers. No date for this meeting of the Secretaries of the two Governments has been fixed so far.

- 4. Agreement was reached on the second problem mentioned above and 15-1-59 was fixed as the date of exchange of territories in certain sectors of the East Pakistan-West Bengal boundary, where demarcation has been completed in accordance with the Radcliffe and Bagge Awards. The Government of West Bengal have been advised to take necessary steps for the exchange of the areas in question by the due date. Necessary action is being taken by them.
- 5. Lastly there was the question of enclaves. There are 123 Indian enclaves which are completely surrounded by Pakistani territory, and 74 Pakistani enclaves similarly completely surrounded by Indian territory. It is not possible for the local Governments concerned to have direct access to these territories. As this led to serious difficulties in administering these areas, this problem was settled by an agreement to exchange these enclaves. Implementation of this agreement requires legislation as exchange of territory is involved. Necessary steps to that end are being taken by the Government of India. No date for the exchange of enclaves can be fixed till the legislation has been enacted and the State Governments concerned have completed necessary preliminary arrangements to carry out the exchange.
- 6. The question of vacation by the Pakistani forces of their illegal occupation of Tukergram was taken up during the discussions. The Pakistan Prime Minister suggested that this should go hand in hand with the solution of the difficulties that had recently arisen in the Patharia Hill Forest area where he alleged Indian authorities had made similar encroachments and changed the status quo. It was finally agreed that the two Conservators of Forests and the two Chief Secretaries of Assam and East Pakistan should meet and decide the area to be exploited by each party in the Patharia Hill Forest area without overlapping on each other's areas. This will involve a temporary demarcation and will take into account de facto possession. Since the meeting of Prime Ministers, the Government of India have requested the Government of Pakistan to implement this part of the agreement. Correspondence has also taken place between the Governments of Assam and East Pakistan regarding the meeting of the officials to resolve the difficulties in the Patharia Hills Reserve Forest Area. So far, no definite date for the meeting has been agreed to by the Pakistan authorities.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM

**Date**: Nov 29, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on Developments in Pakistan

The following is the text of a statement made by Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister, Ministry of External Affairs, in the Lok Sabha on Nov 20, 1958:

A large number of Short Notice and ordinary questions have been tabled by Hon'ble Members in regard to recent development in Pakistan.

There have also been notices under Rule 197 asking for a statement to be made in regard to these changes. Most of the facts have been fully reported in the public press and are known to members. Nevertheless, in view of the desire of members of the House, this statement is being made, recapitulating some of these facts.

<Pg-290>

These recent developments in Pakistan are of great significance and have naturally attracted widespread attention. To us in India they are of particular concern because Pakistan is a neighbour country and unhappily the relations between Pakistan and India have left much to be desired. Also some statements made in Pakistan recently have not been friendly towards India and in some indeed the language has been menacing.

On October 7, 1958, President Mirza abrogated the Constitution of 1956, dissolved all political parties and proclaimed Martial Law throughout the country. General Ayub Khan was appointed Chief Martial Law Administrator. In his Proclamation, President Mirza stated that "a vast majority of people no longer have any confidence in the present system of government and are getting more and more disillusioned and disappointed and are becoming dangerously resentful of the manner in which they are exploited." He laid emphasis on what he called taking the country "to sanity by a peaceful revolution". President Mirza also stated his intention to devise a more suitable Constitution, and to submit it at the appropriate time to a referendum of the people.

This action of President Mirza thus put an end to any kind of free or representative government in Pakistan. It is true that parliamentary institutions in Pakistan had been deprived of much content because of the failure to hold elections ever since Independence came eleven years ago. Nevertheless, there was the form of such institutions. The

Proclamation of Martial Law ended this. For the first time, dictatorial rule was established in a member country of the Commonwealth. The very basis of the Commonwealth has been democratic institutions and the parliamentary form of Government. Both these were suddenly ended by the coup d'etat of President Iskander Mirza.

Martial Law courts were established and the Civil courts were debarred from questioning the action of the Martial Law authorities. In fact, not only was the Constitution of Pakistan abrogated, but all its laws, judiciary and political and economic structure could only function within the limitations imposed by the Martial Law authorities. The old sanctions ceased to exist. The new sanction was the will of the President or the Martial Law Administrator.

On the 27th of October, President Iskander Mirza announced a Cabinet to assist him in governing the country and appointed General Ayub Khan as Prime Minister. General Ayub Khan was sworn in as such in the course of the day. That very evening; however, President Mirza was induced, under pressure, to resign, and General Ayub Khan assumed supreme power and became President as well as the Chief Martial Law Administrator. The reason given by General Ayub Khan for this was that it was necessary to remove an appearance of dual control, and further that President Mirza had been too closely associated with politicians, who had misbehaved so much in the past. President Ayub Khan announced that he was setting up a Presidential form of Government, with Ministers nominated by him as his Advisers. A Presidential form of government presupposes the election of the President by the people.

October 27 thus saw a number of strange developments culminating in the dramatic removal of President Mirza. A Prime Minister and his Cabinet are sworn in the forenoon, and that Prime Minister removes without ceremony the President who appointed him that day, and assumes complete power without any check. General Iskander Mirza was sent in the early hours of the morning to Quetta. A few days later, he was allowed to leave Pakistan for England. Pakistan ceased to be, even in name or form, a free country in the democratic sense, and any criticism by an individual or the Press of this regime was an offence under Martial Law.

Whatever reasons or justification there might be for these repeated and far-reaching changes, the fact emerges that a dictatorial regime with military control, which is normally not approved of by those who believe in free institutions and democracy, was established in Pakistan. From the larger point of view of the world, and more particularly of Asian countries, this was a step which caused much concern. In India, that concern was necessarily all the greater. It has always been the viewpoint of the Government and people of India that it is for the people of Pakistan to choose their own form of Government, and it has never been our desire to intervene or interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Pakistan. The people of India and Pakistan have a common heritage and innumerable associations. We have always desired the welfare of the people of

Pakistan and their economic progress, even as we labour for the advancement of the people of India. We could not, however, help regretting a development in Pakistan which, from all normal standards, was a set back both politically and economically.

A matter of even greater concern to india was the possible-attitude of the new authority in Pakistan towards India. Unfortunately, the relations of India and Pakistan, ever since

#### <Pg-291>

partition, have not been friendly, and the attitude of successive governments in Pakistan has been to encourage feelings against India. Even threats of war have been uttered. This attitude has been further encouraged by military help received from other countries. Nevertheless, attempts continued to be made to reach a solution of the problems which estranged these two countries. It will be remembered that less than a month before the first coup d'etat in Pakistan, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan visited Delhi and held discussions with the Prime Minister of India. As a result of these discussions, agreements were arrived at in regard to some border problems. These agreements related to minor matters. But even a small step in the right direction was helpful.

On the assumption of power by President Iskander Mirza and, later, by General Ayub Khan, the question arose whether this slight improvement in Indo-Pakistan relations would continue and be improved upon, or a reverse process would set in, leading perhaps to greater tension. After the first change, some vaguely conciliatory statements were made on behalf of Pakistan. We welcomed them. When General Ayub Khan declared himself as President, one of his earliest utterances was of a completely different nature, and referred to the adoption of extreme measures, and even war with India, in order to have a satisfactory solution of the Kashmir question. Subsequently, President Ayub Khan spoke in a somewhat different vein and emphasised the necessity for amicable and peaceful settlements of disputes between India and Pakistan.

In these circumstances and in the nature of things where a country is under a military regime, there can be no certainty of what future developments might be. We can hope for the best, but we have to be prepared for any possible emergency that might arise. There is no adequate reason for our Government or our people to take a tragic view of the situation. At the same time, there is equally no reason for a complacent attitude.

We have in the past repeatedly expressed our concern at foreign military aid being given to Pakistan. This becomes of added significance in the new context that has arisen in Pakistan, and it may encourage still further aggressive tendencies there.

There has been a recrudescence of border incidents and of cases of ill-treatment and harassment of Indian nationals at the border check

posts. I am placing on the table of the House a statement of border incidents that have taken place between the 11th September, 1958, the date on which the Joint Communique was issued after the meeting of the two Prime Ministers, and the 15th November, 1958. An analysis of these incidents will indicate that, during the last five weeks or so, since the abrogation of the Constitution on the 7th October in Pakistan, there have been thirteen incidents on the India-East Pakistan border, and three incidents on the India-West Pakistan border. During the four weeks previous to the 7th October, there were seven such incidents on the India-East Pakistan border and one on the India-West Pakistan border. Minor incidents such as those of cattle lifting or petty thefts have not been included in this list. A serious aspect is the number of cases of kidnapping. Sometimes the persons kidnapped are returned a few days later. Whenever such an incident occurs, immediate action is taken by the State Government concerned, as also by the Central Government, and the appropriate authorities on the Pakistan side are approached. The matter is pursued and, in fact, we are now dealing with several such incidents according to the procedures laid down for the purpose. Apart from individual protests, we have addressed a separate communication through the Pakistan High Commissioner in New Delhi, expressing the Government of India's serious concern at the frequency of recent border incidents and the many cases of harassment and ill treatment of Indian nationals at the border check-post. A recent case has been particularly deplorable. A member of the staff of the Assistant High Commission in Rajshahi and his wife were brutally treated at the customs checkpost at Darsana railway station. We do not know if this kind of misbehaviour and the increasing number of border incidents are a reflection of some new policy of the Pakistan Government or are clue to a weakening of the authority of that Government at the borders. In any event, the least we can expect is that adequate punishment should be given to those who are guilty. We have just received information that the Government of East Pakistan have informed our Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca that they have ordered disciplinary action to be taken against the East Pakistan Jamadar concerned in the incident at Darsana railway station.

I do not wish to say much more on this occasion. We shall watch the situation carefully and, whenever necessity arises, place any new information before the House. We shall continue to follow our policy of a friendly approach to our neighbours and at the same time a firmness in defending our rights. I would like to repeat that we wish well to the people of Pakistan and our desire is to develop good neighbourly relations with them.

<Pg-292>

PAKISTAN USA INDIA BANGLADESH CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 20, 1958

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

#### Jehad Campaign

In reply to a question Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister fo External Affairs, said in Lok Sabha on Nov 29, 1958 that the Government of India had received from Pakistan replies in respect of several protests lodged with them in connection with the propaganda for `Jehad'.

Replying to another part of the question Shrimati Menon said: "The Pakistan Government have stated that Indo-Pakistan agreements in the matter do not cover propaganda about the Kashmir issue. This contention is, however, baseless, and has been pointed out to the Pakistan Government. Propaganda for 'Jehad' cotravenes not only the Indo-Pakistan agreements but also violates the Security Council Resolution of January 17, 1948, and Section V of Part I of the UNCIP Resolution of August 13, 1948.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 29, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

#### Canal Water Dispute

Replying to a question by Shri Amolakh Chand on the Indo-Pakistan canal waters dispute, Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Union Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power, said in the Rajya Sabha on Nov 24, 1958 that the detailed comments on the Pakistan plan, put up by the Pakistan representative at the meeting held in London in July 1958, had been prepared, and would be put up by the Indian representative at the forthcoming meeting in Washington on 2 December 1958.

PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM LATVIA INDIA

**Date**: Nov 24, 1958

# Volume No

1995

#### **RUMANIA**

Shri K.D. Malaviya's Statement in Lok Sabha on Oil Agreement

Shri K.D. Malaviya, India's Minister for Mines and Oil, made a Statement in Lok Sabha on the Nov 19, 1958 on the Indo-Rumanian Agreement for setting up an oil refinery in Assam.

The following is the text of his statement:

As the House is aware, Government approved the proposal to conduct negotiations with the Rumanian Government with regard to the offer of assistance made by the Rumanian Prime Minister when he visited India in March 1958. A Technical and Economic Mission was deputed to this country by the Rumanian Government and they gave the details regarding capital and operational costs for different alternative patterns of production. These were necessarily tentative. In order to enable further clarifications being obtained quickly and also to conduct negotiations for the setting up of a refinery in Assam it was decided to depute an Indian team to Rumania in June/July 1958.

This Delegation was able to obtain all the necessary details as well as a draft of an Agreement as prepared by the Rumanian Government for consideration by the Government of India. This draft Agreement was examined in consultation with the other Ministries concerned and I was able to obtain the concurrence of the Rumanian Government, while at Bucharest to some essential changes being incorporated in the Agreement. I must thank the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic for agreeing finally to our suggestions on clauses relating to non-convertibility of initial payments in Indian rupees, gold parity, patents, jurisdiction, etc.

The salient features of the Agreement are briefly as follows:

(a) The Government of Rumanian People's Republic have agreed to offer on long term credit a sum of Rs. 52,380,900/- being the total value as estimated at present of the supplies to be made and the technical and other services to be rendered by them for the erection and construction of the refinery to be located in Assam. This will be subject to an interest of 2.5 per cent per annum. 15% of the credit offered will be repaid in six instalments, the first one to commence thirty days after signing of the Agreement and the last one thirty days after having put the refinery into operation and having obtained

the full range of products. The balance of 85% of the total credit will be repaid in ten instalments, with the first two instalments commencing on December 31, 1961, and the last one ending on December 31, 1965. The Rumanian Government would buy Indian goods as far as possible

<Pg-293>

against the payments made under this Agreement: and the balance of credit not thus utilised, will be converted into transferable free currency, after 1st April, 1961, if so desired.

- (b) The Rumanian Government will undertake, under the terms of the Agreement:
- (i) to design the petroleum refinery;
- (ii) to supply the equipment and materials for the process units and auxiliary installations;
- (iii) to ensure that the design as well as the machinery and equipment supplied by them conform to the best and up-to-date Rumanian technical standards in regard to quality of materials and workmanship;
- (iv) to ensure by the Rumanian engineers and technicians deputed to India the technical assistance in construction work and technical supervision for the erection of the refinery;
- (v) to train Indian technicians in designing, erecting and operating the Refinery, in Rumania;
- (vi) to put the refinery into operation;
- (vii) to indemnify the Indian Government in case of an infringement of a foreign patent.
- (c) The Indian Government will be responsible inter alia:
- (i) to select the refinery sight;
- (ii) to collect and put at the Rumanian party's disposal data and information of local nature for the designing work;
- (iii) to furnish all temporary facilities necessary for the construction and erection of the refinery;
- (iv) to supply construction materials;
- (v) to supply materials from indigenous sources, even though the Rumanian Government had agreed to supply them, thereby reducing the total value of the credit offered;
- (vi) to draw up a Technical Assistance Contract and conclude it

within thirty days of the signing of the Agreement;

- (vii) to transport and handle all materials and equipment including construction equipment;
- (viii) to store and preserve the equipment and materials required for the construction of the refinery;
- (ix) to construct and erect the refinery with the assistance and under the technical supervision of the Rumanian engineers.

I have no doubt that this collaboration with the Rumanian Government for the establishment of the first oil refinery in the Public Sector will pave the way for greater association with them on other projects as well.

The development of the Assam Oilfields and the refining of crude oil from this source is one major project. Its constituent parts are the production and transportation of crude oil by a pipeline to be constructed in two stages, a refinery in Assam to process approximately 0.75 million tons per annum and a refinery in Bihar to process approximately 2 million tons per annum. With the conclusion of the agreement with the Rumanian People's Republic, the Assam Refinery will take shape gradually and, I hope, be on stream by April, 1961. The offers of collaboration for the construction and erection of the Bihar refinery are at present under consideration and a decision is expected to be taken shortly. As the House is aware, the refineries will be entirely in the Public Sector and the production and transportation of crude oil have been entrusted to Oil India Private Limited, a participatory scheme with the Burma Oil Co./Assam Oil Co. in which Government of India have 1/3rd share. The Government have taken reasonably speedy actions to see that the Public Sector Projects are established according to a time schedule. Likewise, I hope that the Oil India Private Limited which has hitherto been functioning under the aegis of an ad hoc Board of Directors and is shortly being incorporated will also take concerted measures to ensure that the production of crude oil is kept at or about 2.5 million tons per annum and to lay and construct the pipeline upto Barauni in accordance with the time schedule already indicated to them.

<Pg-294>

INDIA USA ROMANIA BURMA

**Date**: Nov 19, 1958

### **Volume No**

#### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

#### Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement Signed

A fresh Trade Agreement was signed in Moscow on Nov 16, 1958 between India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This Agreement will come into force from January 1, 1959 and will remain in force for a period of five years.

The new Agreement provides for the development of balanced trade and for the reciprocal application of the most favoured nation treatment in the trade between the two countries. Provision has also been made for the establishment by the U.S.S.R. of a Central Account with the Reserve Bank of India which will facilitate the transfer of Soviet funds from and to their accounts with Commercial Banks in India. Technical credit facilities will also be accorded to the U.S.S.R. in order to facilitate an even flow of trade and Soviet purchases of Indian goods. All commercial transaction between the two countries will be effected in rupees.

The schedule regarding imports of goods from the U.S.S.R. into India includes among other items various types of industrial equipment and plants, raw material, power and oil drilling equipment, equipment for the coal mining industry, equipment for irrigation projects, various machine tools and instruments, tractors and farm machinery ferrous rolled stock, non-ferrous metals, fertilisers, dyes, cellulose, paper, asbestos and other industrial material, oil products, cereals, films, printed matter and other goods.

The list of goods to be exported from India to the U.S.S.R. contains such traditional items of Indian exports as tea, spices, skins and hides, wool, tobacco, shellac, cashew-unts, vegetable and essential oils, as well as manufactured goods including, specifically, jute fabrics and sacks, leather goods including footwear, woollen fabrics, coir products and handicraft goods, films printed matter and other goods.

The Agreement was signed by Shri K. B. Lall Director General of Foreign Trade, on behalf of India, and Mr. J.F. Semichastnov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

RUSSIA INDIA USA LATVIA

**Date**: Nov 16, 1958

### **Volume No**

#### UNESCO

#### Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's Inaugural Speech

The following is the text of the speech made by Vice-President Dr. S Radhakrishnan, Leader of the Indian Delegation to UNESCO, at the inaugural ceremony of the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on Nov 04, 1958

Mr. President. Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. Director-General, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As one connected with the activities of the UNESCO in some capacity or other from its foundation in 1946, it is a matter of pride to me that as the Leader of the Indian delegation I happen to be the President of the General Conference on this significant and auspicious occasion. On behalf of the General Conference and member States of this organisation, I accept with great pleasure from the Director-General these noble and inspiring buildings full of light and warmth, colour and beauty.

It is a day of rejoicing for all connected with this project, the Director-General and his Secretariat, the Executive Board, the Headquarters Committee, the architects, the engineers, the contractors and the workmen and many others that their labours have reached fulfilment. To the Government and people of France and the Municipal Council of Paris, who have, in many ways, generously helped us, our special thanks are due. This city with its intellectual countenance and luminous memories, which attracts all but yields to none its mysteries will now have this additional title to architectural fame.

The representatives of the peoples of the world will meet in this new home, draw inspiration and strength from their varied experiences and strive to establish the great fellowship of mankind which is the goal of human effort. It is true that today we are deeply divided and yet we are divided only to be made one, though we of

<Pg-295>

this generation may not live to see the distant scene. It is not an orthodox theologian but a great rationalist, your Joseph de Maistre who wrote shortly after the French Revolution; "Providence never wavers and it is not in vain that it shakes the world. Everything proclaims that we are moving towards a great unity, which, to use a religious expression, we must hail from afar. We have been grievously and justly broken, but if such eyes as mine are worthy to foresee the divine purpose, we have been broken only to be made one". If we penetrate the political changes and see the deeper currents of thought and feeling, we will discern the working of a social

dynamism, a new experiment in human co-operation, in human helpfulness.

The word has been shattered by fanaticisms. The means of destruction have increased beyond anything we knew or even imagined when the second world war ended. Peace has become a matter of life and death for all of us, and the only way of securing it is by the appreciation of eternal values, truth, integrity, understanding, love. We must maintain our love of these values even amid the distractions of modern life. UNESCO believes that we must understand others and respect them if we are to live at peace with them. Mere knowledge of each other's ways does not necessarily allay suspicion, fear and distrust. Prejudice is not always the outcome of ignorance. There is the inclination to evil, an innate malignity in men's minds. The passions are implanted in us so that we may struggle with them and thereby attain a degree of knowledge and virtue denied to other creatures. The way to overcome evil propensities is not by a mere increase of knowledge but by the growth of charity. We must grow in greatness, if we are to achieve a human order, tolerably free from want and fear. If we cannot change our minds and hearts, we cannot change anything.

Catastrophe may be impending but is still a little way off in the future, and if the human in us asserts itself, it may be averted altogether. We should repudiate the false doctrine of man's helplessness against world events. Man is higher than the forces which threaten to destroy him. If we act with firmness the collective contagious insanity can be broken and will be broken.

The meeting together of educators and thinkers, scholars and scientists, artists and creative writers reminds the world lost in the crazy tangle of power-politics that all is not lost, that there are brave men and women filled with a vision of human future, fighting for the values of civilisation, dignity and decency, freedom and truth. In his great play of Antigone Sophocles had made it clear that there is something above and beyond human enactments which men must respect as superior to them. We should obey the law of dharma, of truth, of love. At a time like this full of wrath and insecurity, when the forces of evil, the rule of might and the madness of men seem to triumph with an insolence hardly equalled, the work of our organisation calling upon the peoples of the world to be humane, to be humble, to be repentant, to be understanding is of great significance in the general frame-work of the United Nations Organisation. International co-operation is the way to international understanding which is the essential condition of enduring peace. A commonwealth of mind and spirit is the foundation for the commonwealth of nations.

When each one of us enters these buildings, he should get to his desk as to an altar and remember the noble words of William Lloyd Garrison: "Our country is the world; our countrymen are all mankind", an echo of the ancient Sanskrit saying:

bhrataro manujas sarve

svadesho bhuvana-trayam.

All men are brothers; the three worlds are my native home. All who work here are the servants of the human race, the apostles of the world to be, civitas mundi.

May I conclude with an ancient prayer:

"Let all be happy, let all be healthy, let all see the face of happiness, let no one be unhappy. Peace! Peace! Peace!

sarve bhavantu sukhinah,

sarve santu niramayah,

sarve bhadrani pashyantu,

ma kashcit dukhabhag bhavet

shantih! shantih! shantih!

<Pg-296>

INDIA FRANCE USA MALI UNITED KINGDOM

**Date**: Nov 04, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### Financial Aid

A cheque for Rs. 1.9 crores for the Rihand Valley Development Projec was handed over at New Delhi on Nov 24, 1958 to Shri A.K. Roy, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, by Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the U.S. Technical Co-operation Mission in India. In all, a total of Rs. 7 crores by way of rupee contribution to the project has been made by the U.S. It is a reimbursement of the expenditure already incurred for the period April 1, 1954 to June 30, 1957. In addition, the Technical Co-operation Mission has provided \$6 million worth of heavy equipment as well as the services of two field technicians.

This completes the U.S. assistance of Rs. 10 crores under Operational Agreement 20 for the Rihand Development Project, whose total cost is

estimated at Rs. 45 crores. About a third of this is the foreign exchange cost of the project. All the heavy construction equipment provided by T.C.M, has been delivered and the major portion of it has been working through two construction seasons. The two technicians who have been provided have been at the site of the project since March 1957 advising on the utilisation of the equipment and the employment of modern concrete dam building techniques.

<Pg-297>

USA INDIA

**Date**: Nov 24, 1958

### **December**

	Volume No
1995	
CONTENTS	
Foreign Affairs Record	1050
Volume IV	1958 December No. 12
CONTENTS	
ATOMIC ENERGY CONFERENCE Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sab	oha 299
COLOMBO PLAN Tempo of Economic Activity	300
GHANA Ghana Prime Minister's Visit Dr. Nkrumah's Reply	302

GOA
Release of Political Prisoners 304
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Policy 304  Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Foreign Policy 308  Prime Minister's Reply to Foreign Policy Debate in Lok Sabha 314  Prime Minister's Reply to Foreign Policy Debate in Rajya Sabha 324
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Cyprus 329 Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Algeria 349 Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of Guinea 356 Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Treatment of People of Indian Origin in South Africa 359 Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the President of the Security Council 360
INDONESIA  President's Speech at State Banquet in Jakarta 360  Naval Agreement Signed 361
IRAQ Indo-Iraqi Trade Agreement Signed 362
MALAYA  President's Speech at Royal Banquet in Kuala Lumpur 362  President's Speech at State Banquet in Kuala Lumpur 363
RUMANIA Shri K.D. Malaviya's Statement in Lok Sabha 364
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Promotion of Technical Education 364
<pg-i></pg-i>

SRI LANKA GHANA INDIA CYPRUS USA ALGERIA GUINEA SOUTH AFRICA INDONESIA IRAQ MALAYSIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### ATOMIC ENERGY CONFERENCE

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru laid two statements on the table of the Lok Sabha in reply to an unstarred question by Sarvashri Ram Krishan and Agadi on Dec 16, 1958. The first statement related to the decisions taken by the Second General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency held at Vienna during September 1958. The second gave the list of 67 countries which attended the Conference.

The text of the first statement is attached.

The Prime Minister in his reply added:

"The Agency's objective is to seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world and to ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose. In the circumstances, the subject of nuclear weapons tests does not come within the purview of the Agency and was not, in consequence, discussed at its Second General Conference."

The following were the important decisions taken, resolutions passed and recommendations made at the Second General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which was held in Vienna from September 22 to October 4, 1958:-

The Conference elected the Netherlands, United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Venezuela, and Peru to the Board of Governors (The Board has a total membership of 23, some of whom are designated in accordance with the provisions contained in the Statute of the Agency and the others are elected. The designated members are Australia, Brazil. Canada, France, India, Japan, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Denmark and Poland):

The Conference approved of the second report by the Agency to the General Assembly of the United Nations:

The Conference approved of the rules on the consultative status of non-governmental organisations with the Agency :

The Conference authorised the Board of Governors to invite inter-Governmental organisations engaged in the peaceful uses of atomic energy in accordance with the objectives of the Agency as stipulated in its Statute to be represented by observers at the Third General Conference;

The Conference approved of the relationship agreements with the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation and

the World Meteorological Organisation;

The Conference authorised the Board of Governors to prepare rules regarding the acceptance of voluntary contributions to the Agency and to apply these rules provisionally until the General Conference approves these rules;

The Conference decided that a report shall be submitted each year to the Economic and Social Council on matters within the competence of the Council;

The Conference approved of the recommendation of the Board of Governors that the total appropriations for the administrative expenses of the Agency in the year 1959 shall amount to US \$5,225,000 and that the target for voluntary contributions shall be fixed at US \$1,500.000;

The Conference resolved that the Board of Governors and the Director-General should establish a laboratory for specified functions after consultation with the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Agency;

The Conference approved of the recommendations of the Board of Governors that the amount of the Working Capital Fund for 1959 should continue to be \$ 2,000,000;

The Conference appointed representatives of Norway, Yugoslavia, and the Federal Republic of Germany as external auditors of the Agency;

The Conference resolved that the Board of Governors should give earnest and early consideration to initiating action for a survey to be made of the needs of the less developed countries in the matter of nuclear power generation plants; should adopt measures for continuing study regarding the development of technology and economics of small and medium scale nuclear power reactors best suited for less developed countries and assist them in planning

<Pg-299>

and implementing their training programmes in that connection;

The Conference resolved that the Director after consultation with the Scientific Advisory Committee and interested specialised Agencies should submit a plan of conferences and symposia;

The Conference decided that the Agency should utilise the services and experience of existing research centres and of other sources of information;

The Conference directed the Board of Governors and the Director-General to co-operate with FAO and WHO and scientific centres which have practical experience of the use of isotopes in agriculture and medicine with a view to the organisation of appropriate courses;

The Conference adopted the final scale of members' contributions for 1958 and provisional scales of contribution for 1959;

The Conference resolved that commencing with the scale of assessment for 1960, these assessments should be approved in advance based on the scale adopted by the UN for the preceding year and not made subject to retroactive adjustment;

The Conference decided that the Agency should seek participation in the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

AUSTRIA USA THE NETHERLANDS INDONESIA PERU VENEZUELA AUSTRALIA BRAZIL CANADA FRANCE INDIA JAPAN SOUTH AFRICA BELGIUM DENMARK IRELAND POLAND NORWAY YUGOSLAVIA GERMANY

**Date**: Dec 16, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### COLOMBO PLAN

Tempo of Economic Activity

The problem facing India today is how the momentum of her economic activity noticed in the last few years can be preserved. This is the question posed at the end of the chapter relating to India in the Colombo Plan Consultative Committee's latest annual report published in New Delhi on Dec 29, 1958, 1958. It discussed the trends in the Indian economy during the last year and it also indicates, in broad outline, the measures that have been taken so far to enable the process of development to proceed without endangering economic stability.

The report says during the last three or four years, there has been a marked quickening in the tempo of economic activity in India. The annual rate of public expenditure on development and of private industrial investment during the past two years has been nearly double the average in the first Five-Year Plan. The country finds itself today in a position to launch simultaneously on a wide variety of interdependent activities which together, will produce a substantial forward movement in all major sectors of the economy. Such a forward move is to be carefully related to the foreign exchange resources which may become available. Investment in the economy, both private and public, has gathered greater momentum than had been anticipated.

The report observes that while the first two years of the Second Five

Year Plan have been a period of achievement, they have also been one of strain. The economy has been subjected to growing pressures on prices and on balance of payments. The pressure on internal resources and particularly on the balance of payments, which became evident in 1956-57, became more serious during the year. There was a larger deficit in the Central and State budgets--Rs. 4,640 million as compared to Rs. 2,380 million. But the expansionary impact of budget operations was upset by the larger deficits in balance of payments and by the decline in the net indebtedness of private sector to the banking system. Wholesale prices, particularly prices of foodgrains, which showed an upward trend till August 1957 declined thereafter upto February 1958 and rose again in the first half of 1958-59. Foreign exchange declined by Rs. 2,600 million in spite of a further drawing of Rs. 345 million from the International Monetary Fund. Agricultural production was adversely affected by drought in large parts of the country and industrial production rose at a much slower rate than in the past years. Economic policies pursued during the last two years have had some effect in containing these pressures. The pressure on prices persists but it is mainly confined to prices of foodgrains and a good harvest may bring about improvement.

The highest priority continues to be given to increases in agricultural production. On the one hand, it will have a salutary impact on prices and on the other, it will increase surpluses of money crops for export. Also it will considerably reduce the need for food imports. The drain on

<Pg-300>

foreign exchange reserves is not on account of expansion in domestic consumption nor due to much decline in export earnings. The drain has occurred primarily because investment in the economy, both private and public, has gathered momentum.

The recent trends in prices and balance of payments, the report says, underlines the central problem, which any developing country has to face-the problem of resources. During the year, the objectives of India's economic policy were threefold: (i) to reduce the strain on balance of payments; (ii) to keep a check on prices particularly of foodgrains and (iii) to augment, to the extent possible, the resources available for development by mobilising domestic resources and securing additional loans and credits from abroad.

In order to achieve these objectives, the report points out that special attention was devoted to the promotion of exports. Restrictions on imports which had been in force since the end of 1956 were intensified and further cuts in import of consumer goods were made. Simultaneously steps were taken to rationalise and reduce, to the extent possible, the foreign exchange requirements of the Plan. It was decided that only the core of the Plan consisting of the steel mills, coal mining development, rail and port development programmes and certain power projects should be put through and only such of the projects outside the core of the Plan as had reached an advanced

stage of completion. Furthermore, only those new projects outside the core would be commenced which earned or saved foreign exchange.

