1959

Volume No

| 1995 | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | |
| Content | | |
| | | |
| Foreign Affairs Volume V | s Record 1959 JANUARY | No. 1 |
| | CONTENTS | |
| FOREIGN AN | ND HOME AFFAIRS | |
| | Republic Day Broadcast Message to Indian Nationa | ls Abroad 2 |
| INDIA IN TH | E UNITED NATIONS | |
| | a's Statement on Economi ed Countries | c Development in Under- 2 |
| INDIA AND | GHANA | |
| Dr. Nkruma Prime Minis Press Comm | ter's Reply | 4 5 6 |
| INDONESIA | | |
| Trade Agree | ement Extended | 7 |
| MONGOLIA | N PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC | |
| Promotion o | f Trade | 7 |
| SWEDEN | | |
| | | |

7

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| Indo-U.S. Co-operation Programme Extended | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|
| UNITED KINGDOM | | | |
| Air Services Agreement Reviewed | 8 | | |
| UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC | | | |
| Instruments of Ratification Exchanged | 9 | | |
| WEST GERMANY | | | |
| Loan Agreement Signed | 9 | | |
| YUGOSLAVIA | | | |
| Marshal Tito's Visit Marshal Tito's Speech Press Communique | 10 11 12 | | |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA GHANA INDONESIA MONGOLIA SWEDEN USA GERMANY YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Broadcast

The President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following Republic Day broadcast to the nation on January 25, 1959 :

I take this opportunity once again to talk to my countrymen, to greet them and offer them my best wishes on the eve of our Republic Day. it is the ninth Republic Day that we are celebrating and it is well to remember that our Republic is still young, but it is growing at a pace which fills our hearts with pride and gives not only to us but to our friends outside as well a sense of satisfaction.

In these recent years we have seen the spectacle of a gigantic effort to mobilise the whole nation to develop its resources and to reconstruct its economic life. Despite handicaps and numerous difficulties, which planning in such a vast country as India of necessity involves, we have gone on and intend to go on from plan to plan till we have made sure that every citizen of the Indian Republic can have a reasonable standard of living and enjoys a measure of social security. On the progress that we have made in this direction so far, we have been the recipients of compliments from many a foreign visitor and impartial critic. While this naturally makes us happy, we are only too conscious of the difficulties we have to contend against and the shortcomings we have to get over. whenever, therefore, we allow our minds to wander and bring the affairs of the State within the purview of thought, both the sides of the picture emerge to view. Let us see how the situation stands.

During the year that is ending today I have had occasion to visit a few foreign countries. It pleases me a great deal to see that India is held in high esteem by the peoples and leaders of those countries. There is admiration for the manner in which we have conducted ourselves since the dawn of freedom. There may be several factors like our ancient heritage and our tremendous efforts in tackling the problems of economic reconstruction and industrialisation that have helped others to formulate their views about India, but I have no doubt in my mind that the biggest single factor that has been responsible for eliciting this appreciation abroad is our foreign policy. By many India is looked upon as a bulwark of peace and as, a nation which stands for the progress and freedom of all nations, which recognises diversity in the pattern of ideologies and administrations and which at the same time believes that given mutual goodwill and tolerance, all these diverse patterns can co-exist. The fact that we are trying to solve our problems by well recognised democratic methods adds to that appreciation.

I feel happy to say that this policy has won us friends and well-wishers in foreign lands. But at the same time it casts a heavy responsibility on all Indians at home and on those of our nationals living in foreign lands. We must see that in our thinking and our day-to-day behaviour we refrain from doing anything which may not conform to this policy of tolerance and coexistence. A nation's ideology and policies are often judged from the behaviour of its nationals.

Coming to things nearer home, it is wellknown and easily understandable that planned economy imposes great stresses and strains on the people. A nation in this respect is not far different from a family unit. In order to plan a better future and to build up a happier life, both have to make sacrifices, undergo some strain and possibly some suffering. It may well mean dislocations and deprivations. but the idea of ultimate achievement sustains them, helping them to endure those sufferings willingly. if, therefore, our planning has imposed any such hardships on certain sections of our people, it is expected that in the larger interest of the nation and a brighter and happier future, these will be faced without demur.

What is of utmost importance is the spirit of sacrifice, the willingness to give voluntarily in the present in order to have more in the future through our own efforts. It would be wrong to imagine that austerity as a virtue belonged only to the past or that the spirit of sacrifice is not needed to build up a free nation. If anything, there is greater need for this spirit today than it was before when we were engaged in the struggle for freedom. It is my earnest request to all my countrymen, to all my brothers and sisterswherever they live, whether in towns or in the country-side, to ponder over the situation and ask themselves whether they have made or are willing to make their share of the sacrifice for the building of the India of our dreams.