The measures taken so far have already had some impact on the economic situation. In the field of fiscal policy, during the last two years there has been considerable additional tax effort. Since the commencement of the Second Plan, the additional tax measures adopted by the Central and State Governments are expected to yield Rs. 9.000 million over the Plan period. This figure is slightly more than the original estimate of Rs. 8,500 million of additional tax resources envisaged in the Second Plan. Imports on private account in the first half of 1956-57 were Rs. 3.200 million and rose to a little over Rs. 4.000 million in the second half of the year. They declined by Rs. 210 million in the first half of 1957-58 and further by Rs. 850 million in the second half of the year. Another indicator of rigorous restrictions on imports is the data regarding import licences. In the period October 1957--March 1958, import licences issued amounted to Rs. 3,500 million which was about half the level of licensing in the first half of 1956. Even licensing for capital goods has been drastically curtailed--Rs. 1,080 million during October 1957--March 1958 as compared to Rs. 3,730 million in the first half of 1956. The present import policy which permits no imports except those required for maintaining industrial production cannot be continued for long without an adverse reaction on internal production and prices. The restrictions on imports are beginning to effect the level of fixed investment in private industry. Yet imports have been drastically curtailed because the country is determined to see that the development expenditure keeps in line with available foreign exchange resources.

In order to enlarge the scope for exports, over 200 items have been freed from control as a result of a comprehensive survey. The list of items subject to quota restrictions has been considerably shortened and the banned list now carries a few items largely of strategic value. The Export Risks Insurance Corporation set up a little over a year ago had undertaken risks amounting to Rs. 60 million by the end of July 1958. These measures will take time to yield results but the effect of the import policy has already become evident.

Recent developments, the report goes on, have brought to the fore the problem of increasing savings in the economy and of conserving and enlarging foreign exchange resources. There are some indications that the outlook for internal resources for development may turn out to be more satisfactory in the coming year than was originally expected. The Central and States budgets for 1958-59 have made a provision for an outlay of Rs. 10,000 million on development schemes included in the Second Plan, that is to say, an increase of Rs. 1,400 million as compared to the likely actuals for 1957-58. Also the budgetary deficit is expected to be about half that of the previous year, which was Rs. 4640 million. The reduction in deficit was based on larger receipts of external assistance, a larger and successful borrowing programme and larger collections from small savings. The post-budget tax concessions, such as, reduction in excise duty on cotton textiles

and certain export duties including those of common teas will mean smaller revenue. But on the whole, Governmental operations are expected to lead to a smaller expansionary influence on the economy than was anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Summing up, the report says given a normal

<Pg-301>

harvest, the internal stresses and strains may not be excessive. There is, however, no room for complacency. It will be necessary to continue the economic and financial policies now in force. A programme of investment designed to lift an economy from a very low level of productivity and incomes invariably causes strain on prices and on balance of payments. The extent to which these stresses and strains can be minimised depends on the success in mobilising resources at home, in securing resources from abroad and in increasing productivity for the different sectors of the economy, specially in agriculture, the report adds.

SRI LANKA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 29, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

### **GHANA**

Ghana Prime Minister's Visit

Prime Minister Nehru told Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the Prime Minister of Ghana, at a banquet given in his honour in New Delhi on Dec 24, 1958 that his visit to India was doubly welcomed "both for the sake of Ghana and for the sake of Africa and the new movements and urges that are moving there, moving the minds and hearts of millions and millions of people." All these great forces could not obviously be suppressed and they would find an outlet. "We can only hope that they will find that outlet in peace and friendship, for otherwise, it will be most unfortunate for all concerned", he added.

The Prime Minister of Ghana in reply said that the forces at work in Africa had put Ghana into a place where it had "become more or less the springboard for the final liberation of the African Continent." "The time has come", he said, "when the freedom of one little territory on the Continent of Africa is not freedom unless that freedom is linked up with the freedom of all the territories in Africa to-day which are under colonial regime".

Welcoming Dr. Nkrumah, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, we welcome you, Sir, here on your first visit to our country. We welcome you for a variety of reasons, because your country is a fellow Member of the Commonwealth, and you represent an independent State of Ghana. But in addition to that, we welcome you as something more.

Nearly two years ago, Ghana became independent. Perhaps many people in this part of the world were not acquainted with the name of Ghana. They knew the country, of course, but they were not acquainted with that name, and to them the independence of Ghana was something more than the independence of a new country which had been under colonial rule. It is something more because this has happened in Africa. In the last dozen years or so, ever since the war, many people had talked about certain movements in Asia and a number of countries in Asia became free and independent. They called it the renaissance of Asia. We had Africa in mind, some of us, because Africa was full of problems, full of long history of cruel suppression and so when this relatively small in size country of Ghana became independent it was to many a historic event of considerable significance. We noticed even from this distance the reactions of that on other parts of Africa and we have been watching since then, this last year and a half or so, these reactions growing and how Ghana became some kind of a symbol to many other countries in Asia and in Africa. Recently we heard of Ghana and the newly independent country of Guinea coming closer together and perhaps as a portent to other changes. Only a few days ago you had a conference at Accra where representatives of nearly all the African countries gathered together. That also I think was almost an eye-opener to people who were not intimately acquainted with what was happening in Africa. The forces at work, the undercurrents, which had been working there for a long time came to the surface and surprised many people and suddenly they realized that something big was happening in Africa, and Africa was astir with all kinds of longings of freedom. It was not so much individual countries in Africa that sought their freedom-- which of course they did--but something on a wider and bigger scale. Africa somehow seemed to come very much in the centre of the picture, hoping, longing for freedom and, what is more, doing so, not with too soft a voice, but rather assertively, aggerssively, which was perhaps natural after this long period of suppression and terrible history of hundred of years. So the drama has unfolded itself during the past year and a half, and in this drama Ghana has been

<Pg-302>

a very important element and central State.

Your coming, therefore, to India is doubly welcome, both for the sake of Ghana and for the sake of Africa and the new movements and urges that are moving there, moving minds and hearts of millions and millions of people. We wish them well and we hope not only that they

will achieve their freedom but they will achieve it peacefully and in co-operation with other countries and we hope that the peoples of Africa and the countries of Africa and we in Asia as well as other countries in Asia, all of them, will live co-operatively and peacefully together,-- countries which are sometimes described as underdeveloped wherever they might be, have to some extent common problems to face, sometimes common background of colonial rule. So inevitably, they come closer to each other, to learn from each other and, where possible, to help each other. So we have been drawn to these countries and we have been drawn in particular to the new countries taking shape in Africa and I earnestly hope that in the future these bonds of friendship and co-operation will grow to the advantage of both parties and all these countries. For if that does not happen, the alternative is rather terrible to contemplate, bemuse, all these great forces that have arisen, that are evident in Africa, moving masses of human beings, obviously cannot be suppressed. They will find an outlet. We can only hope that they will find that outlet in peace and friendship, for otherwise, it will be most unfortunate for all concerned. Anybody acquainted with Africa, whatever his other views might be, must realize that this great continent is full of vitality. It may be backward in development but when people are full of vitality and full of the desire to make good and grow, they have the essential quality to grow and they are likely to make good. So I have no particular anxiety about the future provided that this growth is peaceful and leads soon to freedom of those countries. Otherwise, as I said, there may be unfortunate conflicts which will do harm to many people, in many countries. So you come here today not only as the Prime Minister of Ghana but as a symbol of what is moving the minds and hearts of the people of Africa and we welcome you especially in that capacity, Sir.

I trust that your brief visit to India will enable you to realize to some extent what our own aims, ideals and objectives are. Our very bigness brings tremendous problems and we hope to survive them and get over them and to achieve the objectives we have placed before us, though undoubtedly we shall have to work very hard for that. So, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of Ghana and for the prosperity of the people of Ghana.

GHANA INDIA USA GUINEA

**Date**: Dec 24, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

**GHANA** 

### Dr. Nkrumah's Reply

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must thank you very sincerely for the kind words which you, Mr. Prime Minister, have spoken about Ghana. Some time ago when I was a student in the United States, I read a book, the Glimpses of World History, and the part that interested me most was the Chapter dealing with Africa. I said to myself "Why can't that man be in Africa?" I am only saying this to show that if I am here today, the purpose is to see if I can advance the inspiration which I personally have found trying to read some of your books and also about Mahatma Gandhi. I am also here to be able to learn what you have done for the past ten years or so, of the great developments that have taken place in India under your leadership. Ouite apart from this, I am carrying with me certain things. We have been able to set Ghana free. Now Ghana is a sovereign State within the Commonwealth, but more than that the independence of Ghana has not been something that we can say has to stop here. Forces are at work today which have put Ghana into a place where Ghana has become more or less the springboard for the final liberation of the African Continent. This has been expressed in various forms.

After independence, the first task that we tackled was the convening of a conference of the eight independent States of the African Continent. We met and out of that has emerged the African personality, as you yourself have said. At long last, in world history an African personality has emerged which can speak for the African Continent.

Just before I came, we had another conference. That conference was composed of all political parties not only from the eight independent States, but from all the territories in Africa under colonial rule. We met and out of the discussions something has emerged in addition to the African personality which was created at the conference of the independent African States. That was the African community. The time has come when the freedom of one

#### <Pg-303>

little territory on the Continent of Africa is not freedom unless that freedom is linked up with the freedom of all the territories in Africa today which are under colonial regime. So I come here with lot of headaches, and I think I will have time to discuss about these problems with you. One thing that I want to emphasise is that there is a great deal of goodwill in Africa today. Sometimes, when I think of it myself; it terrifies me. The forces that are at work today are that Africa has got to be free. As most of you know, the Continent of Africa is under six or seven different colonial powers. We are organising these various territories, and we hope that it will not be long before this great era, this great new era, will usher into Africa complete independence and sovereignty for the very territories that are there today.

So, when we are here we are here to renew the friendship and goodwill which exist between Ghana and India. I want to go further and to say something more than that. I hope that sweet goodwill and friendship between Ghana and India, as also goodwill and friendship between Africa and India would exist. (Applause). You might go even further than that. You might also put it as the friendship and goodwill that would exist between Africa and Asia.

I want to take this opportunity, again, to thank you very much for the reception which has been accorded to me and my party ever since we arrived at Bombay. We had a good reception at Bombay and I saw a little bit of India. I hope my few days' stay in India will make me see more, so that when I go back I shall have a happy story to tell my people.

GHANA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 24, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

GOA

### Release of Political Prisoners

In a written reply to a question Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in Rajya Sabha on Dec 24, 1958 that four Indian nationals were still in jail in Goa.

Replying to another part of the question Shrimati Menon added that the Government of India had repeatedly taken up with the Portuguese authorities, the question of release of these Indian nationals. Recently the Counsellor of the United Arab Republic had visited Goa on behalf of India and had drawn the attention of the Portuguese Governor-General to the Indians still in jail.

**INDIA** 

Date : Dec 24, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Policy

Initiating a debate on India's foreign policy in the Lok Sabha on Dec 08, 1958 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said: Mr. Speaker, Sir I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the Policy of the Government of India, be taken into consideration."

We had a debate on the international situation and foreign affairs in August last, i.e. nearly four months ago. These four months have seen considerable and significant developments. From the time we discussed this last, we have before us one important change that has occurred in West Asia, that is, in Iraq, where a revolution had taken place and the monarchy had been displaced by a republic. Fairly intimately connected with it was the situation in Lebanon, and that situation became worse and there was the landing of foreign troops both in Lebanon and in Jordon. Fortunately, the situation was controlled and ultimately the foreign troops were taken away.

In this connection, I should like to refer to the work of the United Nations Commission in Lebanon, because I do think that that Commission performed a remarkably fine piece of work there and it was largely due to that Commission that tragic developments were avoided. May I also mention in this connection the name of the Indian member of that Commission, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal

<Pg-304>

to whom I should like to pay my tribute, knowing as I do the good work he did in this Commission in Lebanon. As the House knows, he had been appointed our High Commissioner for Pakistan.

Some Hon. Members put me a question a little while ago and some newspapers also rather seem to think that most of our Missions are lying vacant whenever a crisis occurs. It is rather a remarkable criticism, and this was particularly directed against Shri Rajeshwar Dayal going to Lebabon. No Mission is, however, in that sense, vacant. It is true sometimes that the Head of the Mission is not there, deliberately not there, it is not accidental; that is to say, there are sometimes gaps. Each change, if I may say so, changing people, sending one Head of the Mission to another place involves a chain of changes and it is very difficult to have the chain fit immediately in every place, and there are gaps. In every Foreign Office there are gaps. It does not much matter, because there are good people to run it for a short time of one or two months. It is not normally considered at all undesirable. But apart from this, a number of places have been mentioned; particularly mention was made of Pakistan. Now as a matter of fact, we sent a special man to function as High Commissioner. When Shri Rajeshwar Dayal could not go a High Commissioner was functioning, Shri Mitra: and he functioned till Shri Rajeshwar Dayal came back.

Then mention was made to Lebanon (Beirut), Budapest; I forget at the moment, the third place. There we do not have a full Mission, that is to say, when I say a full Mission, a residing Ambassador. In Budapest we have a Mission; we have competent man. But the Ambassador is the same as the Ambassador in Moscow. So he normally lives in Moscow and pays visit to Budapest and one or two other places which are associated. That is the normal practice to have one Ambassador dealing with two or three countries and having subordinate offices in other countries. That was so in Beirut also. We do not have a special Ambassador in Lebanon. Then it was connected with Cairo. But there was a competent officer in charge of the subordinate offices in Beirut. And may I say that officer also did distinguished work during all these troubles in Lebanon?

Then there was the case of Baghdad where, it is true, there was no Ambassador present. In the normal course the Ambassador had come away here and the next Ambassador had to go from Copenhagen or Stockholm. I think. He was not present there. But there was nothing extraordinary about it and this kind of thing is likely to happen and we cannot guard against it and no harm has been caused to anybody, because we are competently represented there.

At the present moment, if one looks down the various problems afflicting the world, whichever way one looks at it, one comes against the cold war, the basic thing which creates these problems, for which there appears to be no prospect of an immediate solution. There are two conferences going on in Geneva now. One is the Conference on the suspension of nuclear tests and the other is the Conference to consider measures relating to prevention of surprise attacks. Both Conferences have got rather bogged up, stalemate. But only yesterday I think some slightly hopeful news came from the first Conference, that is, the Conference on the suspension of nuclear tests, hopeful in the sense that they had provisionally and temporarily agreed on the first article of the long list. At least they have got moving. That does not take us very far, but anyhow they had got out of the state of being held up without any agreement. But the difficulties are many, and the House knows the nature of the difficulties.

Broadly speaking, so far as the question of nuclear tests is concerned, the Soviet attitude is that the question of suspension of nuclear tests should be separated from the other disarmament proposals and the discontinuance of tests should be immediate and permanent, while the attitude of the Western Powers is that all these questions should be taken together. Well, so far as we are concerned, as the House knows how anxious and eager, not only anxious and eager but how deeply we feel about the continuance of nuclear tests. We feel that it is in the nature of a crime against humanity to continue any tests which endanger not only the present generation but the future generations to come. For our part, nuclear tests should be

suspended quite apart from anything else. The argument is strong enough for that. We will say "abandon" but certainly "suspend" if you can abandon that later. At the same time we realise that there is some ground for saying when people are very afraid of each other the whole question should be considered together, or at any rate nothing should be done which might, in this present cold-war context, create a position of greater difficulty for one side than that of the other. So, it is not merely a question of taking item 1 first and item 2 second. The difficulties are deeper. Anyhow, they are moving slightly.

In so far as the other question is concerned, about surprise attacks, I fear the future is not at all promising. Here also the approach of the

<Pg-305>

Western nations is that the experts should confine themselves to the scientific study and analysis of the technical problems involved in reducing the risks of any possible surprise attacks.

The Soviet side, on the other hand, contends that the problem of surprise attacks is a problem of unleashing a new war and so specific disarmament problems and political issues should be included in the agenda for discussion, which also according to the Soviets, should include the question of foreign military bases. So, immediately you come up against political problems there is a deadlock.

I mentioned these two Conferences which are proceeding at the present moment in a rather leisurely fashion without bringing much results and at the same time without daring to break up because breaking up would create a feeling akin to despair in the world. All I can say is that I hope gradually they will find some way to go on and even to come to some minor agreements rather than have no agreement at all.

This question of the cold war covers every question in the world today--whether it is in the Near East, whether it is in the Middle East, whether it is the Far East or whether it is these military pacts or groups. Everything is to form part of the cold war and it becomes difficult even to consider the question in the United Nations which can be separated from this approach of cold war. I suppose it is inherent in the situation today in the world. We have endeavoured with some success to keep out of it. When we talk about the policy of non-alignment, it obviously means non-alignment in this cold war conflict.

A rather curious result of this cold war is that well-known words with very definite meanings are distorted and begin to mean something else or are used in another context. What I mean to say is that if a country is allied to a group in a military alliance then that country is supposed to be a standard bearer of light and freedom, whatever it may do or whatever institutions it may have. If a country is in the other side, then it is described by the opposite side as sunk in

reaction or other bad things. We see the use of the words 'democracy' and 'free world' and we also hear the word 'peace' being brandied about. Everybody wants peace and sometimes people want peace with the atom bomb combined. Sometimes peace is talked about in terms which appear to be almost more violent than the terms of war and threats. So, democracy too is used even in some curious way in connection with countries which have martial law. It is for that country, of course, to determine what kind of Government or control it has. It is none of our function. It may be for some country the best way of governing that country. It is not for us to determine. But what I am venturing to point out is not what happens in that country but the reactions of what happens in that country in other countries. That is what I find interesting, i.e., the reactions of trying to explain martial law as some kind of extension of the democratic principle. This intrigues me. That shows to what length our thinking can be distorted because of our wishes and because ultimately of the cold war technique.

It is just another instance, if I may mention it. Human rights are talked about a great deal. Day after tomorrow happens to be the Tenth Anniversary of the Human Rights Declaration and perhaps, Sir, you would be good enough to mention that fact day after tomorrow in this house because it is an important fact to be mentioned and to be remembered by us and by the world. The Human Rights Declaration was passed at that time ten years ago with nobody dissenting in the UN so far as I remember. It is true that the practical application of it and all that has been discussed ever since, but all the principles were accepted unanimously. Now by no stretch of imagination can the policy pursued by the South African Government, i.e., the policy of apartheid, be reconciled with any human rights? It is in direct conflict with not only the Charter of the United Nations but the Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, we see certainly some criticism of that occasionally in other countries, but when the matter comes up before the United Nations countries who stand up for democracy, freedom, anti-racialism and the rest support for some technical reason, it may be, the attitude of the South African Union Government in regard to apartheid, or at any rate they refuse to criticise or condemn it.

Now, all this produces a certain confusion in the public mind. The only yard-stick left is not that of principle but of who is with us in the cold war. That is the only yard-stick left and that country, whether it is in this group of nations or in that group, whatever may happen-- whether it may happen in South Africa or in some country having martial law or in some country like Hungary where other things happened --that has to be protected and they have to be accepted, because they are our parties in the cold war. They are on our side. We cannot criticise our own colleagues. But that does produce, as I said, confusion in the public mind

<Pg-306>

and because of this we see the growth--take this anti-racialism--of anti-racial sentiments in other countries. Even in England, which has

been on the whole free from them, some months back there were some very unfortunate riotings not against the Indians as such but against West Africans because gradually the principles on which the United Nations or various countries are supposed to stand get so much mixed up with other matters that they are not clear and people tend to act in a wrong direction.

You know, of course, of the developments in Pakistan. In this connection may I deal with a notice under rule--I do not know what the rule is, 115 or some such Rule--which asks me to make a statement in regard to something said by General Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan in Karachi on the 4th December in which he has blamed India for border incidents. I do not know what I am expected to say about that-- to criticise General Ayub because he blamed India for border incidents? Naturally one would expect the President of Pakistan to stand up to what he thinks is advantageous to his country or the report that he has received because it is our belief and it is our honest belief that these border incidents are generally caused by aggressive tendencies on the border on the Pakistan side. But I have said to this House before and I say it again that firstly these incidents are greatly exaggerated. One should not consider them as a sort of Governments coming into conflict there. They are exaggerated. They are distressing sometimes apart from one or two which are really bad, some cattle lifting, this, that and the other, during the harvest season, people trying to go to their fields on the other side and their being driven out: that type of thing. Certainly I am not prepared to say--I want to be as precise as possible--that always the fault lies on the other side. We have been in error sometimes. When I say we, some local people there have been in error. But, whatever the facts are, I have no doubt about one thing, that the reports that are sent to each Government by the local authorities are generally onesided reports, because we only see one side of the question. And if General Ayub Khan sees any reports, the reports are entirely onesided to Pakistan. So, there is no point in our objecting to General Ayub Khan saying something. That is an onesided version being affected by it.

The main thing is much more difficult: the main problem of India and Pakistan. These are petty things, petty eruptions here and there. The main problem remains and in a sense has become a little more difficult because of new conditions in Pakistan. Not essentially difficult, but simply as I said before, because Martial Law itself removes various checks in governmental action and when the checks are removed, it may depend on the mood of the moment. That is the difficulty. The second difficulty is that Pakistan, whether it was before the Martial Law or after Martial Law, continues to get considerable military supplies and military aid from outside, when it is patent that the military aid is, in the opinion of leading authorities in Pakistan, needed only against India. As I said, I do not expect war with Pakistan. But, the fact is that one cannot become complacent about it. One has to take measures and one has to carry fresh burdens because there is military aid.

I have often given thought to this matter of these Pacts: the Baghdad Pact and the South East Asia Pact, and tried to understand as far as I can the reasons for these pacts. That is to say, I may not agree with it, nevertheless, one tries to understand the reason, even if one does not agree with it. I have completely failed to understand that reason. In the whole of this period, the last few years when these Pacts came into existence, one can see definitely step after step how these Pacts have not brought security to any country, but have made the position more difficult and brought insecurity and in West Asia, of course, considerable upsets like in Iraq and elsewhere. So far as I can see, these Pacts have no reality left, but they have to be kept up more for the sake of prestige than anything else.

Looking around on the African side, the House knows that a new country has declared its freedom, that is Guinea. Ghana and Guinea have recently come to some kind of a broad agreement to join together. It is not yet quite clear in what form they will join.

Whether it is some kind of a federation or other kind of a Union, that is being discussed. This raises rather an interesting problem for the Commonwealth because Ghana is a member of the Commonwealth and Guinea is not. How Guinea can be accommodated, whether an outside country can be in union with a country inside the Commonwealth: these are the problems which are raised. It does not affect us very much. I am merely mentioning it. What we are really interested in is this movement in Africa towards greater freedom, greater unity. Obviously it is desirable for larger federations to grow up in Africa of free countries than for each separate small country to function independently. From that point of view, we welcome this.

At the present moment, today, I think there

<Pg-307>

is a Conference being held at Accra, what is called an All African Peoples Conference. I refer to it because some questions have been put to me or I have been asked to make a statement. This conference is not a governmental conference at all. It is a non-governmental conference, though some Governments may be interested in it. I have been asked: are we represented. No. Partly because we have not been invited and partly because we do not fall in the scope of it as a Government. Also it is a purely African conference. There is no one outside the African area going to this conference except, I believe, one or two African Associations in London. There are two African Associations and they send observers. Officially or otherwise, we have nothing to do with this conference.

Recently a very big question has arisen which affects Europe and which affects the world. That is the issue of Berlin. I am not going to say anything about it--I am merely mentioning this fact--because it does not concern us directly. It only concerns us in so far as it is one of the most difficult problems in the world which has always in it the seeds of a major conflict. After a quiet period for many years, this has again become a very urgent and vital problem.

The House knows that our President is at present on his way to Indonesia. He has spent the last two days in Malaya. Now, in response to an invitation from the President of Indonesia, he has gone there. Some months back he went to Japan. I am sure the House would welcome these visits, because, apart from the individual aspect of it, they do bring these countries nearer to each other. His visit was very successful in Japan and Malaya. I am sure his visit to Indonesia will bring greater understanding between India and Indonesia and I am sure the House would send good wishes to him during this journey.

I have ventured rather deliberately not to go into any details, but to deal with these problems broadly and bring them to the notice of the House. We function in regard to these external matters on[y, if I may say so, if we must. That is to say, we do not wish to get entangled in them. Where the are our own matters, of course, there is no question, we have to function. Otherwise, in these big problems, we have to function to some extent in the United Nations when they come up or elsewhere. It is our good fortune to be looked upon with friendship by many countries and with respect by some. We are asked to undertake duties outside India as in Lebanon and as in Indo-China which is still continuing. It is not our desire to get entangled in foreign affairs. Foreign affairs and international relations descend upon us as they descend upon every country whether we like them or not, and we have to shoulder the burden as every independent country has to do.

In regard to our own particular problems, naturally our particular problems relate to our neighbour country Pakistan; they relate to Goa; they relate in a different way somewhat to people of Indian descent in Ceylon; they relate to people of Indian descent--not Indian nationals, mind you --in South Africa. These are specific problems, continuing ones, which we try to solve, and sometimes go a little step forward. For the rest, the major world problems are there. Some of them again we are intensely interested in, because of our past and present thinking, such as the freedom of colonial countries--Algeria, other places too--because we are apt to forget that a large part of the world is still under colonial domination, and what is more, that there is a tendency towards rigidity now. When India became independent, eleven years ago, more or less, that was followed by a number of countries becoming independent round about India and elsewhere. Later, one or two others like Sudan and Ghana and Morocco and Tunisia came in. The process is going on, and now Guinea. Nevertheless, there does appear to be some rigidity about this approach now which is unfortunate because it can only mean greater conflict. No one surely in the world can imagine that countries which are under colonial rule will accept that and be content with it. They will fight against it; the struggle will continue, and the only possible and desirable remedy is to grant them freedom, and then seek their co-operation.

So, in this world of conflict, we try to do our modest little, which may not be very much, but at any rate, we try to avoid creating more

enmity, more conflict, by following a policy of goodwill and friendship with all countries.

INDIA USA LEBANON PAKISTAN HUNGARY RUSSIA EGYPT IRAQ DENMARK SWEDEN SWITZERLAND SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA GUINEA UNITED KINGDOM GERMANY INDONESIA JAPAN CHINA ALGERIA SUDAN MOROCCO TUNISIA

**Date**: Dec 08, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Foreign Policy

Initiating a debate on India's foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on Dec 15, 1958 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and

<Pg-308>

the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Almost in every Session, Sir, I move such a motion and there is a discussion which ranges over the wide world but which rather tends to concentrate naturally on some matters more intimately affecting India, some matters in regard to our neighbour countries, a little about Pakistan, a little perhaps about Ceylon and a little perhaps about Goa. Now, naturally, a country's foreign policy may be divided up into some parts, namely two; one is particular matters affecting its interests and the other is the wider world matters which affect it also in the wider sense that anything that happens in the world affects every country. In a sense some of the bigger issues in the world are of high importance to us. If there was a war, we would, I am quite sure, keep out of the war, but the whole world will be affected and we will be affected. And if there is a war involving nuclear weapons, there will not be much choice left on the day as to whether he chooses to die or not. He may be eliminated in spite of his wish to keep apart from it. Therefore, because of the world coming rather closer together, these wider international questions assume a greater importance even to a State which does not wish to be entangled in these questions, and we have been compelled almost against our wishes in the matter to deal with these wider questions more and more. There is, of course, the United Nations where such

questions do come up and every country and its representative has to express its opinion in regard to them and occasionally to vote. Apart from speeches and voting, there is a great deal of consultation done in the United Nations often behind the scenes.

Now, Sir, I do not know what turn the discussion on the subject will take in this House and what particular matters would agitate Members' minds more than others, and, therefore, it is a little difficult for me to deal with this in detail at the present stage, because I would rather try to meet the points raised by Hon. Members than go into detail about some issues about which they may not have too much interest or about which they may not have much doubt in their minds.

In the narrow issues affecting us--'narrow' meaning more intimate issues, not world issues--obviously the main issue is that of developments in our neighbour country, Pakistan. There have been strange developments there and we have followed them naturally with a great deal of interest and sometimes concern. Not that we wish to interfere in the slightest with what the people of Pakistan want to do in their own country, but whatever they do sometimes affects us or may affect us. There has been a good deal of discussion on this issue and various statements have been made by me, and I believe in this House too many questions asked, and I do not propose now to cover the same ground unless some Hon. Member raises some issue connected with it or emphasises some aspect of this question. There is one thing I should like to say. Two or three days ago, the President of Pakistan, addressing some kind of a gathering, accused India of trying to isolate Pakistan and he also accused India of encouraging border incidents on the border between West Bengal and East Pakistan. Now, among the many subjects that are constantly brought up before us-this House and the other House--is this question of border incidents. Naturally Hon. Members are anxious to put an end to them. And it is an odd thing that while this question is always brought up here because we feel, Hon. Members feel that those incidents are due to the aggression of Pakistan-- even so, the President of Pakistan has referred to them as if they were due to the aggression of India.

I have tried as far as I can to consider these matters objectively and factually. I cannot say that any one of us can always succeed in doing that and even facts are not quite easy to obtain about minor incidents and facts are often confused because they deal with, let us say, char areas or islands that come up after the monsoons. The river shifts, and every year after the monsoon this happens about those islands, and there is a dispute as to who owns them or who should occupy them while they are above water, because in the next monsoon they will go down under water again. Meanwhile, it is good soil. They yield crops and so peasants on both sides try to utilise them. It is my belief, after a good deal of consideration of all these problems as objectively as possible, that the attitude of the local people there on the Pakistan side and the local authorities has been often an aggressive one or they have encouraged aggression. I will not go into further detail about that, but I would like to say this that a number of incidents that are reported to us and, may be, reported to

the Pakistan Government, petty incidents--I am not talking about any major ones--about boundary are really rather confusing incidents, that is to say, confusing to the people who live there on either side. It is very difficult for them to know exactly where they are when the boundary shifts, the river shifts and all that, when islands come up, how the island is to be divided, whether the boundary would be in the middle of the island or where. The boundary

#### <Pg-309>

was laid down by Justice Bagge, and all know that he drew a straight line between two points across the river, going along the length of the river. If the river shifts, if it is a river boundary, it is a shifting boundary. If it is a fixed boundary with a straight line, then as the river shifts, it may well happen that the river goes completely on one side of the boundary or the other. Or, when an island comes in between, it has to be carefully seen where that imaginary line is. You do not put boundary pillars in the middle of a river. These difficulties arise, and each side locally, specially the peasantry on either side, naturally think in terms of their own rights in the matter. I will not go into this matter unless Hon. Members want me to say something or to give some information about it.

But about what the President of Pakistan said that we are trying to isolate Pakistan, I submit, Sir, that that is not only not a correct statement, but he is mistaken if he thinks so. Perhaps he thinks so because of a wrong line of thought that Pakistan has consistently followed. The first thing they have thought has been that India has never accepted partition, does not intend abiding by it and wants to weaken and possibly put an end to Pakistan as a separate State when things are feasible. Anything more unrealistic or devoid of fact I cannot imagine, and it is not a question of my expressing my opinion or this House expressing its opinion, but facts are facts. It is an inconceivable thing that that kind of thing happens, and it would be a most undesirable thing strictly from the point of view of India if any such thing happens. I do not want them to happen, and any person who has any conception of the modern world can realise that such a thing would not be a matter between India and Pakistan but would be a world upheaval, further that the conditions, political or economic, that prevail in Pakistan have a powerful effect on India.

So far as the economic conditions go, it is bad in that it is not good for us that the economic conditions in Pakistan are bad.

Therefore, we have always wished and worked and so far as we can, we have directed our policy so that Pakistan may flourish. But naturally, we do not expect that Pakistan should commit aggression on us everywhere, whether it is in that part of India which is Jammu and Kashmir or in any other part of India. In fact, mentioning Jammu and Kashmir, I should like to remind the House something that the House knows very well that we made it clear long ago--and we have repeated it--that any kind of aggression on Jammu and Kashmir is obviously aggression on India and that aggression will have to be met anywhere

and everywhere, not in a confined territory where that aggression takes place. That fact must be clearly understood. I hope no such occasion will arise because it would be most unfortunate for both our countries. But there should be no doubt in any person's mind in regard to that position. But I should like to disabuse President Ayub Khan again of this idea that we wish anything but well by Pakistan. We do wish it well because looking at it from our point of view, it is advantageous to us apart from any idealistic things, and for us to try to isolate Pakistan does us no good. It is true that we believe in a policy which is called non-aligning up with any military blocs, We think it is bad to line up with military blocs. We think it is particularly bad for a weak country to line up with militarily strong country. If two strong countries line up, well, I do not think it is a good thing. But they pull their weight. If a militarily weak country lines up with a militarily strong country, well, it ceases to function in that independent way as an independent country ought to function. The odds may be against us and we have not favoured the idea that Pakistan should go in for these military alliances. But, after all, it is for Pakistan to decide this and not for us to decide. Past experience has shown not only in regard to Pakistan, but in regard to other countries in Asia that these military alliances called the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO, have failed to serve any good purpose whatever, and they have brought insecurity and often conflicts in those regions. Well, if people and countries do not learn even from their experience, it is a little difficult for anyone else to do anything in the matter. I suppose the President of Pakistan said that we wish to isolate it because we have often criticised the Baghdad Pact and if the Baghdad Pact goes--and indeed, it is not exactly in a very vital and living condition, rather moribund even now--they seem to imagine that they will be left helpless. Well, I can assure them that our policy in regard to the Baghdad Pact certainly takes into account that Pakistan is there. It is based on wider considerations, and anyhow, all this past experience of a few years has shown that the Baghdad Pact has no significance as a Pact. There is the other significance, of course-arms, exchange of arms, apart from the Baghdad Pact. That is

Now, our policy has been--and we shall continue to follow it even though there might be difficulties--of friendship with all countries even though we do not agree with them and that includes Pakistan, always, of course, guarding our own interests. At the present moment, the House knows that our President is on a visit to the Republic of Indonesia where he has received a quite extraordinarily warm and cordial

#### <Pg-310>

significant for us as for others.

welcome from the people and from the Government. Lately, before that, he was in Malaya where also he received a warm welcome and some months back--two or three months back --he visited Japan. The President has been functioning not only as our President, but as the most outstanding ambassador of this country carrying our goodwill to

the people of other countries and thereby helping in promoting that atmosphere of international goodwill and, more specially, of closer relations with these neighbouring countries of ours. I wish that the same relations subsisted with Pakistan.

Going to broader issues, one of the most striking things today-although it may not receive very much public attention--is the gradual development of what has been called the 'African personality'; it is emerging, and I have no doubt that it is going to play a vital role in the future; whether it can play that role through peaceful development or not I cannot say because in this very Africa, where this African personality is emerging, there are other forces down south and in south-west which are not only opposed to that African personality but are ranged today in complete opposition to any idea of race equality, political equality or any equality. Of course the most outstanding exponent of this doctrine of racial inequality is the Union of South Africa. But there are some areas north of it, north-west of it, where, though the Government has not expressed those opinions, the people there, that is, the European people who are dominant there often express the very ideas that the South African Government expresses. It is a long story about the people of Indian descent in South Africa. That question has really merged into bigger questions where not only Indians but the whole African population and the Chinese and the Japanese and whoever may go, who is a non-European or a non-American, is affected. Recently, only a few days ago a resolution came up before the United Nations General Assembly, as it comes up every year, and I do not know what more we can do about it however strongly we feel--as we do feel strongly--about this matter.

This Resolution, it is interesting to note, was passed with the biggest majority that it has had in the past few years, and gradually countries that were opposed to this type of Resolution were now supporting it or at any rate not opposing it. But I am sorry that among the countries that still oppose that resolution are one or two Commonwealth countries of note, but I am glad to note that other Commonwealth countries have supported it, some which did not previously support it. In fact one might almost say that there is worldwide opinion today against the apartheid in South Africa, and those countries that support that are a few; I believe five countries out of eighty or so in the United Nations voted against that Resolution. Those countries too do not really support that principle of apartheid but for political reasons and for other reasons they do not wish publicly to oppose it although privately I believe they disapprove of it. So we have been building up in the United Nations, we and other countries, world opinion against this and we have been building it up not only because we object to it but what is much more important, if this kind of thing continues in the Union of South Africa and at the same time this, what I referred to as the African personality, grows, there can be no doubt that there will be a mighty clash between these two. Such a clash can be of advantage to neither side, because it is quite inconceivable for these growing nations of Africa, finding their soul you might say, in some measure of freedom, to put up with the kind of treatment that the South African Union has given to coloured people. They will never put up with it, as we can never put up with it. So our only hope lies in the fact that on the South African Union side this pressure of world opinion, this recognition that the whole world is turning against them in so far as apartheid is concerned, will have some effect, and they will change their policies to avoid this tremendous catastrophe. Deliberately in the United Nations as elsewhere we have approached this question as moderately as possible. Even this time the resolution put forward was--I do not know if I have got it here; I do not think I have got the detailed resolution here--a moderate one, expressing disapproval of South Africa's policy and not acting up to the last year's resolution of the United Nations General Assembly and calling upon them again to meet the representatives of India and Pakistan. We are prepared to meet them. We shall again invite them to meet us, to discuss this matter, because in the final analysis there is no way of resolving a problem except by consultation, discussion and settlement rather than to do it by war or to allow the problem to continue.

Now I referred to this growth of the African personality. We know, of course, about the emergence of this new State of Ghana a year ago as an independent State. Other developments have taken place since then, and the latest has been Guinea, which formed part of the French Dominion, becoming independent. And a very interesting phase of this new development has been Ghana and Guinea agreeing to come together.

#### <Pg-311>

It is not quite clear in what form they will come together but whatever legal or constitutional form that might be, it does represent the outward manifestation of that deep urge in Africa for African countries to come together, especially in West Africa. And in the recent conference which, I believe, is still being held in Accra, this urge has found utterance, and I am sure that this House would wish to send its goodwill to these young African nations who are finding their soul now, and who, it must always be remembered, is the past centuries, have suffered more than any people in the world--all those long years and centuries of slavery being imposed upon them, people being carried away, bound hand and foot, in a most cruel way-and have carried this burden of sorrow. So, it is a peculiar happiness for us that they should get rid of these shackles progressively. And I should like in this matter to congratulate even the colonial powers who at last have, to some extent, helped them in this process--in regard to Guinea, the French Government, and in regard to some other areas, the British Government.

And yet while I congratulate them, another case comes to my mind, that of Algeria, where for the last several years there has been that most bloody conflict and all kinds of excesses have been committed. We had hoped, and I still hope, the General de Gaulle's Government would deal with this Algerian question in a broad-minded and generous way, recognising tile basic fact that the question cannot be settled except in the full freedom of Algeria. There can be no doubt about

that. Now, Sir, in this matter, a resolution came up only three or four days ago or even less, before the United Nations General Assembly.

That resolution was passed in a big way but it failed to secure one odd vote in order to get a two-third majority. It was a great moral victory for the Algerians and whether they got an extra vote or not, the victory was theirs, at any rate in the United Nations and it is interesting to see how the voting went on this question. I ant sorry I cannot just get hold of the paper which gives details of the voting on this Algerian question. But speaking from memory, all the great powers like the U.S.A., I believe, abstained from voting.

That shows of course a vote of the U.S.A. is not merely a vote of one country. It represents the vote of a very great nation which exercises more authority in the United Nations than any other country because of its power and position. It shows therefore that the position in regard to Algeria is also taking a favourable turn to some extent. I will not go further because there are all kinds of hurdles in the way but this, I submit, is perfectly clear that the Algerian question cannot be solved except on the basis of independence. What relationship free Algeria may have with France is a matter entirely for them to determine. They may have some kind of close relationship which two free nations have. That is a different matter. We have realized always that in considering the Algerian problem, that aspect of it which reminds us of a million or more people of French descent living there is an important one. We cannot ignore it merely, but important as it is, I do submit that the fact of 10 times that number wanting independence is more important still. You cannot ignore 10 millions for the sake of 1 million specially when that country happens to be where the 10 millions and their ancestors have always lived. The only feasible solution would be to agree to this but give full protection to the big French minority there. Anyhow it is not a question for me or indeed for this House to indicate any solution except to say that we desire the freedom of those people who have so bravely fought for it during these years and that we would hope earnestly that General de Gaulle's Government which has shown in some matters, foresight and generosity as in the case of Guinea and one or two other places, will, also in this much bigger issue, show that foresight and generosity.

The biggest issue from the point of view of the world at the present moment is the issue or those issues which bring any possibility of a world conflict nearer. We have had a good deal of trouble, as this House knows, in the Far East of Asia over the islands of Quemoy and Matsu and ultimately of course, in regard to Formosa. That trouble, that problem, continues and as far as I can see, it is likely to continue. At present the crisis may be said to be not quite so acute in the sense that no large-scale fighting is going on but tile problem remains.

A new aspect of this cold war has now arisen in Berlin. The German problem has always been a very difficult one and a very important

one, and now that problem has got somehow concentrated over this issue of Berlin. I do not know, and I do not wish to say anything as to how this issue will develop. I would only say that this is a dangerous issue which could lead to all kinds of complications and even conflict, in spite of the fact that I am quite sure that all the major powers concerned do not want that conflict. As a matter of fact, at the present moment there are two conferences

### <Pg-312>

going on in Geneva, a conference as to how to avoid or prevent surprise attacks and a conference in regard to the suspension of nuclear tests and how to discover a test if it is secretly made anywhere. These have been going on for many weeks, but the progress is slow. I gather that with regard to the second conference that is to say the one about nuclear tests, some kind of a draft paper is being put forward and progress has been made and agreement is being arrived at with regard to the first three articles of that paper. That is slow progress, but nevertheless it is hopeful progress. Every progress is hopeful. As to the conference about surprise attack, we have no information as to how they are getting on; but as far as we know, they are not getting on very well. Anyhow, they are still meeting and discussing.

One thing I may mention in connection with Africa. A proposal has been put forward by the South African Union for South-West Africa to be divided up, one to go fully to the South African Union and the other to remain under the U.N. Trusteeship. I am glad to say that this has not found support in the United Nations, because it would be a most dangerous and harmful thing for any area of Africa to be handed over to a country which proclaims loudly its policy of apartheid, and acts up to it, not merely proclaims it, and it would be a complete breach--and South Africa has committed it--a complete breach of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Human Rights Declaration to which reference has been made by you, Sir, the other day to put other people under the Government of the Union of South Africa, and it would be, I submit, a violation of everything that the United Nations stands for.

That is the position, Sir, with regard to these major matters in the world. It is a curious situation, because it has come to be known and to be admitted that any kind of a nuclear war will result in almost the virtual destruction of mankind. It is further admitted that any war between the great powers is bound to be a nuclear war. It cannot be a petty war. There may be a petty war between other countries, but not between the great powers.

Now, having come to these conclusions, it should follow that one should try to avoid cold war and, therefore, one should avoid all steps that lead to it. For any of the major powers to imagine that it can compel the other to submit to its will is obviously mistaken and it is recognised as such. President Eisenhower has said so; Mr. Khruschev has said so too. If that is admitted, what is the logic of

the situation? Hardly enough, having admitted all these facts, the inevitable logical result of all that is not accepted or is not acted upon and each party appears to think that it can by actual or verbal strength induce the other to submit to its will. Now, this is a dangerous policy because somehow or the other the tenuous bonds that keep them together may break. I am not here to suggest any way out of this terrible tangle but one thing I would with all respect suggest. If it is not possible--and I think it is not--for either of the major groups to convince the other of its error--I do not think that the American Government is going to convince the Soviet Government of the error of its ways and I do not think the Soviet Government is going to convince the American Government of the error of its ways--any attempt to convince each other may be like very earnest believers and protagonists of religious theories coming together, trying to convince each other and indulging in heated argument. The result of this is to make them more bitter against each other than perhaps if they had not tried to discuss this matter with each other.

It is worse here because there are the vast armies lined up on either side. Therefore, the idea of convincing each other is ruled out, on major issues, the idea of by force compelling each other is ruled out. What remains? Well, at any rate, one should avoid saying things about each other which make matters worse, condemning each other, running down each other, whatever your views may be; that is to say, the technique of cold war does not help. It makes matters worse. Whatever your views may be, it is better almost to remain silent for a while if you cannot use language which is more or less polite to each other. Perhaps, that might help a little in bringing the logic of the situation, to make it clearer to peoples' minds. It is not for me to advise anybody but I am merely stating in effect what our broad approach has been, and whether we agree or disagree with a country, we try to avoid the cold war approach because I am convinced that it can only do harm. That does not mean surrendering to a wrong principle or to superior force but does mean making it slightly easier when the time comes for some kind of a partial settlement to be arrived at. The biggest thing today, therefore, is disarmament out of which all these things grew. Of disarmament, the biggest aspect is nuclear weapons and of nuclear weapons the immediate aspect is stopping nuclear tests. I know that you cannot isolate them; everything has to be taken together but one has to make a beginning and then take up the next step. If one wants the full agreement to emerge about everything, the result

### <Pg-313>

is that there is no agreement and, so far as nuclear tests are concerned, I think it has been, especially on all matters, fully accepted by all scientists that every single nuclear test adds to the poisonous and harmful elements in the atmosphere which injure the present generation and will go on causing injury to future generations. Yet, these nuclear tests have gone on and each party calling on the other to do something and not doing it itself more or less. Well, it is not from any sense of virtue that I am saying all

this, because we lack virtues in many ways, such virtues as the others possess. But in such matters one has to talk frankly, give expression to one's feelings, hoping that one's voice may perhaps affect people's thinking elsewhere.

There is one fact which I should like this House to bear in mind. We, in India at least I hope, do not claim any special virtue. We have our virtues, of course, and we have our faults. We certainly are not a military power and we have no strength in the financial sense. Why is it that India's name is respected over large areas of the world, in many countries today? Why is that whenever India's name is mentioned, or some representative of India comes, that person or that name is associated with the cause of peace? There is no doubt about that. Our policy may err here and there, but the world acknowledges that India works for peace, and more especially the people of the world which give these big welcomes, which our President has had in countries he has visited, which other people have, which even a humble citizen of India gets, because he comes--the people say--from the land which works for peace. Now, that is a great honour for us, but also a great obligation for us to work along these lines in that temper and climate of peace, trying to develop this climate outside certainly, but inside our country also, because you cannot isolate tempers. If you have that temper abroad, you have the temper in India. If you have the temper in India, that reflects itself elsewhere, just as foreign policies and domestic policies cannot fundamentally be isolated. They act and react on each other. So, in the final analysis, it comes to this that we should endeavour to cultivate this temper of peace in our foreign relations and within our country also.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC IRAQ INDONESIA JAPAN SOUTH AFRICA GHANA GUINEA ALGERIA FRANCE GERMANY SWITZERLAND PERU

**Date**: Dec 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Foreign Policy Debate in Lok Sabha

Replying to a two-day debate on India's foreign policy in the Lok Sabha on Dec 09, 1958 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the debate yesterday on this motion dealt chiefly with Indo-Pakistan relations, and more particularly, with border

disputes. There were many other matters also referred to undoubtedly. I should like, therefore, to say something again about these border disputes and about that agreement which is sometimes referred to as the Nehru-Noon Agreement. But before I do so, I shall deal with some of the broader questions again,

The Hon. Member, Shri Jaipal Singh, used language which created a good deal of confusion in my mind, and perhaps in other people's minds too. He began by saying that he was in general agreement with our policy, our foreign policy, but he did not agree with the policy of nonalignment. It was rather an odd thing to say, after saying that he agreed with our policy, that he did not agree. Then he said that yet he agreed with the Nehru policy. About this, I am not quite clear in my mind, if he was speaking seriously or just--what is called in French jeu d'esprit.

I do not know myself the various distinctions and differences between our general policy, the policy of non-alignment and what might mistakenly be called the Nehru policy. I thought they were much the same, all these three.

Anyhow, I would submit, in order to clear up any misapprehension that, first of all, when we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously it means non-alignment with military blocs. You cannot have a negative policy. The policy is a positive one, a definite one, and I hope, a dynamic one, but in so far as the military blocs today and the cold war are concerned, we do not align ourselves with either bloc. That is all. That itself is not a policy. It is only a part of the policy. And that is clear enough, and we have to lay stress on that because, unfortunately, in the world today, countries talk and act so much in terms of this cold war and in terms of military blocs and of fear of the one or the other, that one has to lay stress on the fact that we are not parties to the cold war and we are not members of or attached to any military bloc.

Having said that, of course the policy can only be a policy of acting according to our best judgment, and furthering the principal objectives and ideals that we have. Every country's foreign policy, first of all, is concerned with its own security, with its own progress, and one has tried to protect that. Now, security can be protected

#### <Pg-314>

in many ways. The normal idea is that security is protected by armies. That is only partly true; it is true, no doubt, but security is protected by policies; if you have friendship, you, to some extent, gain security; if you have hostility, you are slightly or somewhat endangered. Therefore, a deliberate policy of friendship with other countries goes further in gaining security than almost anything else. It may not succeed, of course; that is a different matter.

Apart from this, from the larger point of view of the world also, we have laboured to the best of our ability for world peace.

We realise that our influence in such matters can only be limited. Naturally, because we are not in possession of, nor have we the capacity to possess weapons like the modem atomic nuclear weapons. But still our influence has not been negligible not because, as I said, we ourselves are influential—in such matters, we do not make such a claim—but because we do believe that what we have said in regard to peace has found an echo in people's minds and hearts in all countries, because, in fact, it was the right thing. And in spite of governmental policies and cold war and the like, people have appreciated what we have said and reacted to it favourably.

As to what our influence has been on governments, I hope we have been able to impress them with the urgent necessity of this matter. Anyhow, I cannot say definitely about it, but I can say with some assurance that our influence on peoples generally all over the world in regard to this particular matter of peace has been very considerable, and any Hon. Member who happens to go to any part of the world, in Asia, Europe, America, Africa or elsewhere, will always find India's name associated with peace. That brings a great responsibility upon us. It is a privilege to be associated with peace, but it brings, as I said, a great responsibility, that we should not only try to live up to it and function so that we may advance the cause of world peace but in our domestic sphere also we should work on lines which are compatible with peace. We cannot obviously have one voice for the world outside and another voice and another action internally which conflicts with that.

Therefore, our foreign policy has this positive aspect of peace. It is obviously the positive aspect of an increase, of an enlargement of freedom in the world, of colonialism being replaced by free and independent countries, of a larger degree of co-operation and all that. So I hope that Shri Jaipal Singh on further reflection will see that there is no conflict between the various appellations and various descriptions of our policy that he gave. But anyhow, it is completely incorrect, if I may say so, to call our policy 'Nehru' policy. It is incorrect because all that I have done is to give voice to that policy. I have not originated it. It is a policy inherent in the circumstances in India, inherent in the past thinking of India, inherent in the whole mental outlook of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom and inherent in the circumstances of the case today. I come in by the mere accidental fact that during, these few years I have represented that policy as Foreign Minister to foreign countries and in this country, and I have spoken about it many times. Personally, I am quite convinced that whoever might have been in charge of the foreign affairs of India and whatever party might have been in charge of the foreign affairs of India, they could not have deviated very much from this policy. Some emphasis might have been greater here or there because as I said, it represents every circumstance that goes towards making the thought of India on these subjects.

I say this because some people in foreign countries imagine that this policy has suddenly grown out of nothing and it is merely a policy, as Shri Jaipal Singh himself described it--I hope not very accurately--of sitting on the fence. I do not know what fence he had in mind. There is no question of sitting on the fence or trying to woo this person or that person or this country or that country. We want to be friends with them. We avoid, as far as possible, running down countries, even though we might differ from them, although we do not hide our sentiments, because we have felt that there is far too much running down of countries one by the other and creating bitterness so that people's minds are closed. You do not open a person's mind, normally, by running him down. He reacts violently in thinking or action.

So we avoid doing that. There are many things happening in this world which we dislike very much. We do not talk about them except sometimes as a moderate expression of opinion. If they affect us intimately, of course, we have to talk about them. But generally we avoid talking about things which do not affect us intimately or which do not affect basic causes like world peace, etc. There we have to talk. So I have no doubt that this House, barring perhaps Shri Jaipal Singh, has no doubts about this matter.

But this talking of sitting on the fence does

### <Pg-315>

involve an attitude of mind which, I think, is not correct. It is said there are only two ways of action in this world today. One must come down this way or that. Now I repudiate that attitude of mind. If there are only two ways--if you accept that--then you certainly have to join the cold war, and, if not a military bloc, at least a mental military bloc--if not an actual armed bloc. I do not understand that attitude at all. I just do not see--I speak with all respect to the great countries --why the possession of great armed might or great financial power should necessarily lead to right decisions or a right mental outlook. I do not see how that follows at all. They may be right, they may not be. But the fact that I have got the atom bomb with me does not make me any way more intelligent, wiser or more peaceful than I otherwise might be. It is a simple fact, but it needs reiteration. The greater a country in armed might, the wiser it must necessarily be in action--I do not think it follows. I said that with all respect to the great countries. I am not criticising anybody, but I am not prepared even as an individual, much less as the Foreign Minister of this country, to give up my right of independent judgment to anybody else, in other countries. That is the essence of our policy.

It may be, as Shri S.A. Dange said, 'Oh, you are friends with all, but sometimes you are more friendly with some people than with others'. That reminds me, of course, of that famous saying that 'all men are equal, but some are more equal than others'. It is true: it

may be that occasionally because of some of our activities or some of our expressions. People who themselves feel strongly about these matters this side or the other, feel that we are inclining too much on this side or that side. The fact of the matter is that we are following our own course of action as we judge right and incline on every side, whenever an opportunity offers itself, to be friendly with them. But it is true that in various matters--let us take economic matters and some other matters, to which I shall refer--we have past contacts which we certainly carry on. In the past, our economic life, rightly or wrongly, in trade, commerce etc., has gone in a certain direction. We have not tried to uproot it. We have tried to develop other directions too, but we have not tried to uproot the old directions, old contacts, old trade ways: we have tried to develop them as well as new ones, and that may give an impression that we have emphasised one and not the other. But, that is the point which Shri Dange laid stress on. He objected to our Chiefs of Staff going to England for certain conferences of military officers there and he thought that that meant some kind of lining up with the military apparatus of some countries of the Commonwealth. He also objected to our Navy joining in manoeuvres with some Commonwealth Navies, or chiefly the British Navy.

I do not think he is justified in objecting to that even, if I may say so, from his own point of view. I think it must be due to some misapprehension of What is done and what happens. We send our Chiefs of Staff to London occasionally to participate in what is called a joint exercise. We send them because it is a very good opportunity for gaining wider knowledge of modern methods in so far as one can get them there. I do not say that there are no other places where you can get them. But, it is not taking part in manoeuvres; it is not thinking of defence policy vis-a-vis other countries.

For instance, whenever there is a Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and I attend it, there is, usually, side by side with it a conference about defence matters. We do not attend it. I forget now whether there is any other Commonwealth country which has not attended. I think Ceylon does not attend it. Certainly, it has not attended it. We have not attended because we have nothing to do with the defence approach or the peace and war approach of the United Kingdom or the Commonwealth countries.

But, it is quite another matter for us or for our representatives to see an exercise. An exercise means really discussing modern methods of war, usually in a room, and how old methods have been affected and so on. We have not got too many of those opportunities to do that by ourselves in this country. Where an opportunity offers itself, as it sometimes happens in a limited way, we have to take advantage of that--even in other countries apart from Commonwealth countries. But, in the main, here is an opportunity; we come into touch and we take advantage of it.

Then for the Naval manoeuvres. A Navy or an Army must have some kind of practice. You cannot keep a Navy or anybody in trim without active

practice of mock battles, mock wars. Manoeuvres are mock battles. Our Navy is not big enough to be divided up into two forces fighting a mock battle, one with the other; it is not big enough for that purpose. May be the British Navy, may be the American Navy or the Soviet Navy can do that internally; we cannot. So, we take advantage of these naval manoeuvres and participate in these mock

#### <Pg-316>

battles, try to reproduce very very imperfectly, of course, the conditions of warfare and our people learn from them. It is of the highest importance that our sailors, or for the matter of that our soldiers, should have practical experience in so far as it can be given; and we take advantage of that, whenever an opportunity comes our way.

Then the question--a question almost always mentioned in the past of our Commonwealth relationship has been raised. On this occasion it was hardly mentioned. If I remember correctly, it was rather a Member from the Congress side that mentioned it, and not from the opposite side. That is, the desirability of our continuing as a member of the Commonwealth. I have tried to explain our viewpoint many times. I will just say a few words about it.

The House knows that our membership of the Commonwealth has not led us to forsaking any policy of ours being proceeded with. It has, in fact, rather helped us occasionally to put that policy more strongly and more impressively, if I may say so, on others, whether they are Members of the Commonwealth or other people. It has helped us, therefore, in trying to put across our policy more, perhaps, than otherwise it might have been the case. Of course, this does not take us very far, I admit, to other factors. The argument that is advanced is that because South Africa, for instance, is functioning in a particular way, a racial way, apartheid etc. and South Africa is a Member of the British Commonwealth--I am sorry for the use of the word 'British'; it is an old word and it came in connection with South Africa--therefore it is somewhat below our dignity or not in keeping with what we should do to remain in the same group of nations to which South Africa belongs.

I can very well understand that sentiment and that feeling against the racial policy of the South African Union. It is, I believe, among the many questions that trouble the world today. It is, I think, more basically wrong and dangerous for the future than for anything else. You can talk a great deal of other conflicts, ideological conflicts, communism, anti-communism and so many other things. It surprises me that those countries, particularly those who stand for the democratic tradition, those who voted for the United Nations Charter and for the Human Rights Convention--may I remind this House that tomorrow happens to be the tenth anniversary of the passing of the Human Rights Convention--it surprises me that those great countries express themselves so moderately or do not express themselves at all about this racial policy of the South African Union. It is not a question

of policy only. I say it is the greatest immorality, international immorality for a nation to carry on in that way. We have no desire or reason to interfere with what a country does. The South African Government can do what it likes in its internal policy. But, I say, even apart from the fact that in South Africa people of Indian descent are concerned and these people went under certain guarantees and that therefore we have a special concern, even apart from that, even if we do not have that special concern nevertheless, we would have held these strong views about the racial policy of the South African Government.

As I said, it has been a matter of rome distress to me that from others who stand for the democratic tradition, who stand for the dignity of the individual, who have condemned this South African policy, not a voice can be heard elsewhere. Some do. The House will remember that the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, when he was here, spoke strongly and effectively against this racial policy. But some other countries do not do so.

It is this to which I referred in another context yesterday. It was the context of Pakistan. And, I wish to make it clear again that I am not criticising the internal affairs of Pakistan or martial law. It is up to any people to have the kind of government they choose and it is not our concern unless that government threatens us or unless that government functions, as I say the South African Government functions, against the canons of recognised international morality.

That is a different matter, and we have to do it. But what, naturally, has been a matter of some concern to me is how the democratic outlook, the democratic tradition is gradually disappearing or is being gradually converted into something, shall I say, a matter of some verbiage or words, and not of a dynamic view of life and action. It is from this point of view that I have watched carefully the reactions of other countries to what had happened in Pakistan. When I found a constant apology in these other countries for what had happened in Pakistan and almost an attempt to show it as something not far removed from democracy, it really amazed me. There can be no greater, well, attempt to delude oneself and it showed me how far this type of mentality which the cold war is developing has gone.

We are not interested really in any principle which we hold dear: we are interested only in

<Pg-317>

knowing whether this country is with us in a cold war or not, or is in a hot war. That is the chief test.

Take the case of Goa. Take the, case of Portugal. What Government Portugal has is none of my business or none of the business of this House even. But everybody knows that Portugal has, what is termed, a very authoritarian government--some kind of a dictatorship. Let them

have a dictatorship. But Portugal again becomes the strong pillar of peace and democratic principles from another point of view. It does not fit in my mind, it does not flick in my mind--this kind of thing. It shows that we have all, whether in the Communist countries, whether in the non Communist countries, become so apt to use words in meanings which are not the dictionary meanings; we simply distort them in some way to fit in with our approach to a particular problem. Here is Portugal--quite apart from the question of Goa; Goa we know all enough; and, what they do there. There is not the remotest question of any civil liberty or freedom in Goa. Nobody-- well, I won't say 'nobody'; I am talking about not 'nobodies', but important bodies, important people and important countries--they say little about Goa or Portugal, and what they have said in the past has been rather an encouragement to Portugal in Goa. We saw recently, some months ago, an election in Goa--I am sorry there are no elections in Goa; it was in Portugal. It was one of the most odd elections that one has read about. We have seen criticisms of other elections in other countries, but the Portuguese elections, apart from some newspaper scribes, was calmly passed over.

So the point is not what policy, what programme, what the objectives and ideals of a nation are; but, in this present cold war conflict, where does this nation stand, is it with us or not with us.

Again, a simple fact is forgotten, that it does not necessarily follow that a government of the day in these matters, major matters, has popular will behind it. Whether it is war or peace people count. Today even people who are not free, even in colonial countries, count. In war they will count still more. And, deals are made with governments forgetting the deals, may be worth nothing at all unless the people of that country approve of that deal or, at any rate, do not resent it. So, all these confusing situations arise.

One of the major examples of this kind of thing is what happened in lraq, one of the chief founder nations of the Baghdad Pact. In fact, the very name of the Pact was taken from the capital city of Iraq. Suddenly the country changed, because all that was superficial, because all the deals were with a group at the top which did not represent the country, the people, and the people threw out the group at the top;and, there you are, the Baghdad Pact high and dry, one day thrown out from the mansion it had built for itself. Where it is I do not know, except in speeches and writings.

So we live in this odd world where, to use another phrase, there is so much double thinking, so much use of language in a double way, that if one is confused it is not surprising. I do not pretend to possess any peculiar wisdom or intelligence, but I do try to avoid to be wholly confused by this situation. I cannot lay down what the future will show. So far as we in India are concerned, I should very much like not to stray too much from the right path and to serve the cause of peace in India and outside, not only from the larger view point of the world but from the narrowest, opportunist view point of my own country.

We try to do that, and in doing that take the question of our neighbour country, Pakistan. I have tried to be fair. As this House knows, I have acknowledged often enough what I thought was wrong on our part. I have said only yesterday that in regard to these border troubles sometimes we are in the wrong, sometimes we emphasize things which should not be emphasized. I have said all that in my attempt to be fair--I do not know if I can be fair because nobody can be perfectly fair in matters which affect us so intimately; but I have tried to be fair--and it has been a matter of grief to me that inspite of all these efforts not too much change is visible on the other side. I did not make those efforts waiting for a change; whether a change comes or not I think we should function in the right way. That is not only the right way, but it is a way of strength not of weakness--whether it is South Africa, whether it is some other place.

Hon. Members sometimes ask me, `why don't you act with strength'. Tile Hon. Member, Dr. Subbarayan said that in South Africa and Ceylon we must do this and we must do that. Where do these `musts' come in, I should like to know, in international politics? I do not understand it. Where does `must' come in regard to South Africa. Am I to declare war against South Africa? Obviously, not. I can only take the matter up in the United Nations or I can express my opinion, that is all. So, why all these fine gestures of defiance which you cannot give effect to? It has no meaning and

<Pg-318>

ultimately it becomes a sign of weakness if we talk in that way.

Ceylon--of course, Ceylon is in a completely different category. It is friendly nation. It is our neighbour, and it is very closely aligned to us in cultural and other matters. We want to be friends, and I am quite certain the people of Ceylon want to be friends with India. Yet, we have inherited this problem of a considerable number of people of Indian descent in Ceylon, apart from the Indian nationals. There it is, one of those problems which with all the goodwill in the world is not easily solved. Essentially, it should not be treated as an Indian problem or a Ceylon problem, but as a human problem affecting a large number of human beings. I am not arguing that point. But I say, what is the good of telling me "Go and solve it immediately"? How am I to solve it immediately? I cannot. Am, I to threaten Ceylon and make the lot of those people and everybody much worse? It might satisfy some kind of ambition on our part to display the strong hand, the fist. We do not normally, when we are in the right mood, display the fist to anybody. So, one has to see this matter in that context. One has to see the Pakistan matter in this context. One has to see the border troubles in this context.

It is true; I think Acharya Kripalani said yesterday that these border troubles will continue. That is to say, so long as there is friction between India and Pakistan, it is likely to be reflected on the borders. To some extent, it may become a little less, but it will be reflected, because it is the basic atmosphere, the basic relationship between India and Pakistan that is wrong. That is taken advantage of not only sometimes by good people, but certainly by bad people on both sides. On the Pakistan side specially and sometimes may be on our side too the bad people are protected; they are not stopped from doing it, because there a feeling of nationalist pride comes in: We must protect our men. The same thing happens somewhere in the middle of Rajasthan. It is only some evil-doers misbehaving.

Coming to these border matters, Mr. Jaipal Singh talked about Chittagong hill tracts. I must confess that when I first went through Justice Radcliffe's award, in which he awarded the Chittagong hill tracts to Pakistan, I was considerably surprised, because according to any approach of principle, I saw no reason for that. But there it was; it was a clear decision and not a question of interpretation. I could not interpret it in any other way. What were we to do? We had accepted soon after partition Radcliffe as arbitrator, in a sense, arbitrator. However much it went against my thinking, against our interests, against India's interests, I could not break it; we could not break our word. We had to accept it, although we thought it very unreasonable and devoid of any approach of principle. There it was mad that has been the position till then.

The matter has been raised from time to time, notably by Mr. Jaipal Singh. I can very well understand his feeling in that matter. I share that feeling. But what am I to do? I cannot denounce the Radcliffe award, which definitely, deliberately, in a clearly defined manner, gave that to Pakistan. We can negotiate with Pakistan if a proper atmosphere is present and consider it. But the House can well realise what the answer would be, if we suggested negotiation about the Chittagong hill tracts, which have been given to them precisely and definitely by the Radcliffe award. It would lead us nowhere, when there are difficulties about much simpler matters with Pakistan.

We could hardly raise this matter previously in the United nations. I do not see how we can raise it in the United Nations. The obvious answer is there: The Radcliffe award and all that. So, there it is. I do not know what I can do about it, however much Mr. Jaipal Singh or I may feel about it.

There is a calling attention notice from Shri Premji Assar. In that notice, he has said that a spokesman of the West Bengal Government had said that it would be physically impossible to prevent the exchange of enclaves by the target date. There is some misapprehension about this matter. So far as the Cooch-Behar enclaves--enclaves in the old Cooch-Behar State--are concerned, there is no target date at all. There can be none, because their exchange can only take place after legislation has been passed by this Parliament. There was some doubt as to the method we should pursue. It was clear that this required at least legislation by Parliament. Some people said that it might even require an amendment of the Constitution. But all the legal luminaries we consulted have agreed

that this does not require an amendment of the constitution, but does require legislation by Parliament. Naturally, we will come before this House sometime or other with proposals to pass that legislation and the House will consider it. So, there is no question of target date there.

The target date was fixed for the other exchanges, not the enclaves. That target was fixed some months ahead so as to allow for

### <Pg-319>

demarcation and settlement to avoid any confusion afterwards. That demarcation was started and then it was interrupted. According to us, it was the fault of the Pakistani people. However, it was interrupted. Now lately it has started again. The West Bengal Government approached the East Pakistan Government and they agreed to start it again. The West Bengal Government has suggested to them now that in order to expedite this matter of demarcation, more than one survey party should function and there should be several parties. To that, we have had no answer, so far as I know. But one party is functioning now.

A great deal was said yesterday from both sides of the House about the Berubari Union. May I give the facts? One Hon. Member enquired when this question arose about the Berubari Union becoming a matter of dispute. In the Radcliffe Award, the boundary for the Berubari Union was not very clearly described. There was a map too. But the matter at that time was not referred to Justice Bagge, which came soon after. Bagge finished his work in 1950, but in considering the second Bagge Award, then fresh problems arose and there were two interpretations.

It was in 1952 that this question of the Berubari Union became a matter of dispute and discussion between India and Pakistan, that is, about six or seven years ago. It is true that so far as possession is concerned, it had been in our possession since independence. The House may remember that although possession was ours, Pakistan claimed a large part of the area round about Sylhet-Karimganj as an interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, it is amazing how much difficulties this Radcliffe Award has caused us in interpretation. They claimed huge areas and Justice Bagge has to deal with this matter together with an Indian Judge and a Pakistan Judge. The decision of Justice Bagge in regard to a large piece of territory in Karimganj was in our favour. That part was disposed of But nevertheless, after the Bagge Award again difficulties arose in interpretation of what Bagge had said and what Radcliffe had said. The difficulties arose chiefly because first of all they laid down a rule that we shall accept, broadly speaking, the boundaries of districts or taluks or administrative areas. Now the administrative areas inside a country does not matter. But when the boundaries become international frontiers, it makes a difference. Sometimes it is said as the other side of the river. Then they attach maps to the description, and the map does not tally with the description.

Sometimes they name a river and there was doubt its to which river was meant.

Anyhow, my point is that after the Bagge Award several other matters arose on interpretation and we have been holding to certain interpretations of our own and Pakistan to some others. It was after the Bagge Award, after at least 1952 that Pakistan raised this question about Berubari Union. We contested their claim and in our opinion, we said, the whole Union had been awarded to India. The dispute has gone on. I am merely referring to it. It is not a new dispute. This was finally considered at the Prime Ministers' meetings. I may as well say that the Prime Ministers do not consider it. I am not an expert on revenue boundaries, but we considered it at the official level, with Secretaries and revenue authorities advising us. And the whole agreement that was arrived at between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan, which was really arrived at the official level by various parties advised by Secretaries and revenue officials, was accepted by us after closely examining it. One of the parts of that agreement was that this Berubari Union, which both claimed in its entirety, should be broadly divided into two parts, northern and the southern, the northern remaining with India and the southern going to Pakistan. I cannot obviously enter into the merits of the case. Large maps and charts and revenue records of what this meant and what that meant becomes highly complicated. I am merely venturing to place before the House the procedure that was adopted. So, we accepted the advice chiefly of the revenue authorities and others of West Bengal that this might be done.

Now I should like to point out that in these various matters of interpretation and dispute, well, there were some matters in which one could say with confidence that our case was strong. In some matters we felt that our case was not very strong. Naturally when we have a dozen such matters some points are strong and some weak, and we had to take all these matters into consideration in coming to a "give and take" agreement.

A great deal was said even by Shri Jaipal Singh anti other members that we show weakness in dealing with these matters, our case has gone by default and we accept everything that Pakistan says. Well, that is not correct.

Even in the present case, it might interest the House to know that as a result of the so-called "Nehru-Noon Agreement"--I want to give the figures; I have got them here--as a result of the agreement in regard to the exchange of territories, the total area which comes to India is 42.4 sq. miles: the total area that goes to Pakistan is 4.8 sq. miles. And when I say coming to India, a part

<Pg-320>

of it is in India now, but that is taken out of the area of dispute and agreed to that it is in India. The total area in dispute in this area was this 47.2 sq. miles. As I said, of this 42.4 sq. miles

definitely comes to India. So, it is not a question of handing over territory to Pakistan and accepting what they say. The total area of Berubari Union is 8.74 sq. miles, and the agreement is that about half of it should go to them and about half of it should come to India.

Reference was made to Hili. As a matter of fact, the whole area, a large area of 34.86 miles comes to India, and Pakistan admitted that it should go to India, although they have been claiming it.

In reply to a question the Prime Minister said: The total population of Berubari Union is 10,000 to 12,000. I think half of it remains there. Roughly half of it goes there. But I do not know the density of population in each part. About 5,000 to 6,000 may be affected by this.

Replying to another question about the area occupied by India now the Prime Minister said: I cannot give the exact figures. But, as I said just now, this includes some parts which are at present in the possession of India. Now, if you go into the details about this, it is a highly complicated matter in which for months and months our experts have been struggling with revenue records, maps and all that, and finally in regard to these particular matters they felt that it would be advantageous, not only from the national point of view but from the point of view of the people of these areas, who were subjected to this constant indecision and conflict, to recommend this settlement of these particular disputes, and we accepted that rightly.

It is a fact that whatever you may decide, it causes some inconvenience, some upset to some people. We wanted to see that it is as little as possible.

One thing more about Tukergram has been as the time since independence in India's possession. The dispute about Tukergram as such only arose this year, that is, Pakistan raised this question. In another sense, Tukergram is part of a larger area about which there was some dispute, a continuing one. But by itself there is no dispute about this and it was undoubtedly, according to our thinking, our territory. I say this because some statement made on our behalf in answer to a question, I think in the other House, has slightly led to some misapprehensions. In fact, our Deputy Minister made a statement in the other House, clearing that misapprehension, today.

some Hon. Member suggested that a Joint Judicial Board be constituted to deal with these problems and that the Chairman of that Board should be neither an Indian nor a Pakistani, but some outsider and I believe he suggested someone from another Commonwealth country. That kind of proposal, I say, is a completely wrong one and we are not at all prepared to consider it. We are prepared to consider a Tribunal to take up such matters; some matters can be referred to it, because after all finally there is no way of settling these matters except either by agreement or by an arbitrator or by a tribunal.

We suggested this in regard to some other matters, to Mr. Feroze Khan Noon, but he rejected that. He did not accept that. I think some Hon. Members actually read out yesterday from what he said on that occasion when he went back to Karachi. I do not see any other way of settling them. It is our misfortune that two tribunals, the Radcliffe and the Bagge, still left matters vague.

An Hon. Member--I think it was probably Mr. Dange, or may be someone else--said that it was not safe for our pattern of armaments to be linked up with one particular power. Broadly speaking, I agree with that statement. We should not be tied up to any big power. To some extent it becomes a little difficult for us to spread ourselves out all over the world and the real answer to this question is to produce things oneself in one's own country, except any special thing which we may buy here or there; broadly speaking to increase our defence production capacity. We are trying to do that to the best of our ability. It is not an easy matter and we cannot, however much we might produce things ourselves, build up that enormous equipment for research and advance which the great powers have. We do not intend doing it; we do not need it. We are not aiming at any kind of competition in this matter. But we want to be self-sufficient in this respect in regard to our normal defence equipment.

Finally, Sir, I should like to say something in regard to some remarks which Acharya Kripalani made. First of all he said that our Military Department must be above suspicion in regard to contracts, etc. I entirely agree with him, of course. And not only the Military Department, but all Departments should endeavour to do that. I cannot say honestly that every department of Government here, or in fact anywhere else is hundred per cent. perfect. There is trouble, there is misappropriation and all that sometimes. But I do believe that the kind of opinion that is

<Pg-321>

sometimes held apparently about so-called corruption etc., in Government departments is much exaggerated.

As I said, we are functioning today as a Government over a sphere which is probably a hundred times bigger than in pre-independence days. It is a tremendous domain, and new territories are being included--I mean to-say the public sector and all that. Everything is tremendous. If I may use a word each department of Ministry, is an empire in extent. Now this very extent raises difficult problems and we are constantly struggling and endeavouring to make our apparatus of Government more efficient, more economical and to have people of integrity. I think that marked progress is being made in this direction.

Remember this that today how many eyes are on Government departments. Every Member of this House or the other House--if not every Member, a large number of them--are vigilant guardians. They are vigilant to

see and if anything happens down they come upon them quite rightly, they should. There are so many people looking up to them. If a mistake happened it just happened. Our Newspapers also are eager to pick up anything that might savour of some scandal. So that there are enough eyes and ears at work and the smallest thing that happens is brought out either by question or in newspapers or otherwise. One must remember also all this background and see the enormous range of governmental activity. If they pick out something and if something happens, they must see it in relation to it. And do not--if I may say so with respect--because of one case or two or ten cases think that 10,000 other cases are wrong. We must have some perspective in view.

My hon. friend Acharya Kripalani mentioned defence. And defence, remember, is in such a matter the most difficult department of all, difficult, that is to say, so long as it deals with foreign affairs. If we produce our goods ourselves then it will be on the same levels as others. Nothing is more difficult than purchasing armaments from the big firms abroad and elsewhere. There is no real competition in that matter. Deals are not done normally in public. They can more or less fix their own prices and we try to argue with them and accept them or not. So defence is always, a dangerous thing and in every country it is in deals connected with defence that wrong things happen. I entirely accept that in defence we have to be very careful.

Unfortunately, the first year after independence; 1948 was a very critical year for us. Soon after independence the Kashmir trouble started and nobody knew in 1948 at what time the Kashmir trouble might not extend to an all-out war with Pakistan.

Those who held responsibility then found it rather a heavy burden to carry, i.e., about our security, about a possible major war as to what might happen. A little later came the Hyderabad problem. It was a small affair as it happened. But we saw it in terms of all this, i.e., what was happening in Kashmir, what was happening in Pakistan and just soon after Partition when we had very few arms, very few vehicles and all that in proper condition. We were anxious to buy and certain contracts were made.

The first contracts were made--the very first--by the new department at India House--till then every contract was made through the India Office, i.e., through the British agency. The early contracts were made when no proper establishment was built up and all that and here we had a violent hurry because of this acute dangerous situation which might result in sudden war with Pakistan and we would not have this or that. Certain contracts were made then which led ultimately, as the House knows, to enormous trouble and still pursue us, i.e., what is called the Jeep Scandal and all that. So, see the context of it.

We have gone into this matter very, very thoroughly and we are convinced--I cannot say honestly that some people in England or some people elsewhere did not make money out of it; some people did because we have lost the money and obviously it has gone somewhere,

but I am simply speaking after air the long enquiries that have been made--that people in India House were by these circumstances and not by anything else hustled in agreeing to certain terms etc. which normally they would not have agreed to or to deal with certain firms which they might not have dealt with. Considering everything we thought that it was our misfortune that we have got caught in that way and not that any person is deliberately at fault. That was our firm opinion and of those who examined it.

Now, remember again thee enormous scale on which Defence purchases firings from abroad. It is a very big scale and I beg you to consider that dealing in this big way how few instances have arisen which have been challenged in this house. May be, of course, some misappropriation was not caught. That is quite possible. It does not necessarily follow that because it was not challenged it was all right. But still what I am venturing to point out is that by and large if you look at

#### <Pg-322>

this picture it has been a picture of straight dealing and care taking. Sometimes a mistake has been made. Even now we are enquiring into some matters which really go back to--I think the story goes back probably about four or five years--1954. We are enquiring into it. We have taken action to occasionally dismiss some high-ranking people and all that. So, we are trying to do what we can. But, again I would beg this House to consider one aspect of this. We have to be vigilant, we have to be careful and we have to take action--and firm action--whenever necessary. But it is a wrong thing--and a dangerous thing--to create an atmosphere.

At this stage an Hon. Member interrupted and said that "firm action is lacking."

Replying the Prime Minister said: The Hon. Member knows about these matters and his advice is always valuable. He may be right. He may be right that firm action is lacking but what I am venturing to say is that wherever necessary or when it is proved we come down with a heavy hand. But one thing is dangerous as it is wrong and that is, first of all, to condemn large numbers of people -fine Services-because somebody had erred. The person who has erred--cut off his head, if you will. Certainly, but do not colour the whole Service with that. It is a bad thing. It is bad anywhere whether it is civil or anybody. It is worse when the military and these people are concerned.

Secondly, do not do anything which discourages the bright people--the scientists, the technicians and others. Thus far they had no chance or very little chance of doing anything special--they had to work in routines, in grooves. Now, the best of them become affected by this and become dull. That unfortunately is sometimes the result of too much bureaucracy. People are promoted by virtue of years of service and not because they have got greater intelligence in their heads.

They go on being promoted one after the other and at a certain stage they are asked to quit whether they are good or bad. I think it is quite illogical and insensible. This may be all right for your lower grade clerks but for intelligent men, when you spend a large sum of money and when you get them trained, to be asked to quit when it is the best time of service, it is quite absurd. Of course, in the educational field it is fantastic. In other countries I have seen the professors reaching the hundred years standard and nobody kicks them out-they are 95 or 92 years of age-because they all are respected, whatever be their age. It is not a civil service kind of thing-the rotation of coming and going.

So, with this bureaucratic approach the brilliant person is treated like a mediocre, on the same level. That may not matter so much in the normal governmental administration. It does matter, of course, but not so much. But it matters ever so much where you have to deal with scientific and other discoveries and progress. The scientist cannot function in that atmosphere. It is possible, if all the tittle he is pulled up and told not to do this and not to do that, just a madness for a man of acute intelligence who is trying to do a bit of high intellectual work. We have got some very fine men in our Defence installations--good scientists and good technicians--and they have been doing particularly fine work in the course of last year or two, and you have seen some examples. Why? Because they are enthusiastic now They have been given free play--do something. I do not want this House to create an impression on them that "we do not approve of your doing them".

Now, Acharya Kripalani mentioned Kashmir and said that it is not safe to rely completely on one person and he referred to certain previous incidents. We should rely on the people.

But about what Acharya Kripalani said--and he said it in all earnestness--I should like to remind him that one has to see these things not in vacuum but in particular situations. Here is Kashmir. It has gone through such an ordeal for many years and which today has armies on the cease-fire line on either side and which in the last year or two, as the House knows, has had to face a secret and deliberate campaign of sabotage. Schools--and I speak with some knowledge--being started to teach people how to commit sabotage and people sent across just to commit that sabotage--on the other side of the border it started not in our territory--sent deliberately. This is a difficult situation to face. It is not a normal situation. And difficult situations have to be faced sometimes in abnormal ways. Nevertheless, in spite of all this elections have been held in Kashmir twice. You may say--and you may perhaps be right--that the elections are not of that high standard as we would like them to be or as they have been held in the rest of India. Nevertheless, whatever be the standard, it does give a great opportunity to the people there. It has given them that opportunity. There are those difficulties. We cannot have it in ideal conditions anywhere. In these conditions, the situation throws up men to deal with these situations. And the present Prime Minister of Kashmir, Bakshi Ghulam

Mohammed, is a person who undoubtedly has shown quite remarkable qualities of organisation and leadership. He has done something. I am quite free to confess here that sometimes he

<Pg-323>

has acted in ways which I have not liked at all-- just as all of us may act in some ways--and I have ventured to draw his attention to these too. But the fact is that here is this great problem and this great responsibility, which he is shouldering, and carrying this burden.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA ITALY CANADA PORTUGAL IRAO TUNISIA

**Date**: Dec 09, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Rep1y to Foreign Policy Debate in Rajya Sabha

Replying to a two-day debate on India's foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on Dec 16, 1958 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the course of the discussion yesterday there was a very large measure of agreement on our basic policy, but a number of rather relatively minor points were raised. I should like to deal with some of these matters and correct some obvious misapprehensions.

I am told that an Hon. Member said something about 1200 Indians being killed in the recent riots in Ceylon. It is not quite clear where he gets this information from.

Then the Hon. Member corrected the figure and said it was 200 and not 1200.

The Prime Minister said: I am glad that he is gradually approaching the correct figure. As a matter of fact, according to our information, two Indians were killed. I maintain that the Hon. Member is suffering under some misapprehension, mixing up Indians with non-Indians, mixing up perhaps the old Tamil inhabitants of Ceylon with Indians. They may have come from India two hundred years ago but they are not normally referred to as Indians. Our definite information is,

after much enquiry, that only two Indian nationals were killed in these riots. For the rest, the statement made by the Prime Minister of Ceylon was that the total number killed during the riots was 115 by mob violence and 44 as a result of police firing. This, according to him, included 12 Tamils who presumably are Ceylon Tamils, 10 by mob violence and 2 by the police firing, and one stateless person, and the nationality of 8 is not known. These very unfortunate riots, as the House will remember, had nothing to do with India. It was entirely an affair between parties or groups in Ceylon. It is true that some Indian nationals suffered chiefly because their shops were looted.

Then, Sir, an Hon. Member referred, in the course of his speech, to some circular of the Home Ministry. In fact the matter came up before me some time ago. That circular was issued because it has become a habit of all kinds of organisations, good, bad or indifferent, to ask for the good wishes of Ministers, Governors and others, and as a normal course we are generous with our good wishes to anybody. But then, this assumes a political colour when it is published, let us say, that the President of India has sent his good wishes to an organisation which normally would not have been patted on the back by the Government--the President or the Governor or the Minister. So, a circular was issued to these persons, Ministers and Governors, that they might be careful about attending or responding in this way to such enquiries or messages without finding out what they were, without referring the matter to us. As a matter of fact this is the larger significance of this question, because we have got several times into trouble on thoughtless replies being sent, which involved the persons concerned, without their being aware of it, in complicated and embarrassing situations. That was the main object of that circular. It is not a question of preventing anybody from doing anything or discriminating.

Continuing the Prime Minister said: I think, in the original list the Indo-China Friendship Association was there and I think there was one Indo-Czech Association too. If with all respect I may refer to these organisations, it has become a practice for half a dozen people in Delhi City suddenly to start an association and they begin to represent India and some other foreign nation. We would welcome organisations of friendship between India and other nations whatever they are. But it is a little difficult to accept that kind of association that is started with mixed intentions by some people. It is all a mere personal matter. And in that sense, and more specially, we have found that when some eminent dignitary is coming from abroad, from some other country, just before that a new organisation springs up to welcome him.

Then, Sir, in regard to the eastern border with Pakistan, I should like to make it clear that since Pakistan occupied Tukergram, there has been no other Pakistani occupation of Indian territory in the east. There have been petty raids here and there have been the cases of those char islands about which I spoke yesterday. And may I say to the House that the border is very well defended? For anyone to

imagine that it is not defended is not correct. And in order to get a

<Pg-324>

balanced picture it would be a good thing to read not only the Indian newspapers, but Pakistani newspapers on this subject also.

In reply to a question whether the account given in the Pakistani press was correct, the Prime Minister said: I do not say it is correct. It is not all correct. Neither, if I may say so, is always the Indian account correct.

Mr. Chairman: Accept it.

The Prime Minister: Yes. Because the Pakistani account is all the time that the Pakistanis are the sufferers from the Indian raid. I think it is quite incorrect. But I am merely pointing out that the way these things are put out-this exaggeration or that--is not always deliberately done because you only see part of a picture of a local area. It is not that somebody deliberately seizes any char island. It is very difficult to know what is happening.

Talking about this matter, we were asked about the recent so-called Nehru-Noon Agreement, as to how we are going to give effect to it and whether a constitutional change would be necessary or not. In so far as the proposals flowing from an interpretation of the Bagge Award are concerned, those are minor rectifications of the border and no legislation or constitutional amendment is necessary. In so far as the Cooch-Behar enclaves are concerned—the exchange of them—we have been advised that legislation by this Parliament is necessary—not constitutional amendment, but legislation by Parliament. We are taking care to get advice not from one source only, but several highly legal sources, and they have agreed that legislation by Parliament is enough and it is the right course to adopt. We propose to take up this question, not in the present session of Parliament, but in the next session; it may perhaps come up before this House and the other House.

An Hon. Member: With regard to Pakistan, what is the process by which they can implement this and see that it is preserved and kept up?

The Prime Minister: Where there is a question of their handing over some territory to us and our handing over some territory to them, well, whoever the authorities may be, they will have to be handed over. If they do not, they do not and we do not, and there the matter ends. It is obvious they have got--no doubt, there is functioning--a Government in Pakistan. It is not that Pakistan does not have a Government. The Hon. Member may not approve of that Government. It is a different matter. That is a functioning Government and that Government undoubtedly will function in this matter if it want to, and can function quite effectively.

An Hon. Member: Sir, the Pakistan Government has said that we have

not fully accepted the recommendations of the Bagge Award. May I know the correct position?

The Prime Minister: You mean whether India has not accepted? Yes. With Pakistan one particular matter is in dispute. They say that the Bagge Award has said something. We do not accept that interpretation. So it has really become a question of interpretation. And there is another matter on which the Bagge Award expressed an opinion--it was about a matter Which was not referred to them. It was what might be called an obiter dictum, for it was not referred to them and they expressed an opinion. But everything comes ultimately to a question of interpretation of what was referred to them and what was not. Now when there was disagreement between us on that issue, well, how a disagreement like that is to be unsolved? And I offered to the Prime Minister of Pakistan that the matter should be referred to some tribunal. It is true that the Bagge Award was itself a tribunal and before that the Radcliffe Award was a tribunal, but in spite of that some differences of interpretation remain. Well, let us define precisely what the remaining matters are and ask a tribunal to decide. There is no other way except either by mutual agreement without a tribunal or by a tribunal or by a conflict with all the consequences. Obviously we want to eliminate any idea of a conflict.

An Hon. Member: Supposing our Parliament passes legislation that we transfer our territory to Pakistan and later on Pakistan Government refuses to pass any legislation or take any constitutional step to transfer their territory to us by interchange, what would the position be?

The Prime Minister: May I continue, Sir, for a little while? It is rather disturbing to have to sit down every two minutes. All these questions, if I may say so, that we give them our land and they do not give theirs, well, this kind of thing does not happen whatever the Government anywhere. There are certain things that do not happen and cannot happen. We are not interested in legislation being passed by the Pakistan Government. At the present moment a decree of the President is the legislation they pass. If the President says 'yes' that is the final legislation in Pakistan; nothing else is necessary, and if he says 'yes' it has got to be done, and I have no

<Pg-325>

doubt that if he says it has got to be done, the land in that area will be given to us. And all these things are done more or less simultaneously.

There is one thing I should like to say in case there is any misapprehension as I think there is, because of something I had said in the other House. In these matters of borders, discussions were held already of course on numerous occasions, previous to the Prime Ministers' meeting held at the Secretaries' level and various other levels, and all kinds of people have been consulted, and the revenue officials have been consulted about maps and other things. Revenue

officials of course only come in about revenue matters, not about political matters, and advise us about that, and it was after consulting all these people and getting a report from them that we considered it at the meeting of the Prime Ministers, and accepted something. We were responsible for accepting that. What I mean to say is this. Some people thought that I was laying all the burden of acceptance of this or any part of it on the revenue officials of Bengal which, of course, is not correct. They had nothing to do with it, except to advise us about certain revenue boundaries, according to them. Because there were certain rival maps and certain new maps, they advised us about certain boundaries of a district or a thana or a pargana, or whatever it is. The next stage was Secretaries and others considering the whole matter, and then, of course, the Prime Ministers. So, I want to absolve the revenue officials, wherever they be, of having taken any part in any decision.

Now, Sir, some Hon. Member asked about the Commonwealth Conference, as to why it should always be held in London. That point was raised in the Conference itself nearly two years ago when it was held, and it was proposed that it should be held at various places in the Commonwealth. So far as we were concerned, we were not only agreeable to it, but also we thought that it would be a good thing to have the venue changed from time to time. The proposal came not from us, but from another member of the Commonwealth. And there it is. It was noted that this might be done. But as to whether it will be done or not, I do not know. It is a matter really not of high principle, but of convenience. There was a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Commonwealth countries held in Colombo some years ago I would not venture to say anything in regard to the Hon. Member's remarks about the Commonwealth, because I feel that I am totally incapable of creating any impression in his mind, whatever I might say on any issue. My difficulty is that the Hon. Member refuses to come out of the twenties, and the thirties of the century. We are approaching the sixties presently, but he still lives in some bygone age so far as his thinking in these matters is concerned.

The Prime Minister said: Then, Sir, an Hon. Member enquired as to why we did not recognise the provisional Government of Algeria, and further, Sir, he wanted to know as to what progress had been made in regard to the economic resolution passed at the Bandung Conference. We did not recognise the Provisional Government, because in our opinion it did not fulfil the normal tests of a provisional Government for the time being. Of course, all our sympathies were with it. We did not state that publicly or did not recognise it, but we felt that that would be a brave gesture which had no particular meaning and no basis in real fact.

In reply to a question the Prime Minister said: The normal tests of a Government are that it should function as a Government; the normal tests of a Government are that it should function in a particular territory or a particular area. And there are also many other normal tests.

An Hon. Member: May I know whether the French Government was recognised at the time of the War, although it was functioning.....

The Prime Minister: We have not such a war started as yet. So there is some difference. In times of war very many things are done.

Then some Hon. Member said: There is actually a war going on between France and Algeria. To this the Prime Minister replied: We are not talking of that war. We are talking of a world war. But the real test, so far as we are concerned, is as to how we can help the cause which we have at heart. We are, I hope, a responsible and a mature country whose voice counts, and such a country does not normally act as perhaps even I might, at a public meeting, act. There are certain tests of a country's action. If it starts acting in the other way, then its voice has no great value. We have to approach other countries; we have relations with France; we have relations with the countries of North Africa. We have to consider all these matters and we have to think as to how we can help in a certain process, achieving a certain objective. If, having said something very bravely, we can do nothing more about it, then we have not helped anybody.

About the economic resolution at Bandung, the economic resolution consisted of two parts, I

<Pg-326>

think. One was in regard to bilateral trade agreements, to consider by correspondence, etc., in what matters we can act jointly. We have had some bilateral agreements. Our Government tried very hard and repeatedly addressed the Bandung countries on this issue, but very few replied. We went on addressing them. Two or three replied rather vaguely, the others did not reply at all. The fact of the matter is, when we discussed this matter at Bandung, everyone was anxious that there should be this economic cooperation. But everyone realised that it was not a particularly easy thing for economic cooperation over this wide area, because the economic problems and interests were completely different. Yes, between two or three countries, may be in South East Asia, the interests were more in common over a geographical area. But over the whole of Asia and Africa, to consider some kind of an economic unit which could have something in common, it became difficult. Personally I think it is desirable and necessary for us to begin, even though at first in a small way, these common economic efforts. I agree with the general principle and I am sure that this will grow and we should work towards that end. But at the present moment it is a little difficult to think of that from a practical point of view. We have been thinking for some months past as to how to come to grips with this problem. We have discussed it and we have been corresponding with other countries. But as the House knows, so many odd political developments have taken place in these countries of Asia and Africa and that idea of coming together to discuss these problems quietly and calmly has not taken shape yet.

Then, Sir, about Pondicherry, I was asked if we had raised this matter with the Government of Premier de Gaulle. We have informally mentioned it on several occasions, and we have been told, again in the informal level, that they are well seized of it, that they like to give effect to it as soon as possible. Again, France has been a country where there have been considerable changes, elections, plebiscite and all that, and apart from reminding them from time to time and pressing them to take action, we can do nothing more now. But Hon. Members might remember that in fact we do possess Pondicherry. We are there and nobody else is there. Although we are anxious that this legal transfer should take place, in fact, the transfer has taken place factually, and it does not make very much difference if the legal thing is delayed. It does make a little difference, of course. For instance, Pondicherry cannot be represented in this Parliament. That is certainly so and there are other things too, and we would like it to be done. But this does not affect the people of Pondicherry too much.

I referred at some length to the friction that has started or the possibility of conflict between the growing African nations, the African personality and the continued rigidity of the South African Government and to some extent of the adjoining areas too. As the Hon. Members know, seventy countries voted for the Apartheid Resolution including the United States of America; and absentees were the Dominican Republic, Finland, Netherlands and Spain. The countries that voted against were the United Kingdom, Australia, Portugal, France and Belgium. That is to say;some countries of the Commonwealth like Canada and New Zealand voted for it while Australia and the United Kingdom voted against it.

In regard to Cyprus, I should like to say that the position there for a long time past has been an extraordinarily distressing one, and a complicated one as all problems become complicated if they are not dealt with early enough. It is a triangular position there. There are the other people of Cyprus. There is the United Kingdom and there are the Greeks and the Turks. Cyprus itself has got a population of 85 per cent. Greek and 15 per cent. Turkish. At the present moment, it almost appears as if the problem is not capable of being solved if you want something by agreement as obviously there should be. We took up the attitude in the recent debates in the General Assembly that the Assembly should declare itself in favour of the independence of Cyprus--that independence may be within the Commonwealth or whatever it may be but it should be real freedom of Cyprus--and should declare itself against a partition of Cyprus. Cyprus is a small island with a relatively small population and we felt that to partition Cyprus would be a calamity. Apart from being a small island, the Greek and the Turkish population is spread out in almost every village and with some experience of partition, we thought that this would be a most unhappy way of trying to solve the problem. It could not be solved that way.

The Prime Minister said: As a matter of fact, the British representative there had himself said that the British Government did

not like the idea of partition at all but somehow they did not like to put that in the Resolution. Ultimately, it was not put in there and they decided to have talks. I hope the talks will lead to something because it is a tragedy that in this small and very beautiful island this kind of a conflict should continue and people should go about murdering each other.

<Pg-327>

An Hon. Member: What is the attitude of Turkey towards this?

The Prime Minister: The Turkish attitude is that they do not agree to any kind of independence, self-government for Cyprus, which puts the Turkish minority under the Greek majority. Either there should be partition or things should continue as they are, broadly speaking.

An Hon. Member speaking of the new developments in Pakistan, referred to the article by Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition in the British House of Commons. That article, as he quoted, was very much to the point as representing the views of Mr. Gaitskell or the Labour Party. I must say that. Mr. Gaitskell said that the very basis of Commonwealth association is parliamentary government, democracy. Well, that is so but, as a matter of fact, in the final analysis the basis of the Commonwealth association is two or more countries being prepared to talk to each other. The moment they do not want to talk to each other on that basis, that association ceases. It is undoubtedly a new development and I cannot say anything because there are no rules to the effect as to who should be in the Commonwealth or not. There are countries in the Commonwealth with which we completely disagree like South Africa. On the other hand, you must remember that the Commonwealth has now got some new outlook and a very important outlook, the African personality. It may have Malaya and Nigeria. This element is growing there and the question will arise and does arise as to how these desperate elements having their completely different forms of Government fit in in such an association. I referred to Guinea the other day. Guinea, as the House perhaps knows, has become a member of the United Nations. The question has arisen about Ghana and Guinea combining together in some type of association or federation. How that would affect the Commonwealth again, whether that means Guinea also coming in the Commonwealth or not, I do not know.

There is, I forget, an Hon. Member who protested about our President going to some military function in Indonesia to address some military academy. I have been completely unable to find out what justification there was for that report in the "Hindustan Times" yesterday. As I said then, I just could not conceive of it, that our President should go to hold a closed session with the military advisers of President Soekarno, which our President does not do even with the Indian Army, much less with the Indonesian Army. I could not make out. I think probably there was some misapprehension. We, in fact, enquired about this matter by telegram, but what I find as far as I can make out is this. The President went to Bandung. He was scheduled to visit that

building where the Asian-African Conference was held. And then he went to a place, he was to visit a certain place, a certain building of the military academy--as an academy, as a building. It is possible that he may have said a few words of greeting there. But there was no question of any conference with the military leaders there or any consultation.

The Prime Minister said: In Goa, on the conditions there we had recently a brief report from the Secretary of the Egyptian Embassy here. The House will remember that Egypt represents us vis-a-vis Portugal. The Secretary was good enough to go there and give us a report about the conditions there. We have not received the full report yet--we are waiting for it; at any rate, I have not seen it-about the brief report did not exhibit a very satisfactory state of affairs. Some improvement, I believe, had been made and some time ago some people had been released too. But there are a few Indians and a fairly large number of Goans in prison still. On the other hand, at the same time the House will remember that there is a case going on in the Hague Court, in regard to Daman and Diu. That case has become a very complicated one, because it has involved looking into documents of hundreds of years which mostly are in old Marathi, which few persons can read now, look into them, translate them and all that. Maybe most of them are not relevant at all. But one has to go through the whole lot.

An Hon. Member: Our sovereignty is being impugned. They demand a right to the passage of their troops through our country. Is this sovereignty to be determined by the Hague Court? That is the point I want to know.

The Prime Minister: We have certain views about that. It is obvious that nobody can tell us to do something which is opposed to our sovereignty, and nobody can tell us to allow foreign troops to come in our soil, no country can tell us that. But the question is not that simple. There are other aspects of it, and therefore I would rather not say anything at this stage.

Finally, I would like to refer to these Geneva Conferences. One of them has not made any progress so far as I know, but the other one is making a slow, but on the whole satisfactory, progress. That is the one in regard to nuclear tests being stopped. Three articles have been

<Pg-328>

agreed to. I have not seen the third article in detail, but the first two articles themselves indicate fairly considerable progress. But all this is subject to the whole treaty being agreed to. These partial agreements will only be valid if the whole treaty is finally agreed to.

I believe, Sir, so far as I can remember I have referred to most of the points raised in the debate. I should like to express my deep gratitude to the House for the way they have dealt with this motion of mine.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM SRI LANKA ALGERIA INDONESIA FRANCE SOUTH AFRICA DOMINICA FINLAND SPAIN AUSTRALIA PORTUGAL BELGIUM CANADA NEW ZEALAND CYPRUS TURKEY NIGER NIGERIA GUINEA GHANA EGYPT SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Dec 16, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Cyprus

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on Dec 02, 1958 on the question of Cyprus:

I had occasion this morning to make a short intervention in the debate on what at that time was a procedural matter. You, Mr. Chairman, advised both the representative of the United Kingdom and me to regard this matter as closed, and for myself that is the position. But I have to set out another aspect of it in view of the position which the Government of India holds in regard to this question and our close relations with the United Kingdom.

Our understanding of the procedure of a debate is something like this: that in the course of the general debate a delegation speaks as fully as necessary on the whole problem from the point of view of his own delegation and his Government. He does not restrict himself to what is contained in the draft resolution, nor do those observations modify it. A co-sponsored draft resolution, especially one with a large number of sponsors, must necessarily represent the factor of agreement among the sponsors. Therefore, it is necessary for me to make a distinction, which is provided for in our procedure, between the present stage of the general debate and that of the draft resolutions. My delegation reserves its position in regard to speaking on the draft resolutions when the resolution stage comes.

This subject has been before us for four years. Indeed, it has been on the political horizon for forty or fifty years or more, I have no desire to go into the chronological history of this position, but it is relevant for us to remind ourselves of the progress that we have made or, even more, of the different context in which this question has come here.

An item of Cyprus--I forget the wording of it--was put down by the Greek delegation in 1954. At that time, its inscription was opposed by the United Kingdom. The voting on it was very close and my delegation abstained, I believe, on this matter. At any rate, we did not support the inscription of the item, to the consternation of the ex-colonial countries. We explained our position at that time, 1954, and I would like to read it now for two reasons:

My Government and my country stand for the independence of nations.—It was long before it had become the accepted policy of the Cypriot people—The arguments we have heard here have nothing to do with the Cypriot nation and nationhood. This is a question of Greece, on the one hand, and the United Kingdom, on the other, wanting the possession of these islands. There is no talk about the people of Cyprus: there is no argument about the nationhood of Cyprus as such.

The position of our Government is that we would support and we desire the establishment of self-government or independence according to the wishes of the people, whenever possible--and we hope it will be possible everywhere by peaceful methods of conciliation and negotiation for their freedom ......

We regard nationhood as territorial: it makes no difference to us whether, in a particular territory, people are of one ethnic group or another. Therefore, the territory of Cyprus is regarded by us as the homeland of a people entitled to the recognition of their nationhood.

The same position was repeated the next year when the United Kingdom took the same objections. It might be pointed out that--a factor relevant to what might come afterwards--

one of the arguments used at that time came under Article 2 (7)--that is to say, Cyprus was a matter of domestic jurisdiction, because domestic jurisdiction is very difficult to reconcile with this international problem.

So in 1955, a new factor had emerged. In the statements made by us and the others in 1954, we were talking about two parties, not the Cypriots and the British, except as far as my delegation and some others were concerned, but the British and the Greeks. By 1955, three parties had emerged--the British, the Greeks and the Turks. Even then, the Cypriot people had not emerged.

Our position in regard to this problem is exactly the same. It is not that we are inflexible in this matter, but in terms of the Charter of the United Nations, in terms of the position of people who have neither political, economic nor social freedoms, their liberation comes first. We will be the first to agree publicly and privately that there is much in the record of the United Kingdom in either assisting or in yielding to the demands of self-government by subject

peoples. In our own country, there have been periods of conflict and co-operation. There have been periods of negotiation. There have also been periods when the ruling authority has said, "we shall not talk to the rebels."

There is an old, old saying which is attributed to Lloyd George when he spoke in regard to Ireland as follows: "We shall not shake hands with `murder' "--and murder today is enthroned in the Government of Ireland. I mean "murder" in inverted commas. It is the business of statesmanship to take the gun out of politics.

We have therefore today the progress of this resolution from 1954 to 1956, and the session held in 1957, in this way, when the United Kingdom, in order that the world might be enlightened on this problem, I believe, agreed to the inscription of this item, and it my memory is right I remember my distinguished friend Commander Noble telling this house at that time that this problem is not a straightforward colonial question. I am not one to play on words, but I would like to ask this Committee which colonial question is a straightforward question. Colornialism is not straightforward. We agree it is not straightforward colonial problem in that sense also. But there are factors involved in it.

But the next part of Commander Noble's statement is even more significant. He said it is not a straightforward colonial problem because the Greeks had introduced the 'question' of enosis. That is why it is not straightforward colonial. But it has become international.

I think--out of respect for historical facts--that there are at least three distinguished statesmen, one of them living, two of them no longer with us, who have a high place in the galaxy of British Prime Ministers--Mr. Gladstone, to start with; Lloyd George afterwards; and Mr. Winston Churchill, who was Under-Secretary of State for Colonies in 1907--who, without the Greeks exerting any pressure, spoke about this island being united to Greece. Now, we are not advocates of this union; we are against it. Our position is that Cyprus belongs to the Cypriot people, and it is their independence as members of the civilized world that will contribute to the strength of the United Nations and will fulfil the purposes of the Charter.

I state these facts to say that union with Greece was part of British policy for a very long time until the nationalist movement developed in Cyprus in 1941. Then always, as elsewhere, come reasons for lack of unity. And I refrain, in order not to vitiate this debate by the circumstance, from drawing instances from my own country. So these great men, having said out of their own volition, not by compulsion, that this island ought to be part of Greece, for their own reasonsbecause in those days, I suppose, Greece was a--Well, I won't say anything about that. Anyway, that was the position.

Therefore this is why we regard enosis as having bedevilled this position and having postponed the day of Cypriot liberation, having

postponed the day of Cypriot nationalism, which is what is being fought against by everybody--and to fight nationalism is to try to reverse the process of history. But it was not a Greek creation alone; Greece--the Greece of Venizelos, pre-Venizelos Greece or post-Venizelos Greece--was only part of this. But that was a part of British policy. Now, therefore, when we look at that we ought to consider whether there was any time in Cypriot history any question of its being more than one entity. There was no time. There is no necessity for us to go far into the past, but from the time of the Phoenicians and the Assyrains to the time of Anthony and Cleopatra and afterwards, and to the time of the Crusaders and the Knights Templar and the Kings of Jerusalem, Cyprus has been one and entire.

Now let us come to more modern, more recent history, the history of the Ottoman Empire--which, incidentally, appears to seek

<Pg-330>

reincarnation. Turkey was suzerain over Cyprus for 300 years. Did Turkey at that time divide Cyprus in two in order to protect the Turkish minority against the Greek majority?

And then, though it was part of the Ottoman Empire, somewhere around the end of the nineteenth century the British were called in, not as an act of cession of Cyprus but in order to protect the integrity of Cyprus--and I am not going into any other details of against whom or what. The purpose of the calling of Britain into Cyprus by the Turkish Government--and I am sure that in spite of Britain's imperial ambitions, at all times she had a very strong isolationist tendency. They had enough problems and did not want to take on any more. In any case, they took on Cyprus. Why? In order to protect the integrity of Cyprus against possible invasion from--at that time I suppose it was Tsarist Russia.

Therefore it was Cyprus--not the Turks, not the Greeks, not the various other communities--that was handed over. It was this island with an external boundary, with an entity of its own, which was taken over.

From then on there was a period of twenty or thirty years, I believe, where Cyprus was governed by the executive acts of the Crown under Orders-in-Council, that is to say, there was no question of treating this as anything but a private estate. That is the position of territories under Orders-in-Council, as Malta was under the Knights Templar in days gone by.

Then came the period of Letters Patent when again under executive orders their position was given some legal status in the way of a charter--and I refer my colleagues of the United Kingdom to the Letters Patent or 1914, 1925, and even as late as 1931--where it is definitely laid down that Cyprus is a Crown colony. Long ago Canada proclaimed her independence from Britain in regard to the Crown--and I hope I am not interfering in domestic politics--and proclaimed the

theory of the Seven Crowns, and said that the Queen of England was the Queen of Canada. Until that time the Crown had been one and indivisible. This was a Crown colony. Its integrity—the word to which this Committee has so much objection—its integrity was constitutionally, politically, factually and every other way, one. Therefore the constitutional position of Cyprus in relation to the British Empire is that of a Crown colony, not two colonies.

Again, I have not the time to go into the various attempts at constitutional reform made in this territory. In each of those the attempt has been to set up some sort of representative institutions for the whole of the colony. The representative of the Crown for this was the Governor of Cyprus. There was no Governor for the Turks and no Governor for the Greeks separately; the Governor was Governor nation-wide. There was one common head representing the Crown of the United Kingdom in Cyprus.

So unless we go back to the Assyrians or the time of the Phoenicians or the early days of the Roman empire, or to the days of conquest in the Middle Ages, or even afterwards when Cyprus was handed over to Italy at some time, we always find there was no question of dividing it. We would be the first to say that there are fissiparous factors today, and we cannot just wish them away. But are we to judge this question merely from what has happened in the last four years or the last five years or ten years, and ignore the history of 3.000 years? At least if there are 3,000 years of the past we should project the problem at least 300 years forward. Actually it should be the other way round, but there it is. Therefore when we are looking at this problem we could not say that, whatever may be the reason, separatist claims have now come forward--and we speak with some feeling on this question of separatist claims, because any recognition by a Power, especially under liberal imperialism, when once it has handed over power it does not interfere except when its own interests are concerned. If you set up these separate legislatures in places, then they crystallize and make for separatism.

But that is not the main point I am now arguing. I say there is no period in the history of Cyprus when there have been two entities in the island. There have been no two Crowns, no two authorities. The trouble came not because there were changes in the body social of Cyprus. There is no part of Cyprus, from all one can study in available figures and literature, mostly supplied by the British Government which is but an exclusive Turkish colony or an exclusive Greek colony. These populations run into one another. Some 27,000 Turks live in the urban areas, but the bulk of them are in the rural areas of Cyprus where, out of a rural population of 65,000, 29,000 live in 108 villages with all-Turkish population; 12,000 live in 38 villages, slightly outnumbering the Greeks; 24,000 live in 150 villages where they constitute a small minority.

While we all regret violence, especially violence between peoples who are brothers to each other, it seems to me float if during past

years the antagonism between these two so-called communities had been so great, there would not be a half-million people in Cyprus; they would have been exterminated. And what is more, along with the rest of the world's population they have increased.

So that there is no place where we can draw a line and say, "This is Turks. This is Greeks." Now, if that is so in regard to the general area of Cyprus in its rural communities, the position becomes even more difficult when we take the urban areas where in the great cities and in the suburbs there are both these populations in appreciable numbers.

Certainly, we have to take into account small minorities. The Turks and the Greeks are not the only racial or ethnical groups in Cyprus; there are Armenians, there are Arabs and, from a religious point of view, there are various sects. Then we are told that there are geographical considerations, and someone has said that if an island is only a few miles from the coast of a large country and if, on that island, there are inhabitants belonging to the large country, then that country must have something to do with it. I hope that the representative of Cevlon was not here when that statement was made because I am sure that it would produce unnecessary feelings in his mind. I want to assure him that that is a theory which should not have any foundation; that is to say, just because a big country is near a small country, there is no reason why they cannot live peaceably. Just because there are only forty miles of water between Turkey and Cyprus, the Secretary of State for Colonies in the United Kingdom has some-times referred to Cyprus as an off-shore island. I have no desire to drag in other things, but I have heard in this Assembly, in another context, that an off-shore island is not necessarily part of the mainland. But of course that is suitable in another connexion. Therefore, the fact of proximity offers other problems.

I believe that Cyprus can be seen in what was formerly Syria--now the United Arab Republic. Although in 1954 there was no Turkish claim, in 1955 there was one. If, in 1958, there is no United Arab Republic claim and in 1955 there should be one, then we should have four parties. It would be like this disarmament business of ours--the four-Power problem. So we cannot, just because other people live in proximity and can look at it, thereby attribute any claims of a territorial character.

I want to say here that I wish to dissociate myself from all the extreme statements that have been made with regard to the nature of rule in Cyprus. All colonial rule must be, to a certain extent, repressive because, after all, it is the rule of a people by another people, the ruled people having no voice in the government, and all colonial governments have to rely mainly on sanctions. But I do not subscribe to the theory that there is neither economic, social, nor other progress. A great many things have happened in Cyprus, good and

bad, as in other places, but if the people of Cyprus were ruling themselves they would make mistakes--big mistakes--but those would be their own mistakes; and self-government initially is the facility to be able to make mistakes and to be able to correct them.

If we look at the economy of Cyprus we find, according to the information submitted by the United Kingdom--not of Turkish Cyprus, not of Greek Syprus, not of Armenian Cyprus, but Cyprus as a whole-that it has made progress, and we have to take into account the fact that, in modern days, these colonies are not merely sponges to be squeezed but nevertheless bear the character of a colonial economy. I say this merely to point out this fact, that this is a colonial question. Let us take these export-import figures. They have the characteristics of a colonial economy. The exports from Cyprus into the United Kingdom are about 29 per cent. The United Kingdom has the largest import into Cyprus, while Cyprus does not export the largest quantity of its goods to the United Kingdom. That is characteristic of colonial economy, and I make no point about it as adverse to the United Kingdom. I only try to reinforce the argument that this is a colonial question, a colonial question in which, whether it is so recognized or not, various parties, including the Greeks, have tried to put back the trend of nationalism.

The joining of Cyprus with Greece is not self-government or independence of Cyprus; and, while no one may be dogmatic about it, there is plenty of evidence from reports of recent times and old times that the Cypriot population have got characteristics of their own. Is it not interesting that even the protagonists of the Turks or the Greeks, when they talk here, say "the Turkish Cypriot", "the Greek Cypriot"? Therefore, they are still Cypriots--one might say "the Christian Cypriot" or "the Moslem Cypriot" in the same way.

An Englishman who visited Cyprus and wrote about it in 1879 refers to this fact:

Except in name, they are neither Turks nor Greeks--I hope that the Cypriots

<Pg-332>

will not be offended--

neither are they an amalgam of these two races. From Latakia to Cyrenia, from Paphos to Famagusta, you will seek in vain for any sample of these types. In neither face nor figure, in neither speech nor genius, have the Cypriots any resemblance to either Turk or Greek. Who, then, are these Cypriots? Do they stand apart, one of those underived stocks which spring from the soil and have no history elsewhere? The Cyriots are an amalgamated race, rustics who till the soil, citizens who occupy towns and ports, men of a sunburned skin but of an excellent physical type. Yet, they are neither Turk nor Greek except in dress or creed. Who and what are they? One fact is clear: they are of Aryan, not semitic stock.

That is of those times. Now we have more modern evidence by a Member of Parliament, who today is not a member of the government but who went to Cyprus as Governor, former Commander Fletcher, now Lord Winster. He said:

In my time, racial animosities simply did not exist: the two races lived and worked side by side in every department of the administration, in the forests, in the health service; the children of the two races played together; racial animosity was unknown. A new and such an ugly development has been the rapid and shocking deterioration in racial relations.

Then he goes on to deal with the plan, which I shall deal with later on.

Today, in the armed services, in industry--I do not say the industry of the owning side because this must be, to a large extent, imported capital--there are labour organizations and trade unions composed of Greeks and Turks. The largest of them is the Cypriot Federation of Labour, which has the largest membership, a mixed membership of Turks and Greeks almost in proportion to the population. Then there are exclusively Turkish unions which are very small. Therefore, in these labour organizations, in cooperative societies, which the British Government has promoted with some success in the area, the Cypriots, Greeks and everyone else remain as common citizens of this place.

This takes us to the position of Turkey, both juridically and politically, in regard to Cyprus. While we are not military allies of the Turks, we are part of Asia. The Turkish Government was represented at the Bandung Conference and supported colonial liberation. It is a country with which we have many ties, whose past history differs from ours, but which, I hope, may provide in the future opportunities of treading a common path in many directions.

The Turks were in Cyprus as Cyprus was in the possession of the Ottoman Empire, and, as I said, they handed it over to the British for looking after. When Turkey had Cyprus--and I say this without any disrespect to modern Turkey--it was not in a position to offer protection. But that is past history. But in 1914, after the declaration of the First World War, the United Kingdom rightly found that it could not administer Cyprus on behalf of an enemy Power.

Since Turkey had joined the Central Powers and Cyprus was still held in some sort of stewardship by the United Kingdom, a new situation arose. Then began the straightforward colonial era, when the United Kingdom, annexed Cyprus.

Under British rule, Cyprus prospered very much more than under Turkish rule. The deforested areas became more afforested. But certain political actions took place at that time. One was Turkey's abdication, under the Treaty of Lausanne, of all rights to Cyprus. The second was even more important. The United Kingdom said that if

the people of Turkish origin in Cyprus wanted to be Turks they must take Turkish nationality and leave Cyprus; that if they remained in Cyprus they would have United Kingdom nationality. So far as I know, at the present time all Cypriots--whether Greeks or Turks--have British passports; they have United Kingdom nationality: they have all the advantages of Commonwealth and Empire citizenship. There is, therefore, no question of Turkey's having left any vestige of sovereignty behind.

We as a Government accept the position that the United Kingdom is sovereign in Cyprus, in the sense that it has legal sovereignty. The United Kingdom has the power to give commands; it has the administrative responsibility for the Island. That is why, from 1954 onwards, we have been saying that this is a matter between the people and the Government: it is a colonial question.

But if the United Kingdom Government has legal sovereignty, the fact is that in all colonial countries the sovereignty really lies in the people. It is latent sovereignty, which becomes active when

the colonial Power is removed or partly recedes. It is the transfer of this sovereign power from the ruling country to the people, to whom it really belongs, which represents the establishment of freedom. This may take place in gradual stages; it may take place suddenly; it may take place by revolution or by peaceful negotiation.

We therefore recognize that the power to do good is in the hands of the United Kingdom Government. The responsibility of bringing the Cypriot people to the fulness of their nationhood through the enjoyment of statehood is also a British responsibility and a British function, in the sense that the United Nations Charter enjoins upon all the Members of the Organization to bring non-self-governing communities to self-government or independence, according to the local conditions. This sovereignty cannot be shared with anyone. It can be transferred, or it can become lower in the administrative Power as it becomes higher in the people.

The United Kingdom representative has told this Committee something which has a double significance. On the one hand, it shows the United Kingdom's anxiety to find a solution to this problem. It shows that the United Kingdom is flexible in this matter. But flexibility by itself may not always be the correct solution. It all depends on the direction and the purpose of the flexibility. The United Kingdom has said that it is willing to share sovereignty, that it is willing to enter into a partnership. But that sovereignty is to be shared, on the one hand, with the past rulers of Cyprus, the successors to the Ottoman Empire, and, on the other hand, with a country which, owing to racial ties, has held the position in the past--apparently this is not the Greek position today, from what has been said in this Committee --that this territory should be amalgamated with its own, that there should be an Anschluss of this territory with its own.

Now, it would seem that if there is any willingness to surrender or share this sovereignty, it should be surrendered to or shared with the people to whom it legitimately belongs. What is more, even if it is argued that the sovereignty would be shared not only with Turkey and Greece, but also with the Cypriot people, it is legitimate to ask whether bringing in these two sovereign nations, far more powerful than Cyprus is or will be, would not in itself make the independence of Cyprus still-born. That is to say, it is legitimate to ask this question: If, as a result of the present plan or any other plan, Cyprus were to become more independent, if its self-government were fully promoted and, afterwards, it became entitled to membership of the United Nations, would not other people, other countries, with greater military and economic and other powers, have been introduced into the government of Cyprus?

The United Kingdom representative has said that the two basic principles of British policy are: first, the elimination of violence, the restoration of a peaceful atmosphere; and, secondly, partnership.

On the first of those propositions, my delegation not only is in complete agreement, but will be ardent advocates. No settlement in Cyprus can be achieved unless there is a cessation of violence from all sides--irregular as well as regular violence. There are 37,000 British troops on Cyprus. It is not without significance that in this little Island of 400,000-odd people, there are--according to statistics submitted by the United Kingdom Government to the Committee on Non-Self Governing Territories--46,000 cases of crime, and the majority of these crimes are in regard to offences against law and order and not in regard to moral turpitude. In other words, because of the present political situation there are crimes involving 10 per cent of the population of Cyprus. That means that the situation is not peaceful, and we agree that everything should be done to bring about peaceful conditions.

From our own experience, we know this: Even when a struggle for national liberation is conducted on the basis of peace, if an act of violence takes place, either because of lack of discipline or because of an inability to stand up to undue provocation, it is not the party with the upper hand that suffers: it is the fellow who is struggling for freedom. From our own experience, we know that every time a railway coach was burned, or a policeman was hit, or a greater tragedy took place, it pushed back the force of our national movement for a certain period. For the greatest strength that a subdued people has is the strength to be able to say no to the conqueror, rather than to use the conqueror's own weapons.

I want the representatives of the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece to believe that the draft resolution which we and some other members of the Committee have submitted is put forward with a desire to see that negotiations emerge and that peaceful conditions are restored. We want conditions to prevail in which the governing authorities will do everything they can to halt the assertion of authority by force

alone. On the other hand, we want conditions to prevail in which the population and their leaders the national

<Pg-334>

movement that is struggling for liberty, will recognize that, while violence may be provoked and even be justified in some cases from an individual point of view, it does not as a national policy pay dividends or advance the cause of freedom.

Thus, we know both from our own experience and as a common-sense proposition, and from humanitarian considerations, that violence does not pay and does not always strike the persons whom it is intended to strike. It brings opprobrium on all parties concerned. Here we are one with the United Kingdom policy. We hope, and we have no doubt in view of the state of public opinion in the United Kingdom and the general policy of the United Kingdom Government, that an attempt will be made to slow down the progress of violence.

We now turn to the other aspect: partnership. I have already said that, from the statements made here, it appears that the United Kingdom Government is willing to have a partnership with Greece and Turkey. Before I examine that problem, I should like to say something of which I would ask the United Kingdom representative to take serious note. Speaking before this Committee, the United Kingdom representative said--and this affects us very seriously:

This idea of partnership is one of which the British people have good reason to be proud--

we do not take exception to that.

Partnership has proved its worth in the development of the Commonwealth as a great association of free and independent nations. It is an idea which accords well with that belief in co-operation and mutual respect which is the hallmark of a civilized and liberal diplomacy.

Now, if those sentences stood alone and were not brought into the Cyprus debate, where a colonial issue is involved and where two sovereign countries are being imported from outside, we would take no exception to them. But we are an independent member of the Commonwealth, having an equal position of sovereignty with the United Kingdom. We are a sister State; we are not a subordinate State. There is nothing in our relationship which involves a partnership with anyone outside. That is to say, our partnership in the Commonwealth does not impose upon us any partnership with anyone else, any military alliance, or anything of that character.

I submit that this parallel that is drawn is something that rather complicates us and makes difficulties with regard to our own public opinion. Partnership in the Commonwealth is a partnership of sister States who are enjoying independence, and, what is more, I should say

that this partnership arises from our free will. And here, while I have no desire to introduce extraneous matter, the matter ceases to be extraneous when it is a matter that is introduced by somebody else. In 1949, India, which has been a self-governing dominion under the Statute of Westminster and its developments afterwards, decided under her Constitution to be an independent republic, with the sovereignty derived from its people. But, for historic reasons, for sentimental reasons, and partly in the hope that the union of free territories, without any bonds from one to the other, would serve, to the small extent that it could, as an example of co-operation in the world, in common with the other eight partners, it decided to come to a new agreement. At that time there was no pressure on the Government of India. There was no initiative from the Government of the United Kingdom or any of the older Commonwealth countries, and we said, and it was communicated, that we were going to become a republic. At the same time India had declared and affirmed its desire to continue its full membership in the Commonwealth of Nations with its acceptance of the King as a symbol of that free association of these independent member nations and, as such, the head of the Commonwealth.

The last paragraph of this communique says:

Accordingly, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan and Ceylon hereby declare that they remain united as free and equal members of the Commonwealth of Nations freely co-operating in the pursuit of peace, liberty and progress.

(Text of the Communique, London, April 28, 1949)

That is what we are trying to do: freely co-operating in the pursuit of liberty and peace.

There is another point: Ireland, which, incidentally, is not a member of the Commonwealth, spoke about this. The representative of Ireland said:

The representative of the United Kingdom, on the other hand, speaks of the arrangements as an experiment in 'partnership'. He has spoken

$$<$$
Pg-335>

in eloquent and moving terms of the virtues of partnership, and we agree with all his general remarks on this theme. We agree with him particularly when he says:

Partnership has proved its worth in the development of the Commonwealth as a great association of free and independent nations.

That is perfectly true, and entirely to the credit of the United Kingdom and its partners in the Commonwealth. But it is not what is involved here. There is no question in this partnership of freedom or independence, let alone nationhood, for Cyprus.

I raise this point for two reasons: we do not want our people or the people in the world--as is common knowledge, very few people except the members of the Commonwealth understand what the Commonwealth is or what the relation is--and therefore we do not want any confusion or any doubts thrown upon the free character of this association. We regard it--I do not want to use stronger words--we regard it as entirely inappropriate to regard what you think is a sharing of imperial power between Greece and Turkey--a proposed sharing of imperial power between Greece and Turkey and the United Kingdom--as analogous to the Commonwealth of Nations. In fact, it is totally the opposite.

What would happen in this case? In this case what happens is that these two sovereign countries, who have remained, who have economic power, who have their own legislatures, their own sovereign authorities, their own constitution, would be brought into the Government or the colony in one way or another and, it is said, for international reasons.

The representative of the United Kingdom, speaking in 1957, said that it has become an international problem on account of the great demand for enosis. As the Committee well knows, my delegation has always stood four- square on the question of nationhood for Cyprus; and in spite of the fact that opposition members of the Greek Parliament or anywhere else will deny it, the fact still remains that the Cypriot people are Cypriots. They are a nation. They seek statehood. They seek the facility to develop themselves, to develop their own resources, to play their part in the community of the world, which is all being retarded by the violence, by the diversion of energies in the struggle. That is what happens, a also by the co-operation of their economic relation. We do not regard this partnership between three possible potential imperial Powers if they take part in it, and I hope neither Greece nor Turkey will take exception to it, because, if they are not in the partnership, they would not be partners, because the relation of Britain to Cyprus is that of the empire to subject peoples, and the Cypriot people's relation to Britain is that of people seeking liberation under a liberal imperial system.

Cyprus may not be a State. It is not a State except in the sense that India was a State before it obtained its independence and signed the Covenant of the League. If Britain had wanted Cyprus to sign the Covenant of the League, it would have been impossible. It is a territory of mixed population, it is true, but most of our territories are of mixed populations. I hope the representative of the United States would not say that his great country is not one of mixed populations. In fact, it is very doubtful whether any country is not without mixed population. I do not think there is much wrong in having a mixed population, but we should have mixed minds.

So that this idea of partnership, while it is a very nice word, in our opinion does not fit in with the situation. So what really is proposed is that the partnership should be one that helps to thwart the growth of nationalism, and not to prevent and come in the way of the flowering of national aspirations into full nationhood.

It was not our intention to discuss the British plan for Cyprus, because we do not believe that in the General Assembly it is possible to evolve a plan for self-government or a constitution, nor is it its function. We think it is the function of the Cypriot people in cooperation with the British Government or vice versa, but that cooperation is essential. Therefore, it was not our intention to discuss the British plan at all, but the representative of the United Kingdom has taken us into confidence, and the published papers on it have been brought into the debate, and, therefore, we have, to a certain extent, to deal with it.

In this plan, if it comes into operation, it could not come into operation without two things: first of all the Turks and the Greeks must elect people, must co-operate with the idea of an assembly, a legislature, and if they do not do that, then the plan drops like a ton of lead. Then, when you take the upper echelon of it, the Governor has got a council, which is Cypriot and Greek, and that is the supreme body, and in that he is to be assisted, in some form, not by the Turks and the Greeks in Cyprus, but the Turkish and

#### <Pg-336>

Greek Governments, which are foreign Governments at the present time. The Turkish and Greek Governments are to share the power of the Crown. There again, unless these two independent nations desire to be partners in this venture, that part also does not come in. Therefore, while the plan may be one of partnership, there is no evidence that this partnership was previously negotiated or that the parties had agreed to it. And therefore, if it is proposed that any plan or solution is to be made without the consent of the people who are to be partners, then, in so far as they are concerned, it could be a plan which is put to them as "take it or leave it" without seeking their consent. Sometimes people are put on committees without being asked to join them, and the very fact that people are elected to them does not mean that a partnership has been consented to.

That is not the only feature. According to the representative of the United Kingdom, in the course of events, this plan is to come gradually into being. That sounds very good. But if you introduce the two communal legislatures and afterwards expect the Governor to coordinate them, then you have already crystallized these divisions. In fact, as Lord Winster has said somewhere in a debate on this, this is not partnership but segregation, and he refers to it. He said, "In all that I did, I aimed at integration." This plan seems to aim at segregation, and there are references to other places, where segregation takes place, which are irrelevant to the purpose of our debate.

Referring to this, and this is the principal speech on behalf of the opposition in the House of Lords--Lord Winster said:

What is proposed may, I fear, bring Athens and Ankara into the affairs of Cyprus. I want a united Cyprus to run its own affairs.

My Lords, how far is this `communal autonomy' to run? To what lengths will it go? Are we to find two fire brigades in a town, one Turkish and one Greek, and the Greek fire brigade not going to a Turkish fire and the Turkish fire brigade staying at home when there is a Greek fire?

...All these things mean that the island will be administered not as a unit from within but by men who will be looking East and West across the sea for their instructions and guidance...

...From my own experience in Cyprus, I feel certain that the chances of the acceptance of this plan will be greatly enhanced if the future procedure is clearly laid down. I feel sure that those concerned will want to know what is to happen at the end of these seven years...

We have another statement from one who usually does not come in the way of something being tried out, and that is the veteran Prime Minister of England, Lord Attlee, who had a great deal to do with the emergence of India as an independent country. He said:

...I would say only this one word of warning: it is rather a dangerous precedent to have Governments from outside brought in because of their coreligionist or may be their nationalist influences. There are many places in the world which are inhabited by natives of different countries, and if they were all to ponder about it they might ask for a finger in the pie, and it would be extremely awkward.

Then there is a reference to India which I will not read out.

Therefore, this plan would really introduce a a kind of tripartite imperialism into Cyprus. And if either the Turks or the Greeks, or we as a United Nations, cared for the freedom of the Cypriot people, we would regard that as a retrograde step. Therefore, we suggest that this is not partnership. It has been argued--and we accept in all good faith the sincere professions of the British Government--that they do not aim at partition. It is not a question of what we aim at as policy, but when we build institutions which are bound to compartmentalize ambition which are bound to compartmentalize social objectives, then you get a divided nation. It is possible to divide any nation that is united by the creation of separate interests, with the best of motives in the world.

In Cypriot politics there always is an element of religious leadership because of the position of the national movement. Therefore, I think it is appropriate to quote here what the Archbishop of Canterbury has to say about this. Incidentally, he is also not entirely a religious person only, because he is a member of the House of Lords, a member of Parliament. He said:

...I believe that partition in Cyprus would be the sign of final and total failure to find a solution:it would be a counsel

<Pg-337>

of despair.

Then we have a former Colonial Under-Secretary, Lord Lloyd, who said:

...Partition is never a very satisfactory solution, politically or economically. It is particularly unsatisfactory in a small island like Cyprus, which is only just viable even as things stand at present. Partition of Cyprus would present much greater problems than the partition of Ireland. In Ireland, there was the homogeneous Protestant community in the north, whereas in Cyprus the Turkish community is spread out evenly over the whole island; so that in the event of partition, transfer of population would be inevitable.

We have some disastrous experiences of transfer of populations"transfer" is a euphemistic word--of the exodus of populations,
millions of them, as a result of the disastrous policies pursued in
the past which resulted in partition. I am free to say that partition
may become inevitable in certain circumstances, but it would be wise
statesmanship not to lay the foundations of the edifice which can
only be sustained on the basis of partition. Therefore, we make no
apologies for saying that my country and my Government, for such
influence as it may have, as part of its duties, would unequivocably
say that any plan which leads to the dissection of this island, any
plan that thwarts the national growth of these peoples, is a plan
that is retrograde and, what is more, it is not likely to lead to
peaceful settlements but to unpeaceful ones, for essentially this
requires the co-operation of the Greek and Turkish communities socalled.

If one can get the Greek and the Turkish communities to be agreed to remain in this way, equally they could agree to come together. If it is based upon agreement, why can that agreement not be used for other purposes?

Reference has been made to the Radcliffe Report and the representative of the United Kingdom has said that this report or this proposal was a good one, that it should have been accepted; the Greeks are sorry that they did not encourage acceptance of it. All these are facts or opinions which do not affect the factual findings of that distinguished jurist. One may not agree with the political conclusions of a judge or of a distinguished lawyer, but one can always place a great deal of reliance on his analysis of facts. This is what Radcliffe said in his report:

The people of Cyprus, I have reminded myself, are an adult people enjoying long cultural traditions and an established educational system, fully capable of furnishing qualified administrators,

lawyers, doctors, and men of business. It is a curiosity of their history that their political development has remained comparatively immature. It is owed, I think, to a people so placed that, when they are invited to assume political responsibility, the offer should be generous in the sense that, within the field offered, no qualification or restriction should be imposed that is not honestly required by the conditions of the problem.

My delegation has purposely refrained from entering the strategic arguments that have been brought into this question. It makes no difference to us whether the Greeks and the Turks and the British and everybody else agreed with regard to strategy or otherwise, but we would say that the primary consideration in this matter is what Mr. Noble has said: the welfare and the interest of the people of Cyprus. They are the principal factors in this matter, and in the British tradition particularly as it has developed within the last ten or fifteen years, and according to the Charter of the United Nations as set out in Article 73, these non-self-governing countries are maintained in trust--not legally but morally maintained in trust--and the great day of fulfilment is when they take it over.

According to the Radcliffe Report as regards Cyprus today:

...Not all education is special to its own community...There are mixed villages shared by Greek and Turk. Many Turks speak Greek as well as Turkish, and the English language is a potential instrument of common understanding.

Then again, he goes on to say:

I am conscious that I do not know enough about the problem. Their representatives have worked together in the past in the service of the Government, in municipal administration, in the activities of cooperative societies and of district improvement boards...

There is no pattern of territorial separation between the two communities and, apart from other objections, federation of communities which does not involve

$$<$$
Pg-338>

also federation of territories seems to me a very difficult constitutional form ...

It is analogous to a theocratic state which is out of date in a modern civilisation. He then goes on to say:

I do not think that it will be advantageous to embroil the Governor in the internal controversies of the self-governing side...

Therefore, whichever way we look at it, whether we look at viability, whether we look at harmony, whether we look at what the representative of Morocco spoke about a while ago, that Cyprus,

instead of being a point of conflict, a point of trouble between Turkey and Greece, would become a place whereú on account of their spiritual, racial and other interests, they would find a field of cooperation, this would go completely against that.

I would also like to pose a question. Let us assume for a moment, for argument's sake--and only for argument--that Cyprus was so partitioned, either obviously partitioned, by putting a political saw across, or where institutions were created with each communityú as was said by Lord Winster, looking across the seas for support, what would be the position? The conflicts, the measuring of strength between the two communities, would not depend either on the numerical position inside the island, or on the economic position, or the strength of fist, but would directly involve Greece and Turkey. That is to say, that this would be a kind of beachhead. The two parts, A and B, would, each one, be the beachhead for the country with which that community is said to be affiliated.

So instead of promoting peace in the Eastern Mediterranean, as it is called, instead of seeing what we have been constantly told are friends and allies working together, it would not be a bone of contention because it is already there. But it would harden the positions, it would lay the very sure foundations of a conflict where Greece and Turkey would stand ranged on the Island of Cyprus ostensibly protecting their protegees, but with all the other troubles, whether it be Macedonia or Thrace or anything else, added to it.

From the international point of view to which Mr. Noble has made repeated references, this solution, which is not what is sought by the United Kingdom Government, though they say they do not rule it out now, is not a solution which will

lead to peace and harmony or to the fulfilment of the purposes of the United Nations. We recognize that after many, years of colonial rule, after there has been violence and bloodshed, after there has been repression, after there has been all those factors that take place when there is a conflict of a ruling power and a nationalist movement, it may not be easy to build a bridge from one State to the other. That perhaps would take time or perhaps would take a degree of gradualism. But that does not mean that the objectives can be changed.

We in the United Nations, apart from our own national positions, must be governed by the principles of the Charter, and those principles accord to the peoples in Non-Self-Governing Territories the capacity to become self-governing.

My delegation has consistently declined to give its support to resolutions, whether it came from the Greeks or from any one else, to self: determination, so-called, in regard to Cyprus. It is not because we do not subscribe to the principles of the Charter, but there can only be self-determination when we are determined what the

"self" is. Self-determination must follow self government as the very justification of keeping anybody under colonial rule is that they are not fit to rule. If they are not fit to rule, how can they make decisions about ruling? Therefore, self-determination, as the Right Honourable Aneurin Bevan pointed out in the House of Commons the other day, must always follow self-government. Self must determine itself, and also we cannot use this idea of self-determination to thwart national ambitions and national fulfilment in various ways.

With regard to dealing with colonial questions, in the past the Empire, under conditions rather different and in modern times, has followed different policies. It is commonly said that on the Continent of Africa there is the Lugard tradition, that there is some other tradition between the West and the East. It is commonly said that if we are going to get anywhere we should rather follow the direction pointed out by Lord Durham rather than Lord North. In Cyprus in this particular matter, this kind of thing would have to be imposed upon the people because there is no evidence that the people have either consented or that they have been consulted. I do not know whether it has been stated in these debates or not but I did remember it from somewhere---it must have been in the debates, I suppose--that flexibility would call for a conference between the Greeks and the Turks and the British as being so-called "concerned"

### <Pg-339>

Powers--it is easy to concern oneself in other people's affairs--plus two other NATO countries which are not concerned. Then it goes on to say that the representatives of the Cypriot parties may also attend. They sit on the doorstep, The people who are most concerned sit on the doorstep attending, while the other people participate.

In all this, it is well to remind ourselves of the only resolution that stands valid today of the United Nations, resolution 1013 of the eleventh General Assembly. This resolution states in its operative part:

"Expresses the earnest desire that a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found in accord with ...... the Charter of the United Nations". Can it be said that in two years there has been a more peaceful approach to this problem? Certainly there has been no democratic approach to this problem.

My delegation is not competent to say what is a just solution because that must be proved by events. There is the approach whereby institutions or plans are proceeding from one place without the element of consent. Consent is of the essence of the democratic process, and there has been no evidence of consent.

With regard to a just solution, it is not enough if it is just, but it must appear to be just. Here I think I referred to the two ways of doing things. One was the imposition of a duty on tea which led to certain: consequences, and there was another situation in another

part of North America--where a similar problem to that of Cyrpus existed. There were two parts of North America, the French and the British. Here is what Lord Durham says about this:

Unfortunately the distinct national character of the French inhabitants of Canada, and their ancient hostility to the people of New England, presented the easiest and most obvious line of demarcation. To isolate the inhabitants of the British from those of the revolted Colonies, became the policy of the Government; and the nationality of the French Canadians was therefore cultivated, as a means of perpetual and entire separation from their neighbours. (British Colonial Policy. Keith, Lord Durham's Report, page 116)

I did not say this, Lord l) Durham said it years ago. Lord Durham's report continues:

It seems also to have been considered the policy of the British Government to govern its Colonies by means of division, and to break them down as much as possible into petty isolated communities, incapable of combination, and possessing no sufficient strength for individual resistance to the Empire. Indications of such designs are to be found in many of the acts of the British Government with respect to its North American Colonies. In 1775 instructions were sent from England. (Ibid.)

to the Government of the day in regard to the land policy in North America, pitting one against the other. I do not say that this is now the pattern of the policy because that policy has failed everywhere, and where that policy has had to be accepted and enforced, it has left in its train far more problems than it sought to solve. Therefore, we hope that our colleagues of the Commonwealth, the Empire, the United Kingdom, will seek in Cyprus that partnership which will enable it to become a sister State in the family of nations, in our own family of nations and in the larger family of the United Nations.

We do not say that there are no difficulties. We do not say that more difficulties have not been created in the last two years or that they have not come into being. But it is always a dangerous precedent in these matters to sow the wind because the whirlwind is the result. If separatist tendencies are either glorified or welcomed, then those separatist tendencies will become themselves the obstacles to progress.

What I have said may perhaps give the impression that one only looks at one side of the picture. There has been progress in the sense that the overwhelming opinion in the United Kingdom is in favour of a peaceful and democratic settlement in Cyprus which will enable it to take its place in the comity of nations. There is no doubt that whatever may be the defects of the plan itself, the plan is an attempt, with which we do not agree perhaps, to find a solution which involves sacrifice of authority by the Kingdom Government.

The very fact that the United Kingdom is having it discussed here is also a change of attitude in the sense of either seeking the cooperation of the United Nations or not wanting to conceal any facts in this matter. All these are items of progress. I believe that the statement made by British authorities that they would have conversations with various leaders

#### <Pg-340>

of the Cypriot movement is also a step forward. But it is not a step forward to have five independent nations participating in a conference at which the main people concerned may not attend. The decision must come about by co-operation and by peaceful negotiation with the Cypriot people, who are the main parties and to whom power must be handed over.

The representative of the United Kingdom said in 1957 that the main difficulty in this matter was enosis; that is to say, the fear that freedom would mean the loss of liberty to the island in another way. In the statement of Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, the representative of Greece, he said:

Greece has never fostered expansionist designs on Cyprus. It does not set its ambitions on the level of territorial expansion, which, in our time, is an outmoded political concept of domination. What Greece has always desired has been the liberation of the Cypriot--I do not subscribe to all these words--"from the chains of an assertive colonialism which they have for so long been struggling to break."

The significance of this passage is that whatever may have been the position in the past, today both the Cypriot national leaders as well as the Greeks look forward to the development of self-government and independence, of statehood and nationhood. I am not prepared to say that this was the policy in the past. But we have been told that it was the policy of enosis that stood in the way. We welcome the development of this national consciousness in Cyprus. I feel sure that as a result of our deliberations here, if the United Nations were to give some sense of faith and some sense of feeling of a desire to go forward, that peaceful negotiations will lead somewhere, to the flowering of the fullness of nationhood at the appropriate time in Cyprus, this would be the strongest factor in attenuating the process of violence. Then it would be possible for us to appeal to the Cypriot people and the world would look to the Cypriot people to take the gun out of politics. The world would equally look to the United Kingdom to follow a policy of pacification, whereby violence would not ensue. The path of progress, therefore, would lie in seeking, in the terms of the United Nations Charter, the promotion of self-government without in any way jeopardising the integrity of Cyprus.

For 3,000 years this island has remained one and entire. There has been no Turkish Cyprus, there has been no Greek Cyprus, there has been no Assyrian Cyprus. Whether the Greeks accept it or not, whether

the Turks accept it or not, it has a distinct personality. And some of us are not unfamiliar with Cypriots or with their life or their speech or their looks. Therefore, if nationality is not something that springs from the beginning of time, it is a social process and that process can be either obstructed or forwarded.

The path of peace, the objectives of the Charter, and, what is more, the solution of this problem, either now or in the far future, depend upon the acceptance of these ideas and seeking for ways of peaceful settlement.

My delegation reiterates the position that the restoration of peaceful conditions and a peaceful approach, even by those who may be under provocation on either side, even by those who labour under a sense of injustice or a feeling that their best plans are not welcomed, they all have to make their contribution in order to reestablish these peaceful conditions.

It is in this sense that we have made these observations.

My delegation reserves its position with regard to further interventions, if there should be any reason for doing so. There is no need to prolong this debate, since so many speakers have taken part in it. When the general debate is over and when all the draft resolutions have been introduced, our delegation reserves the right to explain its attitude on each of them. In this way we hope that the United Kingdom will accept these words, and that the Turkish and Greek delegations will accept what we have said, as intended to be in the interests of the promotion of the principles of the Charter. In this we have no monopoly. It is not as though my Government or my delegation arrogates to itself the prescribing of a policy. We are interpreting what we understand to be the purpose of the Charter. We speak with some understanding of the process of nationalism. And what is more, irrespective of whatever may be its source, it is one of those things which it is impossible to suppress. So long as there are people in Cyprus, whatever may be the combination of forces at any one time or another making any kind of unsatisfactory arrangement except one which is acquiesced in, it would be a great mistake to talk about these great forces and to give the impression, whether it comes from the Greeks or the Turks or the British, that every policy is something with which to sidestep

#### <Pg-341>

them and that we should take advantage of the present situation. The Cypriots, as stated by the Greek delegation here and as we have heard from various other statements, are now prepared to accept the position that their future lies along the fullness of their own development, where they will be able to take their place as equal partners in this great comity of nations some day, and I hope a near day.

On December 3, Shri Menon said:

Mr. Chairman, when you called on my delegation a short time ago to precede the representative of Peru in speaking, I submitted to you that we should like to have the benefit of his profound experience and wisdom, and I am happy that we made that request, because we have had a speech which springs from his experience of the Assembly and from his knowledge of law and the workings of States and the difficulties that have arisen in regard to the settlement of problems.

This morning the representative of the United Kingdom expressed his feeling that those who were sponsoring this draft resolution-particularly referring to my delegation--were perhaps approaching this from a partisan point of view. I make no defence but I want to assure him that our approach in this matter is not partisan. Our approach in this matter was not regarded by the United Kingdom as partisan in 1954, in 1955, in 1956 and in 1957. Basically we have not altered our approach, which is an approach that is not only consistent but mandatory under the provisions of the Charter, an approach that is imposed upon us by our fraternal relations with the United Kingdom. We have, therefore, tried to move away from logic in order not to create embarrassment. Therefore it is with some concern and regret that I say that our approach is regarded as partisan. It is partisan only in the sense that the Cypriot people are the people mainly concerned.

Equally--and I may be saying something with which some delegations that are in sympathy with our draft resolution do not agree--we think that factually, legally and for all practical purposes the other party concerned is the United Kingdom because it is in possession, it is the holder of power, it has the immediate responsibility for the welfare of the island and for its security. For all those reasons, the two main parties concerned are the people of Cyprus and the present holder of sovereign power. This does not preclude in any way-whether by advice, by interference, by consultation, by force of example--the participation of any Member State or any individual that is agreeable to the United Kingdom and to all other parties concerned, provided the co-operation of the people of Cyprus can be obtained--because it is not possible to impose institutions of self-government.

The representative of Turkey said the other day that whenever the delegation of India was speaking it was thinking in terms of its own country. If that is an offence, it is a pardonable offence. If you cannot make use of experience, what is the use of experience? I believe there is much to be drawn from this. Attempt after attempt has been made in many parts of the British Empire from time to time when those in possession, particularly local satraps with immediate experience but perhaps too close a view, have recommended to the home Government and that Government has concurred in prescribing solutions which appeared perfect, and perhaps they were even better in some cases than what was demanded by the people. Therefore, we must go back to the old liberal maxim: "Good government is no substitute for

self-government." Even though any solution that is prescribed may appear to us logical and may appear to us fitting in the circumstances, neither quietude nor peaceful conditions will come unless the co-operation of the people of Cyprus is forth-coming, for without this co-operation nothing but a forced government can remain.

There is no doubt that there will always be dissident groups-majorities or minorities--but ultimately reason and the practical content of any proposals will prevail and bring them into cooperation. But that co-operation is the essence of it, and this draft resolution is very largely based upon that idea.

Though my friend Commander Noble has disqualified my delegation--we have been disqualified before--I still hope that we have a place in their minds and we have our uses. I still submit to him, with regard to what he has chosen to call a compromise draft resolution, that neither my delegation nor the co-sponsors have ever arrogated to ourselves the role of mediator. We have looked at the arguments. We have looked at this problem. We have appreciated the difficulties. We have assessed the fact that a mere logical or legalistic approach would not be applicable in the present circumstances. We also had the benefit of the draft resolutions submitted by the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey and later by Colombia and Iran and, at a further stage, after we submitted the draft resolution, by

### <Pg-342>

Belgium. We have drawn much from these draft resolutions and also from the speeches. My delegation itself did not intervene in the debate until a very much later stage.

Now, the time has come for us, in justice to ourselves, to the cosponsors and to the Assembly, to submit this draft resolution formally, and also to explain it as best we can. The last time that my delegation submitted a resolution was in February of last year, that is really a 1956 resolution which was born late in 1957. That resolution was carried without opposition by something like 76 votes with 2 abstentions.

If my colleague from the United Kingdom will recall the occasion, at that time also we came, in the preliminary stages, under some fire. There were difficulties about these words "peaceful", "democratic" and "just solutions". There were difficulties in regard to the free expression of opinion from another quarter. But ultimately a solution was produced which, if we care to expand its continuity, display our wares fully, includes everything that was wanted.

Now what is the position? That was a year and a half ago. We have neither a peaceful situation nor can it be contended whatever may be the merits of the present approach, that it is a democratic approach. It is not democratic in the sense that there is not the co-operation of the majority of the people or their representatives on this island. The majority may be wrong. The majority may be unwise. In

democracies there are stages when majorities are unwise. But that is one of the incidents of democratic government and of democratic procedures. So, I am sure the Committee will agree with me. But whatever the merits of any proposals, of any approach that is made, it does not conform or respond fully, whatever attempt may be made, whatever the earnestness of the British Government in this matter or of the other two Governments--and I decline to call them parties concerned, we are equally parties concerned--eighty-one of us. But the main party is the people of Cyprus.

It does not fill this requirement of a democratic solution. This is not to analyse constitutions—the Radcliffe Constitution, or the present plan or anything of that kind. Any settlement involves an element of consent. Without consent there cannot be self-government. Therefore, it is a contradiction in terms. How can you give or enable people to achieve self-government, that is, to look after their own affairs and at the same time say you cannot have any share in shaping it, because one or the other alone can be true?

So that the resolution in 1957 which was passed practically unanimously by this Committee, which encountered a certain amount of difficulty in reaching its final stage, which, at that time, we hoped would herald a new era in Cyprus, has not justified our hopes at the time. The only reason it did not was that the co-operation of the people was not forthcoming. You cannot compel co-operation. Co-operation has to be elicited or drawn from the people who are to co-operate, especially when they are the masses of the people in any country.

The representative of Peru has said that the preambular paragraph recalling resolution 1013, is not adequate in so far as it does not reaffirm it. Well, if there is something we wanted to forget, we would not want to recall it. Therefore, to all intents and purposes, reaffirming that resolution, my delegation does not, and I feel sure our co-sponsors do not attach any sanctity to any particular word in this draft. If any alteration will suit anybody, without altering its purposes fundamentally, I feel sure that some solution can be found. So there is no question of departure from the basic ideas of democratic, peaceful and just solution.

Again, I should like to return to a general approach to this draft resolution. Yesterday, I pointed out that the approach of my delegation to the debates on subjects of this kind was that in a general debate, it puts forward, more or less, the exclusive views of its Government--its instructions. But when it comes to the resolution stage, especially the result of discussion and compromise, it has to present that problem. Now, there do not appear in this draft resolution certain words, certain ideas, certain ways of expression which create difficulties or about which there are inhibitions on various Governments who had been immediately concerned in this matter. That is why, and I say quite frankly, the word "independence" does not occur in this draft resolution. It is not a departure from the conception of the Charter. We all know that in the conditions of

Cyprus it is not possible to jump from the present position to independence in one step.

In our country we had to go through the intermediate period. I am not referring to the long past. I am not referring to the day when Lord Morley told the Indian people that "you will not be fit for parliamentary institutions for 500 years." But I am referring to the period of 1946 when we, not quite enthusiastically, but with a practical sense, accepted a situation where it

### <Pg-343>

was necessary for us to move through dominion-hood into independence. Therefore, this element of gradualism, the inevitability of gradualism has been accepted in this, and we have therefore given the go by to the expression "independence" though by no means abandoning our allegiance to the Charter. The Charter itself says self-government or independence. Of course, it means one and the same thing, provided there is a democratic purpose in it.

We still think that the United Kingdom who is the main party concerned, from our point of view, since the Cypriots are not here, will think better of this draft resolution overnight because the purpose that is put forward and I want to say in all sincerity to Commander Noble, if I may say to you--it is not in order to impose, as he suggested, the view of the Government of India as to what is a particular solution; it is in order to put before you the kind of method and approach that may be used in order to bring about a near solution to this problem.

We believe that if any draft solution gets through this Assembly which carries with it as the representative of Peru said the moral authority of the Assembly, and not just merely railroaded through, that would be the greatest contribution to the cessation of violence in Cyprus. It would put heart into the Cypriot people who are not directly engaged in violence. It would be a check on those who out of despair or otherwise regard violence as the only remedy. It would inspire the admiration to think that a new chapter has opened and therefore new methods are to be tried.

Therefore, in the view of our delegation, and we submit in all humility, the moral authority of this draft resolution reaffirms the principles of the Charter, enabling the Cypriot people to think that self-government is the goal of their country, and that there will be a steady march towards it that would be the best prescription for the establishment of peaceful conditions. And if our voice could go further, whatever happens in this Assembly, we hope that in the next twelve months before we meet, the leaders of the Cypriot people will, in spite of all provocations, exercise the power of non-violent action in regard to their rulers, because a subject people has no more powerful aid than their determination not to be provoked.

It is our experience that whenever there has been an isolated

incident of violence we thereby put back our progress towards freedom. The great architect of our liberty, Mahatma Gandhi, oft-times when there was sporadic violence, not any national violence, at the height of the movement of resistance, suddenly called it off, because, he said, it may appear that I am trying to stop something that is going forward and younger people criticized him. But he said that one act of violence hands over to those--we will not call him the enemy--of our friends on the opposite side an instrument which can be put down. I am not quoting his words. I am paraphrasing his words as I understand him--could put back the current of progress. This draft resolution is not drafted in that way. The representative of Peru in referring to this paragraph on violence, said there should be no condemnation.

I fully accept that, but I believe it is unwarranted and not necessary in this case because all that has been said in this draft resolution is:

"Urges all concerned, particularly the Government and the people of Cyprus, to use their best endeavours to establish conditions of the cessation of violence in Cyprus, helpful to peaceful negotiations".

This draft resolution does not seek to place the responsibility on one or the other, but does say that violence is not the way; and, what is more, if there was violence, regular or irregular as I said the one provoking the other, whichever charged first, that is not a condition in which a democratic government can be established.

There are phrases here to which objection has been taken since the beginning of the debate. I said a while ago that we should like to profit by the wisdom of the representative of Peru. A few days ago, the representative of the United Kingdom said that the words "the united personality of Cyprus" had been mentioned by him in a different context. Although the explanation that he gave to us does not in any way take away from the usefulness of this idea of what I understand is the goal of the British Government, we do not want this to be a bone of contention. So my delegation feels sure that our sponsors will agree to the deletion of all these paragraphs which contain inferences about the statements of other governments. In order that no controversial matter is introduced into the draft resolution, we can take away the two statements of the United Kingdom--the one which refers to "the united personality" and the other which refers to "the partition".

There are so many contradictory statements

<Pg-344>

with regard to the partition, and it was pointed out yesterday, that perhaps we had overstepped the intention of the author of the statement in the Assembly. My delegation does not accept that view, but for the sake of agreement—and I feel sure our co-sponsors will agree with us—we are prepared to take out all these three paragraphs

which relate to our inferences about the expression of other Governments.

The next paragraph says that we believe that the Cypriot people are entitled to self-government in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. I am sure that is a sentiment which will be welcomed on all sides of the Assembly. If the Charter provisions are to be thrown on one side, what remains? There has been no question. After all, even this year the United Kingdom has submitted information to the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories with regard to Cyprus, and under the Articles of the Charter a Non-Self-Governing Territory has the right to expect that it will become self-governing. That is the object of these people who are in charge of what are called dependent peoplesú

Therefore there is nothing original in this draft resolution. My delegation does not, and I feel sure my co-sponsors do not, claim originality for it.

I have already referred to this question of violence.

We now come to the debated part for the "effective provisions for the protection of all legitimate minority interests that are essential for a peaceful, equitable and stable settlementú" I invite the Committee to consider this along with the idea contained in the paragraph about partition that was deleted. So far it has not been argued that there are two nations in Cyprus. The argument is that there are communities. If there are communities, there are majorities and minorities; they are unequally divided. So far as we know, there are several communities, the largest among them being the Greeks and the Turks. Perhaps there are several communities among them. But if you give a community organized institutions, that appertains to a nation. No one has suggested that Cyprus is a multi-national place. One has only said that it is a multi-communal place. If a community, by institutional arrangements, is raised to a nation, then what nation arises? There are two communities, Greek and Turkish. If they remain communities, then of course they are not entitled to be regarded as anything more than communities and their communal interests are to be protected by national law and by inter-community arrangements. But if you glorify them by putting them into the position of a nation, then there will be a Turkish nation and a Greek nation within Cyprus. Is it at all possible, once you create a Turkish and a Greek nation on one island, that they will remain isolated from what they call their mother country? Therefore, it really becomes partition. You cannot have a Turkish nation on Cyprus isolated from the mainland of Turkey any more than you can have a Greek nation on the Island of Cyprus isolated from Greece or an Arab nation isolated from the Arab homelands and so many others. Therefore, we say that all that is warranted by facts, that all that will bring about peaceful, equitable and stable settlements is the protection of these interests. By no manipulation can you convert a minority into a majority or can you reduce majorities to minorities. I think a liberal said that even majorities have rights and that they

have to be protected as well.

We are not prescribing any arrangements. We simply say that we consider that there should be effective provisions. What those effective provisions are matter for the Cypriot people, the British Government and anyone else who may be interested in those minorities.

We have very carefully avoided going into institutional arrangements. Here I would like to say so far as my delegation is concerned, that this opposition to partition should not be regarded as a plea for a unitary government. There are those in the Assembly who think we should have said, "a unitary government which alone would represent the unity of Cyprus." So far as my Government is concerned, we do not think that the unity and the integrity and the oneness of Cyprus necessarily demand a unitary form of government. There are countries which are nations and proud of their nationhood--Australia for one thing and the United States of America--which are nations but without unitary governments. Therefore it is possible in the approach that is suggested in this draft resolution to think of all forms of solutions whereby such legitimate interests as are required for these communities can be safeguarded, and their position in the administrative services, in the legislature, in regard to their educational, social, religious and other institutions can be provided for, if territorial arrangements permit. We have examples of countries like Switzerland where there are not only three or four communities but three or four linguistic or national groups all in one State under a form of administration.

### <Pg-345>

Various solutions of this kind are possible; none of this is ruled out. We also have not ruled out the co-operation of the Greek and Turkish Governments in bringing about a solution. But we do not regard them as entitled to share the sovereignty or the sovereign right of cyprus. A representative of Parliament said:

"If the Macmillan plan ever is to be operative and if the representatives of the Turkish and Greek Governments have to advise the Governor, I would not like," said this member of Parliament in a distinguished position, "to regard them as minorities or representatives of plenipotentiaries, but rather as midwives to this constitution to help to bring into being the freedom of Cyprus."

So in that sense the natural, racial, spiritual and moral interests of the Greek and the Turkish people, not their Governments alone, in those who are of Greek or Turkish origin will express itself.

We have not at any time contemplated in this draft resolution the ruling out of any form of negotiation. That is why in paragraph 3 we have taken account of the fact that the United Kingdom is in possession. It has the legal sovereignty and the actual political power to call conferences or otherwise. In this paragraph we have said:

"Requests the United Kingdom Government to continue negotiations with a view to promoting self-government ........" There is nothing in this to preclude the participation in appropriate ways of other parties who may contribute to the solution. What it does preclude is the participation of other parties to the total displacement or to the delegation to a subordinate position of the people of Cyprus.

If my friend Commander Noble would entertain these explanations and look at the draft resolution in that way, he would not regard it as partisan.

It is possible in these circumstances in the negotiations with the people of Cyprus--who, I freely admit, may not be easy to negotiate with at the beginning, having regard to the conditions that prevail-to make use of the good offices of those who know them better. But one thing all parties concerned know that the purpose of these negotiations is not to share out Cyprus among others, but to restore to the Cypriot people as a whole all the guarantees and all the institutional arrangements that are necessary--and I freely confess that no institutional arrangement can be substituted for fraternity and goodwill; those are developed by the maintenance of proper institutions.

Paragraph 4 calls upon all Member States "to co-operate to this end, undertaking to respect the integrity of Cyprus as well as its self-government when it is fully attained." This is a paragraph which, in our opinion, enjoins upon other parties not to cast ambitious eyes upon that island. It is equally a paragraph that is aimed at anyone who has annexationist ambitions in regard to the island, and to confirm the view that non-interference in their affairs with respect to their independence is enjoined by the United Nations.

We have given, if I may say so, great respect-- my delegation to all the sponsors, who come from different parts of the world, whose social institutions, whose alignments in international politics, whose recent backgrounds are all different. We have come together, and in that coming-together there has been a great deal of deletion of fractions in order to find what was the minimum that could be placed before this Assembly. Again looking at this draft resolution, we find these three "Welcoming" paragraphs. It may be argued that they fasten upon other Governments our views because we are saying they said so. And they have said what? They have said "united personality", "partition", "expansionism", and all that. We wanted them, but all these had to go. So we have taken away what are our interpretations of what other people said.

Now I hope the Committee will think--I very much hope that the Committee will think--that it never occurred, on our part, on the part of my delegation and on the part of our co-sponsors, but to provide something with which the United Kingdom can at least live, even if it cannot be enthusiastic about it. If I may say so with respect--and I hope I will not be misunderstood-- there has been no

occasion in the development of relations of former dependencies when proposals have been heartily welcomed by either side. Equally, here have been occasions many times in the histotry of my own country where proposals made by the Imperial Government which appeared logical and which, perhaps, in the context of history it would have been wiser to accept, have been rejected because they did not have the support of the people.

Therefore the deletion of these three paragraphs is another instance on our part of seekina method whereby we can go back to the position in February 1957, with the consequences

<Pg-346>

to which I shall refer again.

There is just one other matter I want to refer to. My delegation has been submitting to this Assembly that self-government by peaceful means, or independence, is the aim not only of the Charter but of various countries which hold responsible positions in the world. There have been only very brief submissions of their views by the United States of America in this Committee. I want, however, to refer to the Declaration made in 1954 popularly known as the Potomac Declaration, when President Eisenhower and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Winston Churchill, made a declaration analogous to the Atlantic Charter. The relevant part is clause 3 of this Declaration, where the President and the Prime Minister said this:

"We uphold the principle of self- government and will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to secure the independence of all countries whose people desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence. We welcome the process of development, where still needed, that leads to a set goal. As regards formerly sovereign states now in bondage, we will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty which would confirm or prolong their unwilling subordination."

Now that, to a certain extent, fits into this case.

"In the case of nations now divided against their will we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections so provided by the United Nations to ensure: that they are conducted fairly."

So if it is the outstanding aim of these two great countries which are the major partners in this alliance to bring divided countries together, how can they be parties to a counsel that will create division?

Now, the question may arise in the statement of all these general principles, does it apply to a particular case? This statement was made on 29 June 1954 by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. On 20July in the British House of Commons the question was asked of the Secretary of State for the Colonies—not the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, but

the former one, who then was Sir Oliver Lyttelton, now called Lord Chandos--the question was asked whether he would apply to Cyprus clause 3 of the Declaration that the Prime Minister had signed with President Eisenhower upholding the principle of self-government; and Sir Oliver Lyttelton then answered, "clause 3 of the Potomac Declaration reflects what has been for many years the policy of Her Majesty's Government of all parties in regard to the political advance of all colonial territories including Cyprus." There can be no serious misunderstanding of this statement because there is no generalization in it; it states "the Potomac Declaration", which was signed by the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States, whereby they bind their two countries to respect what I read out, and that as long as the United Kingdom should hold power in Cyprus. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was the responsible Minister, tells Parliament, "This has been our policy all along and continues to be so, and what is more, it includes Cyprus."

That is the position, and I hope that what I have read out will have some impact upon the mind of the leader of the United States delegation.

Then we are told that there should be no finality. I do not think we need to bother about finality in the United Nations. There never is any finality about anything here, as witness the seventy-two items that consistently appear on the agenda year after year. And this resolution certainly does not refer to finality, because it does not even say "self-government"; it says "promote self-government", and it is strictly in concurrence with the British approach to the problem of freedom, governing from precedent to precedent, and it will take its own course.

I am sure that, after giving the kind of generous consideration that the United Kingdom delegation will certainly give to what we have said --even if they do not say so in public--it will be accepted in their private minds that the genuine way out of the difficulty is not to provide a solution in the Assembly, but that our main concern is that at the end of the session the counsels of despair could become the prevailing factor in the island of Cyprus. I am sure that all of us who are members of this Committee will have in our minds the course of events in this unhappy island where numbers of lives have been lost, often accompanied by instances of cruelty, lives belonging to the diverse communities in Cyprus as well as to persons of United Kingdom nationality. There are gruesome cases on either side, and sometimes deaths. But whatever it is, I am sure that we would not want to be the ones to seek the continuance of this situation, and we

#### <Pg-347>

would also not deny to these people the prospect, in due course of time and after due legal process and the evolution of political institutions, to satisfy the ambition of every self-governing people, that is, to come here as a part of this great Assembly and, if they so will, to continue their association with their present rulers or to establish such terms--of trade or culture or whatever may be sought--for annexation with any other country. This thought of annexation is provided for, so far as this resolution is concerned, in the last paragraph where it calls upon all Member States to respect the self-government of the island. In those conditions, if it was accepted and if it became the law in relation to the parties concerned--which is only if they accepted it--then any violation of that would be tantamount to violation of an international treaty. That is to say, after Cyprus had attained full self-government if its self-government were not respected after this agreement then the party not respecting it would be guilty of violation of an international agreement.

I therefore submit this draft resolution, saying once again that we make these deletions, and I am sure that, subject to our co-sponsors, we would have no objection to altering a word here or there, provided the basic ideas of self-government, conformity with the principles of the Charter, the integrity of this island with respect to minority rights, the ruling out of annexation on both sides and the facility that will be provided for the peoples to progress from institution to institution of self-government with consent, and the abandoning of violence, can be retained.

Having said all this, I do hope that the United Kingdom Government would think it appropriate--I do not use any other word--that the approach made by us is not a partisan one. Believing as we do that a policy cannot be imposed on subjected peoples, how could we logically be regarded as guilty of trying to impose it upon powerful empires? All we can do is to plead, all we can do as a member state of a large fraternity is once again to show by force of example--as has been recently seen in Ghana, and next year will be seen in other parts of Africa, and earlier in the case of our own country--that in the freedom of these people lies greater strength and, what is more, the freedom and the maintenance of the integrity of Cyprus not only would be a contribution to this particular problem, but would be an addition to the area of freedom as a whole. And we are not alone in this fraternity in thinking so.

I do not want to embarrass anyone, but the representative of New Zealand about whose opinions in regard to our draft resolution I have no direct knowledge--told this Committee:

"..... Cyprus is an island and, therefore, has defined frontiers. As an independent State, it would--and we think this essential--be maintained as a single geographic and political unit. It is inhibited by 500,000 people, and there are already independent Members of the United Nations with less .... ".

The representative of New Zealand continued:

"....We would, for our part, deplore any arrangements in Cyprus which would create or perpetuate divisions between the people of Cyprus,

who must find their future in unity and, I would hope, friendship ...."

Later in his statement the representative of New Zealand said:

".... But the first essential--whatever the ultimate solution--"and we are not proposing an ultimate solution; we have not said that it should be a republic that it should be a unitary government, or that it should have the status of independence or of self-government. What we have said is that there should be negotiations meanwhile promoting the institution of self-government, negotiations that are democratic, in which the main party concerned, the party on whom our actions make impact, the masses of the people, men, women and children of Cyprus, would participate by means of representatives. And we have not ruled out any kind of co-operation from any one else; nor have we said that it should take place in the United Nations or outside the United Nations. All this initiative is left to the United Kingdom Government. The New Zealand representative goes on:

.... But the first essential--whatever the ultimate solution--is that progress should be made as rapidly as possible towards self-government in Cyprus."

Compared with this draft resolution, I am afraid that the New Zealand Government's position is very radical. We have not said anything about "as rapidly as possible." We

<Pg-348>

have said "promote that".

The representative of New Zealand added: "We feel that This is a development which should find favour within this Assembly ...."

Therefore, if I am not misquoting or quoting out of context, we have there valuable support among our own fraternity. Thus as a delegation, not on behalf of the co-sponsors in this particular case, we make a special appeal to the United Kingdom Government that, having regard to what has been said here, having regard to what transpires between our Governments in other places, and having regard to the fact that this draft resolution and the approach which we have made has not been just cooked up here, but is a result of deliberation over months, and that the position which we have taken is not one which is intended to create embarrassment, the main concern in our minds is the ruling out of violence in that island, which itself will produce the conditions of peace and of settlement. And I repeat once again that the one factor that can contribute to the abandonment of violence in Cyprus is that the moral authority of this Assembly would be behind effective negotiations. Recognizing that position and, while doing that we should throw our minds back to the situation that has existed in that island, a small place of half a million people where, as I pointed out

yesterday, there were 45,000 cases of crime, mostly arising from this situation.

I also want in this connexion, without in any way being regarded as making an utterance of provocation, to remark that reference has been made to civil war, to civil strife, to conditions of disturbance, etcetera. Has what has been going on for the last four years created a situation of peace? It cannot be argued that we are now proposing something different which will create something that was not there. There is no peace on the island; there are no peaceful conditions there. The police force has to be recruited, in the main, from the community and large armed forces have to be maintained. All these things, I hope, Mr. Noble will not interpret as criticisms of domestic policies, but I appeal to him, in all sincerity, to accept the position which we have taken up, not always an enviable one, but one which is intended to elicit his favourable response, and if there is any way we can meet him or his delegation, we earnestly hope that he will be able to do so, and we are confident that it will create a situation in Cyprus and lay to rest once and for all what I regard as the worse thing that can happen to the country-- participation or annexation.

With this, I will once again appeal to the Committee to adopt this draft resolution unanimously.

INDIA CYPRUS USA GREECE IRELAND ISRAEL OMAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TURKEY RUSSIA MALTA CANADA SYRIA ITALY ARMENIA INDONESIA AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA UNITED KINGDOM LATVIA MOROCCO MACEDONIA PERU COLOMBIA IRAN BELGIUM SWITZERLAND GHANA

**Date**: Dec 02, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Algeria

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Special Political Committee on Dec 13, 1958 on the question of Algeria.

The following is the full text of his Statement:

My Delegation, at the outset, considers it necessary to refer to the special circumstances in which this debate takes place, and expresses its extreme regret at the absence of the delegation of France. This

absence this year is more significant than the absence on a previous occasion.

The Committee will remember that three years ago, when it was sought to inscribe this item on the agenda of the Assembly, it met with considerable resistance, the resistance being based upon Article 2 (7) of the Charter. But the Assembly decided otherwise, and the item was inscribed. As a result of this, the French delegation withdrew. This was an incident which was regretted by the entire Assembly, and, after the debate, those who supported the resolution and, more particularly, those who were close neighbours of the State affected and who were familiar with the conditions, showed great magnanimity in permitting the item, in effect, to be removed from the agenda to enable the French delegation to return.

That magnanimous spirit was a tribute to the neighbours and to others concerned in the introduction of this item to the Assembly. For two years following, the Government of France was represented in this Assembly while the debate took place. While maintaining the juridical position with regard to Article 2 (7), the distinguished Foreign Minister of France informed this Assembly that the representatives of France were present in order to inform the Assembly of the conditions that prevailed and to present their own point of view. At the end of the debate he said: "France has chosen. You can choose

<Pg-349>

as you like".

This year France is absent. This is not a matter between the Algerian people and France, for the situation between the Algerian National movement and France is a matter which affects the Assembly. That is to say, the item has been inscribed, France has taken part in this discussion, and we are constantly told that the movement in France towards colonial problems, and particularly in regard to Algeria, is a progressive one. Yet we are not favoured with the participation of the one Government which can bring this war to an end.

We say this not by way of protest, not by way of condemnation, not by way of sitting in judgment, but as an expression of our sadness that we will not have this participation. It would be bad enough if it were one of the eighty-one States Members of the United Nations without any particular qualifications; but here we have one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, charged, more than others, with world security and the maintenance of international peace, not being able, or not willing, to assist us in these discussions. The whole of the Assembly, on every problem, has made appeals for negotiations--I do not mean on this question in particular, but on questions generally. The approach of the Charter is an approach of peaceful settlement. We will not have the contribution that the one potentially effective Power can make in this regard.

This is all the more regrettable since there is a new Republic in France, the Fifth Republic. With regard to this particular problem, the head of the Fifth Republic said to the world, in October of this year, after the Assembly met: "What must be achieved is the basic transformation of this country", -- meaning Algeria; he did not say "this colony"; "country" means that there are nationals who belong to that country, a place which is the homeland of the people--"so brave, so alive, but also so full of difficulties and suffering. This means that all Algeria must have a share in modern civilization, and it must be brought to them in terms of well-being and dignity." If he had simply said "well-being", one could have understood that it was a paternal Government of a colonial country. But General de Gaulle's proclamation stands. It means that the personality of Algeria, its position as a country, was recognized as late as October; and he pledges to the world that that country, so far as he is concerned, must live in terms of dignity. What is more essential to the dignity of a people than freedom? How can a country live in terms of dignity and modern civilization, even if we give it education, even if we give it food, and build roads--an dictators build roads, you know-and supply all the creature comforts, but without freedom?

Therefore, we must, still hope that this declaration of French policy, which was circulated to us all on 3 October, stands true and will be respected. Our regret is all the greater that the French Government is not participating in this debate; since the Assembly is drawing to a close, it would be an idle wish that we might correct this situation. But in view of the moderation of the debates that have taken place in this chamber -- and those who have participated are mainly countries whose views on colonial rule and the liberation of peoples are well-known; but, in spite of that, the appeal has been for negotiation between the metropolitan Power and the people; there is no strong resolution before us, there have been no speeches of wild condemnation--we hope that the voice of so many nations, even though the colonial Powers have not taken a substantial part in the debate, will be heard in France, particularly by the Head of State, and that he will interpret that as an overwhelming part of world opinion.

A corollary to that is the statement of the leader of the nationalist movement in Algeria. I hope my friends who have sponsored the draft resolution will not think I am fighting shy of these words: "Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic"; but I want to place this particular aspect of my observations in a context which does not create difficulties for those who have not recognized this Government. Now, even taking it in that way, the head of this Government said, in September of this year, that "The presence of Frenchmen and Europeans in Algeria does not pose an insoluble problem. It is certain that Algeria, freed of colonialists" --that is, the colonial Power--"will have neither first nor second-class citizens." The Algerian Republic will make no distinction due to race or religion among those who wish to remain Algerians". Now, wishing to remain Algerians is in conformity with what General de Gaulle said in October, that it was a country and that it must live in dignity.

"Fundamental guarantees will be given to all citizens so that they may participate in the total life of the nation. All legislative interests will be respected." This was the statement made by the head of this Provisional Government who, at any rate, at the minimum, should be considered as the head of the effective nationalist movement of Algeria.

#### <Pg-350>

He goes on to say: "The efforts of this Government"--he is speaking for his Government --"will be to find a peaceful solution through negotiation; and there will be a response, but this will not be a response to a request for unconditional surrender." It is not for my Government to endorse the second part of the statement, which refers to France; but we can accept the first part certainly, that the efforts of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic will be devoted to finding a peaceful solution.

The head of a movement that is engaged in armed resistance in order to establish the freedom of his country comes forward with an offer that he is prepared to find a peaceful solutioe consider the response to it should be adequate and of a reciprocal character.

What is the background of this whole situation? This matter has been before us now for three yeare have had before us the questions of other territories of North Africa of different typee had before us, for many years, the question of the country of the last speaker, Tunisia; and we can remember the speeches made at that time, by France and its allies, to the effect that the Tunisians were Frenchmen and, therefore, the decision must rest with France. Now, history has decided otherwise. Tunisia, today, is an independent State in common with Morocco; the Protectorate which administered French sovereignty over that territory has been withdrawn, so that the sovereignty inherent in its people has blossomed into a Republic.

What is the position with regard to Algeria? There are a great many countries represented here--in particular, those in your part of the world, Mr. Chairman--which are influenced in this matter by juridical considerations, perhaps with the apprehension that there may be some interference in the affairs of a sovereign nation, one of the five permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations. The position with regard to Algeria is as follows. Algeria was surrendered by the Turks when it was part of the Ottoman Empire--in parentheses, may I say that I am happy that there is no claim that it should be put back into the Ottoman Empireú The French proclaimed Algeria as an integral part of France. That was an act of conquest; and conquest, particularly in modern times, confers the reciprocal right of rebellion. Conquest is an act of force majeure. It is not a juridical act: it is a political act; and every conquest confers the right of rebellion. It is written into the American Declaration of Independence, and into the declarations of independence of many countries, including my own, that where people are governed against their will they have the right to rid themselves of that rule. In

1834, therefore, France proclaimed Algeria as an integral part of France.

But if this fact had remained alone, this problem would have a different complexion. However, immediately France proclaimed Algeria as an integral part of France, and the rule of the Ottoman Empire was terminated, not by the people but by France; the peoples of Algeria rebelled against it as early as 1847. So we are dealing not with an ephemeral, a temporary or ia passing phase of the resistance of a people. The peoples of Algeria have been fighting the thraldom of an empire for nearly 100 years; and the French conquest of Algeria met with resistance under the national leader of that day, Abd-EI-Kader. He surrendered. That surrender again, was surrender to physical force; and it carries with it, as its corollary, the right to resist when you are able to wake up.

Then there was quiescence for a period. But in our own time, after the conclusion of the First World War, North Africans in Paris started a movement, moderate in its character, which proclaimed the right of the Algerian peoples to freedom. Then came the years of the Second World War, and the Algerian nationalists presented to the Allies stationed in Algeria a manifesto demanding sovereignty; and there was no greater supporter, not in exact terms but in sentiment, of this movement than the present leader of the French nation, General de Gaulle. It was the first time he proclaimed, on behalf of the Free French Government of the day, that it was proper and appropriate that the Algerians—whom the French call the "Moslem Algerians"—had the right to citizenship without renouncing their status.

This is the background in which we are functioning. We have on the one hand the proclamation of French policy which has recognised Algeria as a country--and what is more, two years ago the Foreign Minister of France told this Assembly that the French Government recognized the personality of Algeria. What is a personality if it is not a personality, that is to say, it has the right to express its person? So if there is any suggestion today that this matter must be decided in Metropolitan France, that the Algerian people have no right to their independence, then there is a regression from the position already communicated to the General Assembly.

#### <Pg-351>

I have no desire to go further into the history of this question, because we are trying to wind up the Assembly as early as we possibly can, and my good friend from Tunisia has now introduced the draft resolution. Therefore it is not necessary to make two speeches, But we can deal with this draft resolution of which the Assembly is now seized.

The liberation movement which is the main resistance and the arm of the Algerian people, today is at war with the French Government--and I say this deliberately for reasons which I hope will soon become clear--because when there are more than half a million modern troops in that country you can no longer call it a civil commotion. When the forces of the French Republic on land, air and sea are being utilized among a people which is comparatively unarmed --but still armed, which makes it a war--I think it is necessary for us to mention the fact in this debate that, apart from all political questions, we should appeal to the Government of France and to the leaders of the Algerian people, to apply very strictly to this struggle the terms of the Geneva Convention. That is, irrespective of the recognition of the Algerian Republic, according to the Convention of which France is a signatory, these people are entitled to be treated as belligerents, with all the consequences that follow from it. Neither party-more particularly the Government of France that is a signatory to the Convention--would have the right to treat these prisoners except under strict conformity with this Convention, providing for their housing--not to put them in common jails--providing for rights of internment, for medical attention, for repatriation to neutral countries, and also to respect the rights of neutral nations in regard to these belligerents; so that when a situation like the arrest of persons who are travelling under Moroccan hospitality and therefore at least in effect under the Moroccan flag, come under hostile action, it is a violation of this Convention.

It is the view of my Government that irrespective of all political settlements that have been made, humanity requires that the status of belligerency should be recognized and therefore the prisoners--and those others who come under hostile action on either side--are entitled to all the amenities, all the consideration and all the law of humanity that are embodied in this Convention, of which France is a signatory.

The Government of India has never resigned its position in regard to independence of the Algerian people We have at times allowed the words personality, entity, and so on, to be used in order to facilitate negotiations. Equally, we have never departed from the view that peaceful solutions are more likely to be permanent, more likely to be effective.

Within the last two years, there have been other parts of the French Empire-v-whether they be protectorates or colonies--which have emerged into independence. Only yesterday we welcomed one of these territories as a Member State of the United Nations. I think members of this Committee, when discussing this matter, could put aside the large number of details that have been introduced into the discussion and just consider whether, if it is possible for Guinea, with a population of two million, the territories of Indo-China which, after waging sanguinary war with France won a military victory and therefore were able to establish their independence, for the other territories of the Federation of French West Africa and of Equatorial Africa, for the Territories under Trusteeship--for all these territories to emerge into independence--the Algerian people alone are to be kept in a state of helotry.

And what is their sin? The main argument which has been used in regard to Algeria is that out of ten million people one-and-a-half million people are Europeans or of European descent. Are we to understand that because a colonial people, either by the laws of hospitality or by the laws of conquest and of surrender, have permitted or acquired the occupation of some part of its territory by some other people, it is therefor to be denied liberty for ever? That is to say, the representatives of people who belong more to modern civilization, and particularly of France, which is wedded to the ideas of liberty, who have become residents of this land--should they, therefore, deny to others liberty? And what is more, should they refuse to accept citizenship in this vast territory and come under the Government under democratic considerations? I say this because it is the view of the Government of India that an independent Algeria, as stated by Mr. Abbas, should and would extend the whole of that freedom without distinction as to race or religion. Therefore the colons, the residents, those others who come into Algeria would be Algerian nationals. The position in the past has been under the French Constitution, that only Frenchmen could be citizens. Now I have no desire to make comparative studies of these two Constitutions--the Constitutions of the Fifth and Fourth

### <Pg-352>

Republics--but it is interesting to note, whatever its purposes may have been, that the Constitution of the Fifth Republic refers to this fact: national sovereignty belongs to the people. The previous Constitution said: national sovereignty belongs to the French people. The French have been accustomed to calling everybody in the French Empire a Frenchman. May I say here, with great appreciation, that although the British ruled us for three hundred years one way or another, and for ninety years more as an imperial Power, they never called us Englishman--they spared us that, and what is more, we parted in friendship. But they have been called Frenchmen, and under the previous Constitution sovereignty belonged to the French people, under the present Constitution sovereignty belongs to the people. And if you put that side by side with the recognition of Algerian personality, with the statement of de Gaulle that Algeria is a country--and what is more, he speaks about its great people--I submit that under the terms of the present Constitution of France itself the sovereignty of Algeria rests in the Algerian people.

The matter having come before the Assembly, it passed resolutions year after year. Each of these resolutions is singularly free from any words expressing condemnation or any kind of phraseology which would create embarrassment to the French Government. In fact, these resolutions, after a great deal of negotiation, have been passed with the acquiescence--I shall not say the consent--of the French representative in this place. But what has happened to them ? As I said, the first resolution was practically a resolution to enable the French to return after what we thought was an act which did no credit to a great Power. But the two subsequent resolutions were resolutions asking for a peaceful and democratic settlement, whatever the

phraseology may be. However, in each case the United Nations either noted or offered the good offices of high personalities. In the first instance it called upon the Secretary-General to offer his good offices and find a solution through appropriate means--it did not even prescribe the means, but spoke of finding a democratic and just solution through appropriate means--in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

This Assembly has now been informed that in fact it has not taken place, nor were the good offices of the United Nations used in order to bring this sanguinary war to an end. And today the situation is that there are half a million troops, with all the weapons of war by land, sea and air, entailing the expenditure of \$ 3 million a day. We might well sit down here and contemplate that this billion dollars a year, if it had gone into the paternal estate of France for the betterment of its people during the last fifty years, would have improved the situation. There is always money to be found for war and suppression, but little for other purposes.

The Government of France expends \$3 million a day in order to wage war against 10 million people, or the majority of the people of Algeria, and while I have no desire to introduce other matters, since France remains in military alliance with a large number of powerful countries, it must at least be expected that it is able to release considerable instruments of war of its own for the purposes of this colonial war. The same thing happened in Indo-China, but there, after many years, the more effective opponents of rule gained a military victory. Are we to wait for the time when the same situation exists in Algeria when this conflict has had its repercussions upon neighbouring lands? There is a difference between the situation in South-East Asia and that in North Africa.

Algeria is surrounded by territories which are charged with a spirit of nascent nationalism and, what is more, territories that are allied in kinship, by race and other features, with the people who are under suppression. As stated in the draft resolution before us, the continuance of this situation can lead to a breach of international peace. The Assembly must take into account the fact that this is a large-scale war, waged by one of the most powerful nations of the world--one of the great Powers, one of the Powers responsible for international peace and security more than the seventy-seven others under the Charter of the United Nations, a Power which, by its historic and by its traditional practice, is wedded to the conceptions of liberty, fraternity and equality which from the Constitution of the eighteenth century have been transferred into every single Constitution afterwards, including the Constitution of the Fifth Republic.

Therefore, we come here again this year to consider this subject with the same appeal--the appeal that there shall be negotiations in order to bring the war to an end and establish the independence of the Algerian people. We have now come to a stage in the debate when there is a draft resolution before the Assembly and my delegation will support this draft resolution. We will support it not with a reservation but with qualifications and explanations. We make that explanation in order that those who find

<Pg-353>

themselves in a position similar to ours may not feel any embarrassment in supporting them so far as we are concerned.

The draft resolution does not ask anyone to recognize the Provisional Government of the Republic. It says: "the willingness of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic to enter into negotiations with the Government of France", and "Urges negotiations between" them. We do not urge negotiations between them in order that they may be recognized as a Government but in order to find "a solution in conformity with the Charter". Therefore, I would say this draft resolution, like all resolutions, can be differently worded or better worded, but this one as it stands, does not offer any insurmountable difficulties in the mind of any country which, like ours, has not recognized the Provisional Government or the Algerian Republic. It is a resolution which, for the most part, recalls previous decisions of the General Assembly; it recognizes "the right of the Algerian people to independence" which is inherent or expressed in the Charter; it expresses concern at the great slaughter that is going on in Algeria of, as I said, a comparatively unarmed people. One newspaper wrote that one cannon-burst can kill fifty Algerians, while an Algerian sniper might or might not get a Frenchman, in terms of war.

Then, in the preambular paragraph, the draft resolution says "the present situation in Algeria constitutes a threat to international peace and security". We can well remember situations, which are less grave than this, inviting the attention of the Assembly and the Assembly taking strong, effective trod prompt action, and countries which are allied to others by military alliances, by traditional friendship, by kinship of religion, race, civilization and everything else, taking the position that the aggressor must withdraw.

If I may say so, whatever may be the juridical "position in this matter, the position of France in Algeria today is not that of a colonial Power trying to restore order, but of a sovereign country committing aggression upon a land that is free, because in all colonies the sovereignty remains vested in the people and when they choose to assert it they become independent. So that as far as the people are concerned, Algeria is an independent country whose independence is being violated by the force of French arms and therefore the position of France in Algeria is that of a country waging war, committing aggression upon a people.

The operative part of this draft resolution does not ask for condemnation of the French Government; it does not ask for anything more than negotiation. It asks for negotiations between these two parties because negotiations, if they are serious, must be between

those who are able to deliver the goods. It has been part of the argument against negotiations to ask: "With whom will we negotiate?" Without disrespect to anyone, that is a common argument from a colonial Power. Here, however, it is now possible to negotiate with a party that is in effective hostility with the French Government and if it is strong enough to wage war and resist it and to carry on for three years against such powerful odds, then it must be assumed that it is possible to enter into effective negotiations and come to a settlement, at least leading to the cessation of hostilities to which I feel that, irrespective of political views every State Member of this Assembly would look forward.

Our own position in this matter, as I have said, has been stated fully by the Prime Minister of India. He said very recently, I believe after the Assembly began:

The French Government have often said they did not know whom to deal with. I think it may well be said that at present what is called the Provisional Government of Algeria represents all the elements in Algerian nationalism, moderate and extremist.

In fact, the head of this Government was recognized by France as a very moderate leader, living in France most of the time, and I believe he was a member of the French Chamber.

And therefore it should be easy--says the Prime Minister--to deal with them as representing Algerian nationalism. I would hope, therefore, that the French Government--General de Gaulle--will deal with these people, because it is obvious that there is no other way of settling the Algerian problem except in recognizing Algerian freedom.

Our Prime Minister has equally stated that the question of the immediate recognition of the Provisional Government in Algeria raises other problems. The real test in our minds has been how we can help in this matter and not merely make a gesture without helping. This comes from a Government that has not recognized the Republic of Algeria but at the same time regards its emergence and the position of the leaders of the Algerian movement as providing an answer

#### <Pg-354>

to the oft-repeated argument, "With whom are we to negotiate", There are two parties; one, the holders, according to French law, of juridical power, armed with all the modern weapons waging the war in Algeria for three years, with more than half of the army committed and the greater part if not the whole of the Foreign Legion, and no doubt having, even if not for that purpose, the indirect assistance that must come to a Power in military alliances from the vast resources that lie behind in reserve. On the other hand are people who, in spite of all their suffering, have not surrendered in three years. And, what is more, Mr. Abbas tells General de Gaulle, "When we offer to negotiate, we do not do so in terms of surrender". We say,

therefore that a situation has now arisen in which, if there was any genuine desire for peace and for creating a situation in North Africa which would not lead to further international complications, which would not endanger in any sense relations such as they are between the independent countries of North Africa, notably the ones recently freed from French rule and the rest of them, it would be the policy of wisdom and humanity and of common sense to try to bring about negotiations. If the French Government has to negotiate in any other way, that negotiation would be something depending entirely on their will in picking and choosing the people with whom they would talk. If you pick and choose the people you are talking to, in a sense you are talking to yourself, and it is not common sense to talk to oneself if you are sane. Political sanity requires, therefore, that they should speak to their opponents.

We are told that there should be a cessation of hostilities before that. Now, as the cessation of hostilities itself requires negotiation, it is also enjoined therefore on the French Government to enter into negotiations—as I said, the French Government only-because the offer of negotiations on the other side, the willingness to negotiate, has already come; and such negotiations have to take place in conditions where results will follow and, in view of certain events that have occurred recently, would have to take place in conditions where both parties feel a sense of security. They obviously could not take place on the battlefields of Algeria; perhaps, equally, they cannot take place where French authority alone remains, in view of present circumstances.

I should like to state here that when the question of Indo-China came up four years ago, the same problem arose: Who are we to negotiate with? And, ultimately, we had the situation where negotiations took place between those parties which were factually in a position to negotiate. It is interesting to note that the French Government signed those instruments on behalf of the Government not represented at Geneva and what is more, the Government of Viet-Nam, which was waging war against the others, signed them on behalf of their own Governments.

There is no escape from these facts; the worst freedom we could ever ask for would be freedom from facts. These facts are before us. And, in this massacre--that is what it really comes to--and with all hardships it is inflicting on the French people and on the Algerian people, with all the feelings of the whole world, notably in Asia and Africa, with its consequences of alienating the sympathies of new nations that have come into existence--taking all that into consideration, this Assembly should make a unanimous appeal to the French Government to negotiate. We should also convey to it that we express our regret, not by resolutions, and we should convey to them that they should take account of the fact that we all regret their representatives' absence from this Assembly, particularly because France is not only a Member of this Assembly but one of the five great countries on which the structure of the United Nations rests.

My Government therefore hopes this will be done. As I said, every resolution can be improved by every delegation, and each delegation, I think, would be justified in thinking they could draft it betterbut, here, what we are providing is not a constitution for Algeria, it is not even going into the details of negotiation. We have to look at the orientation of this resolution, and that orientation is the recognition of Algerian independence, that orientation is a request to recognize that a party who can deliver the goods is willing; and, therefore, there must be a response, and all this under the umbrella of the Charter.

That being the general orientation of this draft resolution, and containing no words of condemnation to a country which is friendly to all the other eighty countries represented here, and with whom we as a Government and a people have very close and harmonious relations-and as far as we had any problems of this kind to solve, they are for the most part solved by friendly negotiation, and only the juridical sovereignty of French possessions in India remains to be terminated; and it was without any feelings of animosity that we approached this. We think, therefore, that there should be no hesitation in the minds-it is not for us to decide, we express our own opinion--of people like ourselves who may

#### <Pg-355>

have difficulty with regard to the juridical aspect of this question. No issue of the recognition of any particular Government of Algeria arises, no issue as to the particular method of negotiation arises, no issue of judging the rights and wrongs of this question, apart from the whole issue of colonialism, arises.

We have here, in our submission, a draft resolution of a character calculated and certainly designed to promote the purposes of peace rather than of conflict.

May I say, therefore, before leaving this subject, that the great mistake for any country, particularly the great Powers, is to think that years of war, whether four or 400, will ever suppress a people's desire for freedom. The whole of Asia, and now Africa, is replete with examples where the power of a strong arm has never been able to suppress a people. France has only recently known the tragedy of conquest and occupation. When that country was brutally treated and its peoples tortured during the last world war, how could a people, how could the head of a Government with intimate contact with this, who organized Governments outside his own territory--Any man in France can say: I will not recognize the Government outside the territory of its own people, any man in France can say: I will not recognize people who are rebels or who run away from the legitimate authority of their Governments. But General de Gaulle, who held the flag of Free France aloft during the war, constituted a Government abroad while, part of the time, in Africa, whereas on the soil of Africa the Algerian people themselves were engaged in the fight for liberty. How could they turn to them and say: We shall be entitled to

liberty, but not you?

It is tragic to remember that, soon after the conclusion of the war, when the Algerian people demonstrated not for their freedom but in enjoyment of the victory of the war, they were put down by the force of French arms immediately after the war itself. But that is past history, and we should never recall these things which would probably spoil the atmosphere of negotiation.

My delegation therefore lends its support to this draft resolution, without reservation, but with the qualifications I have mentioned. It is largely by way of explaining the position of our Government--our relations with France are of the most harmonious character, we have the highest respect for the way they have dealt with some of their colonial areas and we look forward to the prospective and almost immediate liberation of another part of the former French Colonial Empire which is now under trusteeship, we look forward to the extension of and to be able to feel that the concept of freedom in the newly proclaimed Republics of the Ivory Coast and Dahomey is as real as it is in Guinea, so that the arena of freedom will be extended to Africa.

Algeria is a black spot; the oil of the Sahara--if there is any there--or even the sands of the Sahara, or whatever wealth there may be, will not be prejudiced by the liberation of these people because no wealth will ever come out of any territory without the application of human labour, and that has to come from the peoples of Africa because they alone, can inhabit that area. Therefore, the interests of France, the interests of those people, the interests of ending bloodshed, and, what is more the implementation of the purposes of the Charter--when the nations assembled here can say to themselves that the Charter itself is justified by the action of one of its major members--all that requires that there should be a turning of this tide and, in accordance with the hopes which were aroused in recent times, that there should be negotiation. General de Gaulle referred to the brave people who put up their fight for their freedom. All this should be acted upon. We look forward to this draft serving this purpose; and not only the resolution but the debate in this Assembly The Assembly has addressed itself to this problem with great moderation. We appeal to a people who have great generosity in many ways--and what is more, as I said a while ago, in whom the memory of oppression, in whom the memory of occupation, the torture of their own people, the taking away of their lands and the jack-boot on their own soil is recent, and who could be more conscious of the feelings that a people must have when their homelands are under foreign occupation.

With these words, therefore, I have presented the views of my Government on the whole of this question, and my delegation will support this resolution.

**Date**: Dec 13, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of Guinea

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following Statement in the General Assembly on Dec 12, 1958 on the admission of the Republic of Guinea:

<Pg-356>

My delegation joins the several others which have spoken before me, and I feel sure I quote the sentiments not only of those who are in this Assembly, but also of the entire civilized part of the world in the development that has taken place, which has preceded the event which we have now welcomed.

We join in congratulating the two main parties who made this event possible, namely, the new Republic of Guinea and the Republic of France.

While countries have won freedom before, the modern age has seen imperialisms abdicating their power and, at least in the last stage, in an atmosphere of friendship and co-operation or at least in the acceptance of the inevitability of freedom. We are also glad to feel that in the rise of the Republic of Guinea there has been an expansion of the arena of freedom in West Africa, opened in recent times by the action of the United Kingdom in welcoming what was the former Gold Coast to the sisterhood of the nations of the Commonwealth

We have no doubt at all that this event has had an impact on the awakening and the fruition of the efforts of the people of West Africa, and I hope that the whole of Africa will continue to have it in the same way.

In the case of Guinea there is one other factor which we may not lose sight of, and that is the great national movement which has enabled Guinea to become independent today -- that is, the participation of the labour movement of that country -- and it is the full participation of the great trade union organizations which gives us the hope or the insurance of social equity and social progress in this new Republic of Africa. We welcome this eighty-second Member,

therefore, not merely as an addition to our large number but as one which will bring to this Assembly new ideas and which will contribute generally to the lessening of tensions and to the richness which small nations, so-called, have contributed to the work of this Organization.

I feel sure that all of us, and you more particularly, Mr. President, will feel that the admission of this Republic to the General Assembly, especially after such a smooth passage from the Security Council -- and even here it was without a vote actually being taken -- is not a indication but is a proclamation of the justice of the principles of the Charter itself. The Charter stands fully vindicated in the sense that non-self-governing peoples can rise to freedom provided either the obstructions are removed or the strength of their organizations are adequate to overcome them.

So far, encomiums have been paid on occasions of this character, but we may never forget in this gathering that while we welcome good things we are only too happy to congratulate ourselves and others?

We are a political organization in the sense that we are composed of sovereign nations dealing with issues which affect the vast masses of people in the world.

Standing here this evening, one cannot forget the fact that until two or three years ago the Assembly was considering year after year an item called "The Admission of New Members" and here today nations are with us which must wonder, if Guinea could get in so easily, "Why did I have to wait so many years outside.?" When those sixteen countries were admitted, followed by two others afterward, the General Assembly did something that was very good. It was an example that good conduct follows good conduct; that is to say, when we broke the deadlock in regard to the admission of new members, thanks to the co-operation of the permanent members of the Security Council and the general impact of world opinion, we had opened not the floodgates but the doors of freedom, that is, of membership of this Assembly to all those who were ready to come into it.

We hope that the admission of this Territory will be followed by similar admissions of other parts with which this Territory was linked until a few days ago. Since 1946 Guinea has been a part of the French West African Federation. Only two days ago we read that Dahomey, the Ivory Coast and other parts of the French Federation had become republics. We hope that the republican form of government, me content of it will be adequate to provide them the justification for application and the justification for us to welcome them here.

This stands in contrast to the policy in Africa which has been set out very eloquently by the head of State of one of the colonial Powers. I think it would be discourteous to mention names. This is what this great man said only very recently.

European position in Asia having been almost entirely liquidated, --

which of course is not true unless to liquidate means it spreads very much over -- "we now see the new states preparing

<Pg-357>

indiscriminately" -- and we have one of the results of this indiscrimination--"to instigate subversive movements all over Africa, as if conditions were identical in the various regions of that continent or similar to those prevailing among the Asiatic peoples who have gained their independence. Since Bandung, this movement is quite openly led by the Indian Union.

Apart from the four or five independent states -- and this is of importance to us -- "which are to be found in Africa, and apart from the Mediterranean seaboard" -- which does not include Guinea incidentally; I did not say so here--"of that continent where there is a movement to hasten the process of evolution toward a system of autonomous governments or associated independent states, it may be said that Africa lives and must continue for an unforeseeable time to live under the control and guidance of a civilized state.

Incidentally, there is no definition given of a privileged nation here, whether a person who rules over someone is more civilized than the person who fights and gains his freedom. The quotation continues:

Notwithstanding the political experiments which Britain has recently promoted in limited areas, the major sections of Africa consist of territories which depend on European States and lack the conditions necessary for existence as independent, democratic nations.

Public administration and the guidance of labour is unavoidably in the hands of a small minority of Europeans. Their tasks cannot be abandoned or handed over to the indigenous elements indiscriminately and all at once. Transfers of sovereignty are conceivable there, but not the abandonment of it.

Herein is the problem.

That is a statement from the head of a Member State of this Organization. I am happy to think that the consummation of events today stands in contradiction of this very fallacious doctrine.

We also must take this opportunity of congratulating once again the United Kingdom, Italy and France, which have in the last two or three years assisted in the implementation of the purposes of the Charter by enabling dependent territories to come into the membership of the United Nations.

I believe that Guinea is the first element in the French colonial empire proper -- that is, excluding Cambodia, Laos, Tunisia and Morocco, which were protectorates whose sovereignties were only mothered by the presence of an empire on top of them theoretically. This is the first part of 4.5 million square miles of colonial

territory of the French empire in Africa which, by the dint of its own efforts and by the co-operation of the leadership of the French Government, has been able to come here.

We hope that this example will spread not only to the rest of Africa, but also to the Mediterranean to which the quotation I read a while ago refers.

But French Guinea is not the only Guinea in Africa. There are other parts of Africa-- east and west. There are parts of Equitorial Africa which are not French and which are still colonial, and we hope that they will soon come into the fulness of their freedom and come here to our Organization. Also in the heart of Africa incidents are occurring in which one of the parties involved is the same, where sanguinary situations have arisen which are now engaging the attention of the United Nations itself.

We all hope that the wisdom, the foresight and the recognition of the inevitability of the expansion of freedom, which must be in the back of the minds of any imperialist Power, will be recognized in regard to these areas.

My Government, which recognized the Government of the Republic of Guinea as soon as it was born, joins with all of you not only in congratulating this new Republic, but in hoping that their coming here will rapidly lead to the expansion of freedom in East Africa, in the rest of Equitorial Africa -- not only in French Equitorial Africa, but in the rest of the former mandated and Trust Territories, such as Tanganyika, and, as a previous speaker has said, in two or three years time when the neighbouring territories come to the United Nations, we would have altered the composition of this Body sufficiently to make it more representative of the world as it is.

<Pg-358>

INDIA GUINEA FRANCE USA INDONESIA ITALY CAMBODIA LAOS TUNISIA MOROCCO ECUADOR

**Date**: Dec 12, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Treatment of the People of Indian Origin in South Africa

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly

on Dec 10, 1958, on the treatment of the people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa:

My delegation did not want to participate in the explanation of votes before the vote was taken in view of the virtually unanimous agreement on it. My Government desires to state not so much our position as our state of feelings and reactions on this matter. They are of a very mixed character. First of all, my delegation and Government feel extremely grateful to the bulk of this Assembly for the support they have given in this problem over the years, those who today made up this aggregate of 69 votes. But that feeling is very much tempered by the fact that there is one vote that is necessary in order for us to fulfil the purposes of the Charter or to work with it, and that is the vote of the Union of South Africa. No delegation regrets more than we do the absence of that delegation from these discussions. It is not because we think that if they had come here to this meeting they would have voted for the draft resolution; but because regarding this resolution, I know that we will not get a solution to this problem in the hearts and minds of those who are responsible for the Government of the Union, and while that change would come largely from within, we believe that the effect of public opinion throughout the world, as expressed by the votes in this Assembly, will be a great contributing factor.

Next, it comes to our mind that, since this item comes up here year after year, like a hardy perennial, there is inevitably a kind of feeling of fatigue that is likely to rise in us, and what is more, perhaps we are not likely to give it the degree of attention that is required in view of the vast suffering which is imposed upon half a million people within the Union of South Africa who are affected by this resolution. I want to beg of my colleagues on this Committee that they regard this vote that they have cast as something of a moral message to the people who, without any outside assistance, without force of arms, without violence, but against laws that inhibit every aspect of liberty and that are contrary to the purposes of the Charter, are putting up--men and women--a heroic resistance in the tradition of the great founder of this resistance movement.

We also want to express not so much our regret as our sadness at the fact that there were abstentions on this resolution, this issue upon which no one can be neutral. Our country has been accused of neutrality on many issues, but we have never been found neutral when the issue of human right or human liberty is involved. We fully recognize the reasons for the abstentions usually there are 19 abstentions, but this year it has come down to 10. We hope the time will come when it is realized that the alteration in the number of these abstentions—the positive vote—will have the effect that I spoke of in the beginning, the effect of bringing about a change in the hearts and minds of the South African Government—I will not say the people, because against such iniquity, against such a state of affairs, the resistance comes as much from the white population of South Africa, in so far as it extends to certain sections, as from the majority who suffer under it.

We further regret that some of these abstentions come from countries which not only have diplomatic and friendly relations with us but which are very close to us; and therefore we cannot speak in anger-we never would--but only in sorrow. This resolution is not merely a vote; it is a message to the people of South Africa who cannot come here under Trusteeship Agreements as petitioners, who cannot come here as people from Non-Self-Governing Territories, who have no voice but the voice of this Assembly. If it should prove that year after year We pass only a weak resolution and thereby give the impression to the world that we have slaved our conscience thereby, it will do more harm than good. But I am sure that is not the situation. Large number of delegations have spoken and voted on this. Now we come to the fact that the delegation of India has voted for this resolution. It has not asked for anything more than negotiations, which are enjoined upon us together with the Government of Pakistan and the Government of the Union of South Africa. I have been asked by my Government to say that, irrespective of all the developments that have taken place, irrespective of treaty violations, irrespective of the violation of human rights and of affronts to our own nationality and our dignity, we would, in the spirit of this resolution and not introducing any extraneous matter, genuinely seek negotiations with South Africa. It has been said in one place that when some of these abstainers are abstaining, it is because they want to keep their hands free for further purposes of the Charter.

As we did last year, we pledge the word of

<Pg-359>

our Government that we intend, as soon as a few weeks have passed, allowing South Africa sufficient time to receive this resolution, to approach the South African Government again--although we have no diplomatic relations with it--in order to enter into negotiations, without any commitments in regard to the juridical position, at the same time making it quite clear that we do not propose to throw the United Nations overboard in this matter.

It is for these reasons that I have taken the time of the Committee, after the voting has taken place, to explain the position of my Government.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PAKISTAN

**Date**: Dec 10, 1958

## **Volume No**

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lall's Letter to the President of the Security Council

Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative in the United Nations, said on Nov 15, 1958 that the letter dated November 10, 1958 about Sheikh Abdullah from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan circulated as a Security Council document "is merely for the purpose of making propagandist use of the forum of the United Nations".

In a letter to the President of the Security Council, Mr. Gunnar Jarring of Sweden, Shri Lall, who was replying to Pakistan Representative's letter, said: "The legal proceedings in regard to Sheikh Abdullah are sub judice and it would, therefore, not be proper for the Government of India to comment on them".

The following is the text of Shri Lall's letter:

The Government of India have seen the letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan circulated as Security Council document S/4110 dated 10 November, 1958.

Members of the Council will be aware of the nature of the previous statements made by successive Representatives of Pakistan in the Security Council or in their communications

addressed to the President of the Security Council about Sheikh Abdullah. These are on record in Security Council documents. It is quite clear, therefore, that the present communication is merely for the purpose of making propagandist use of the forum of the United Nations.

The legal proceedings in regard to Sheikh Abdullah are sub judice and it would, therefore, not be proper for the Government of India to comment on them. However, out of courtesy to the Security Council and Government of Pakistan, the Government of India have instructed me to send this brief reply to the letter dated 10 November 1958 of my colleague from Pakistan.

Correspondence of this nature hardly helps to promote friendly relations between our two countries, which it is the policy of the Government of India to further. The Government of India have always been, and continue to be, reluctant to participate in acrimonious charges or to utilize the forum of the United Nations for such purposes.

I am to request that this letter be circulated to the Members of the Security Council.

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **INDONESIA**

President's Speech at State Banquet in Jakarta

The President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following speec at the State Banquet held in his honour by Indonesian President, Dr. Sukarno, during his visit to Indonesia:

I am deeply touched by the kind thoughts and sentiments that you have expressed. In fact, I feel overwhelmed.

You and I are not strangers to each other. We have met before, and you already know how deeply I value and esteem your friendship.

You also know how high you are in the esteem of my people. We know you as a great and tireless fighter for the freedom of your country, as a symbol of the energies, the hopes and the aspirations of your people. We have watched with admiration how you have led your people through years of travail, and we hope fervently that you will continue to lead them in their steady progress towards the glorious future that is their destiny.

Both our people have drawn inspiration from

<Pg-360>

our common struggle for freedom. Representatives of both our countries have, in the deliberations of various international organisations in which our countries participated, lent their support to the demand for freedom and independence of dependent people, particularly in Asia and Africa, who were or still are under foreign domination.

It was at your initiative, dear friend, that the first Afro-Asian Conference, which enunciated the ten principles and set the seal on the ideals and aspirations of resurgent Asia and Africa; was held at Bandung. This was no mere accident. It was in the fitness of things that your great country, which had won freedom after much travail and whose people had evolved a philosophy based on their ideal of Punch Sheel should play host to such a historic conference.

We are living in a dynamic though difficult period. The advances made in science and technology in our life-time have been staggering. Only evolution of our moral and spiritual ideals has not kept pace with these tremendous advances in science and technology. The world is passing through terrible stresses and strains. Are the advances in science and technology to be harnessed to the economic and social development of the world and the eradication of hunger, poverty and disease for all men, and thus make their contribution to increase of human happiness and fulfilment? Or are these advances to be used for destruction and annihilation of the human race? These are the questions facing us and the world today. Both our Governments have been doing all they can to secure that those in authority all over the world make the right choice and, instead of frittering away the great gains of science on destructive purposes, put them to constructive use for the benefit of all men, regardless of race, religion, colour or creed.

Basically, our national problems are also similar. Having gained freedom, our countries are engaged in the more complex and difficult task of giving economic and social content to our freedom. Without these essential developments, which improve tile lot of the common man, liberty, freedom, independence, etc. have little meaning. We have faced and are facing difficulties in the tasks that we have imposed upon ourselves through our Five Year Plans. Our resources are being strained to the utmost. We have welcomed the assistance received from various friendly countries. We are confident however about overcoming our difficulties and have faith in the future as we are assured of the dedication of our people to make all sacrifices necessary today for a better tomorrow. Your great country and your people, my great and good friend are engaged in similar task of reconstruction and development. We are confident that under your wise guidance and with the dedication of your people, your great country and its people will achieve the targets of development which will give full economic and social content to the freedom achieved under your leadership.

There is a community of ideals, hopes and aspirations between our two Governments and our two peoples. We have worked together for these ideals in the past and we shall continue to work more closely together for the same ideals in future.

Relations between your country and mine have been close and intimate for centuries in the past, but on account of adverse circumstances, not only Indonesia and India, but almost all Asian countries passed through a period of isolation from one another. Within recent years, there is not only a reversal of the process of isolation, but a positive approach for collaboration and friendship as free nations. This friendship and collaboration between different Asian and African countries is not against any other country or nation, but only for better opportunities for self-expression as a step for collaboration and friendship among all countries, nations and continents. This renewal of contact started some years ago while we all engaged in a struggle in our own respective countries and our great poet Tagore came as an Ambassador of Friendship to your country more than thirty years ago, and today I am happy that I can on behalf of the

Government and the people of India, extend to you personally the greetings and message of friendship of my country and my people.

We have known each other in adversity, and we have co-operated fully and freely towards achieving our ideals and aspirations. I am sure our co-operation and understanding will not only continue, but will increase in volume and quality to the mutual benefit of our two countries and also contribute towards the maintenance of peace and the amelioration of the condition of the people all over the world.

### INDONESIA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

**Date**: Nov 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **INDONESIA**

Naval Agreement Signed

A Naval Agreement between the Governments of India and the Republic of Indonesia was

<Pg-361>

signed on December 3, 1958, at Jakarta providing for co-operation between the navies of the two countries for their mutual benefit. The two Governments will co-operate with each other and render mutual assistance for the purpose of developing and improving their respective navies. Such co-operation and mutual assistance, however, will not include activities in the operational field and will be in the form of attachment of officers and training of selected naval personnel of the navy of one country with the navy of the other. The agreement provides also for combined naval training exercises and for visits to one country by the ships of the other. The agreement will be in force for a period of five years in the first instance.

#### INDONESIA INDIA

**Date**: Nov 15, 1958

# **Volume No**

## **IRAQ**

#### Indo-Iraqi Trade Agreement Signed

A Trade Agreement between the Governments of India and Iraq was signed in Baghdad on Dec 29, 1958. The Indian Ambassador, Shri I.S. Chopra, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of India, and Dr. Ibrahim Kubba, Minister for Economics, on behalf of the Government of Iraq.

The Agreement seeks to promote closer trade and economic relations between India and Iraq to the mutual benefit of both countries. The two countries have agreed to accord to the trade of each other the most-favoured-nation treatment, subject to the existing or future preferences or advantages which either party accords to a third country or countries.

Under the Agreement the two Governments have also agreed to help in expanding the trade in traditional items, like Iraqi dates and Indian tea as well as in extending the trade to a number of new products.

Among the items listed as available for import from Iraq to India are dates and hides and skins. Among the items listed for export from India to Iraq are cotton textiles, tea, jute manufacturers, light engineering products, plastic goods, pharmaceuticals and chemicals.

The Trade Agreement will be valid for a period of one year from the date of ratification.

IRAQ INDIA RUSSIA

**Date**: Dec 29, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

## MALAYA

President's Speech at Royal Banquet in Kuala Lumpur

The President of India. Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following speec at the Royal Banquet given in his honour by His Majesty the Yang-di Portuan Abong, Supreme Head of the Federation of Malaya, during his visit to Malaya:

My Great and Good Friend, I thank you most sincerely for the kind

thoughts and sentiments that you have expressed on this occasion.

As Your Majesty has been pleased to point out, the relations between your country and mine have been of a most intimate character, and have left their indelible mark in thought, word, and all other cultural expressions. It is after all these links which have kept different people and countries in terms of amity and goodwill. And if I may be permitted to say, it is a lack of proper appreciation of these values that is leading to estrangement and worse between peoples. Science and technology have made tremendous progress and abolished distance. The natural result of this should be closer links and friendlier contacts, but man's spiritual progress has not kept pace with the scientific achievement, and mankind is walking literally on the crater of a world-wide volcano which may explode any day. Let us hope and pray that humanity in man will assert itself and turn all these potential engines of destruction into instruments of production and happiness. I am therefore hoping that the contact which is being renewed with vigour today will be fruitful of the good that is expected of it, namely better understanding, truer appreciation and stronger bond of friendship.

Apart from a great thankfulness, my deepest feeling now, if I may say so, is that of great

<Pg-362>

humility. It is the kind of humility that one experiences when one is face to face with history, with the weight of years of struggle behind and the vista of years of endeavour ahead.

Two decades ago, freedom was a goal that we were endeavouring to reach, but could not predict when we would be able to attain it. Yet we knew that there was no limit to human endeavour, and that God willing, one day we would win freedom. We did. And after years of endeavour you have also done the same.

Now that we both have attained freedom and have earned the great privilege of liberty, you and I, your country and mine, your people and mine--we are all travellers on the same road--the road to a future that is bright and full of hope but which demands from us devoted and dedicated work. I feel convinced that we both in Malaya and in India will work together as friends and equals towards this future.

Both Pour Governments and peoples are engaged in the common task of giving to our political freedom that economic and social content which makes for peace, progress and the betterment of the lot of the common man. We shall devote ourselves to these noble tasks in a spirit of humility and dedication in the service of our people. On behalf of myself, my Government and the people of India, I bring our warmest felicitations and good wishes to the people of Malaya and wish all success to Your Majesty and the Government of the Federation of Melaya in their efforts to promote the happiness and prosperity of

your people and enable them to make their contribution to the peace and happiness of mankind.

Your Highnesses, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you the toast of my great and good friend, His Majesty the Yang-di Portuan Agong.

MALAYSIA INDIA USA

**Date**: Dec 29, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **MALAYA**

President's Speech at State Banquet in Kuala Lumpur

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a speech at the State Banque given in his honour by Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman of Malaya on Dec 07, 1958.

The following is the full text of his speech:

I have indeed deemed it a great privilege to have been invited by His Majesty to visit this country as his guest. Please be assured that my people are fully aware of the honour done to me and through me to them as well. The achievement of independence by Malaya has been a matter of great pleasure and satisfaction to us and we are fully convinced that under your able leadership and guidance the people of Malaya will successfully carry the burdens these advances in science and technology in service of liberty and freedom impose on all of us. I regard my visit to your country as a quest in search of old bonds of friendship and brotherhood and their renewal and strengthening and not as a matter of mere ceremonial pomp and pageantry. I am confident that this visit will further strengthen the close and friendly relations between our countries and our people.

The countries of Asia and Africa are coming into their own and with the achievement of freedom are grappling with the tremendous problems of social and economic development which are vital for the happiness of our people. For this purpose we want peace and mutual cooperation for the common benefit of all countries of the world. We are living in a dynamic age--the advances in science and technology have reached a level which is staggering. The great need of today is to do all we can to press these advances in science and technology in the service of man for his betterment and prosperity. Both our countries face similar problems. The main task is to give economic and social

content to our freedom and independence.

I would assure you that I and my people value the friendship of your country and we look forward to ever-increasing cooperation with your country and your people in the pursuit of our common ideals of peace and economic and social development for the welfare and happiness of our peoples. I am confident that under the wise and courageous guidance of its leaders your country and your people will reach their true destiny and make their contribution to the betterment and prosperity of the people of the world.

<Pg-363>

#### MALAYSIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 07, 1958

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **RUMANIA**

### Shri K. D. Malaviya's Statement in Lok Sabha

A statement detailing the salient features of the agreement with the Rumanian Government for the setting up of an Oil Refinery in the public sector in Assam was laid by Shri K. D. Malaviya, Minister for Mines and Oil, on the table of the Rajya Sabha on Dec 23, 1958.

The statement was laid in reply to a question by some Hon. Members of the House.

The Agreement inter alia includes the following: Offer of a long term credit of Rs. 52,380,900/- to cover the value of supplies to be made and technical and other services to be rendered by them;

- (ii) the credit will bear an interest of 2.5 per cent per annum;
- (iii) 15% of the total credit will be repaid in six instalments in non-convertible rupees;
- (iv) 85% of the total credit will be repaid in ten instalments, in Indian rupees, with the first two commencing on 31-12-1961 and the last one ending on 31-12-1965;
- (v) the Rumanian Government will buy Indian goods as far as possible against the payments made. The unutilized balance against these payments may be converted into transferable free currency after 1-4-

1961, if so desired.

**USA INDIA** 

**Date**: Dec 23, 1958

# **Volume No**

1995

#### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

#### Promotion of Technical Education

An agreement to further develop economic co-operation between India and the U.S.S.R. was signed in Moscow on Dec 12, 1958. India's Ambassador, Shri K.P.S. Menon, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. V.P. Elyutin, the Soviet Minister for Higher Education, signed it on behalf of the Government of the U.S.S.R.

The agreement provides for the supply of equipment, free of charge as a gift to India from the Soviet Union, amounting to a sum of Rs. 36 lakhs for the laboratories of physics, electrical engineering, radio engineering and television, electronic devices, geodesy and central scientific and technological research at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay. The Institute, the second in the chain of the four higher technological institutions being established by the Central Government, has already been receiving considerable assistance in the shape of equipment and professors through UNESCO from out of the Soviet contributions to the U.N.O. Fund.

The agreement also provides for the training of 50 Indian engineers in the U.S.S.R. for a period of two to three years with the object of strengthening the teaching staff in the various technical institutions in the country. The entire cost of training which will commence in 1959 will be borne by the Soviet Government. A large number of the trainees will be drawn from among young bright graduates of Indian Universities, who on completion of their training in the U.S.S.R. will work as teachers in the technological institutions. A number of Soviet professors and teachers will also be deputed to India to work on the teaching staff of the Indian institutions. It is expected that this measure will greatly help in relieving the shortage of highly qualified technical teachers in the country.

The agreement further contemplates publication in India of selected Russian text books in engineering. The Government of the U.S.S.R. has undertaken to make available to India translation into English of

such text books as may be selected for the purpose.

The detailed negotiations leading to the agreement were conducted by an Indian delegation consisting of Shri G. K. Chandiramani, Joint Educational Adviser (Technical) to the Government of India in the Ministry of Scientific Research & Cultural Affairs, and Brig. S. K. Bose, Commandant, College of Military Engineering, Poona. The delegation returned to India on December 13, 1958 after a stay of three weeks in the U.S.S.R.

<Pg-364>

INDIA RUSSIA USA

**Date**: Dec 12, 1958