The problem of food is a basic problem for all and especially for us. With our great traditions of agriculture going back to centuries and the capacity for work and shrewdness and intelligence

1

of our people it is really a matter of shame and humiliation that we should have to look to other countries for food and spend hundreds of crores of rupees on importing it. Let every agriculturist realise that in increasing production and enhancing the yield per acre of land he is not only doing a great national service but also improving his own standard and thus combining and identifying national interest with his own. Once this realisation comes it should not be difficult by intensive cultivation and the use of improved methods to raise the yield twofold and solve this difficult problem and become free from the everpresent ghost of hunger.

Brothers and sisters, I would ask you to pause and think of the great opportunity that has come your way and the responsibility that has devolved upon you. The task of raising a new edifice has been entrusted by Fate to you, for you are the builders of a new India. Can any sacrifice be too great to see that you have done your duty and helped your nation, that has tasted the fruit of freedom after a long spell of foreign domination, to reach its destiny?

In the midst of national rejoicings, I have perhaps struck a different note, but truly speaking, the two are not at variance with each other. Rejoicings which flow from a sense of responsibility are truly rich and abiding. I wish you all the best of luck and prosperity in the coming year.

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad broadcast the following message to Indian nationals abroad on the occasion of the Republic Day, January 26, 1959 :

I send my greetings to all my countrymen in foreign lands on the happy occasion of the 9th

anniversary of our Republic. It was my privilege to have met many of them during the last year when I happened to visit Japan, Malaya and Indonesia. Meeting them, talking to them from close and hearing about them from others gave me much satisfaction and pleasure. I had also an opportunity of meeting large numbers of the Indian community in Hong Kong and on the airports in Rangoon, Bangkok and Singapore.

What I told these brothers and sisters of our country whom I happened to meet, I would like to say to Indian nationals living in other lands also. First of all, let me tell them something about the pace of progress at home. We are pursuing relentlessly our goal to achieve social and economic reconstruction in a planned manner and in stipulated stages. In all parts of India big and small projects and good many community development schemes in our rural areas are in progress. If and when you are able to visit India, I can assure you of at least a few pleasant surprises. The countrywide awakening and the feeling of consciousness have begun to bear fruit.

There is something which I would like you also to bear in mind. The people of the countries in which you are now living are bound to judge India through you and from your day-to-day behaviour. For this reason you do not have to act in an artificial manner. You are only to keep in mind the fact that you are the citizens of free India and that all that you do and the way in which you conduct yourselves have something to do with other people's assessment of the mother country. I must compliment you all on the good things that I heard about many of you during my recent State visits to Japan, Malaya and Indonesia.

Once again I send you all my greetings and hearty good wishes for a happy and prosperous New Year.

INDIA JAPAN INDONESIA HONG KONG REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement on Economic Development in Under-DevelopedCountries

Shri C.S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made a statement in the Governing Council of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development in Under-Developed Countries on January 27, 1959.

The following is the full text of his statement :

The establishment of the Special Fund is another milestone in the progress of the United Nations. In the creation of this fund lies the

2

fulfilment of one of the major objectives set out in the preamble to the Charter and the mandate in Article 55 of the Charter to promote "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development". I need hardly say that throughout the years my country has laid the greatest emphasis on this and we believe that prosperity, like peace is indivisible and that it would be a sad and unharmonious-even dangerous-world if it were part prosperous, part wealthy and part poor. suffering from the ills associated with poverty. The creation of the Fund has other significance too. It is the realisation by the United Nations that common effort is necessary to contribute towards the amelioration of the conditions in what are now called 'under-developed' areas. Secondly, it is the beginning of a co-operative step by the nations of the world to solve one of the world's oldest and most pressing problems. We know by experience that co-operative methods in national affairs produce the best results for the good of the community; likewise such efforts in international field promise much good for the under-developed countries and the international community as a whole. Thirdly, it is significant that the Special Fund brings together big powers whom recent developments have often led

into competitive conflicts in various fields, including fields of economic assistance to under-developed countries, in a joint effort to aid the economy of under-developed countries. The creation of the Special Fund is thus very satisfying to my delegation and it is fully in consonance with the policies of my Government and the spirit that has animated its discussions here. If I may say so, it is a very good augury for the future. In our view the Special Fund is important more for the future than for what it promises immediately. The larger the area of the co-operative efforts as are embodied in the creation of the Fund, the better it will be for all concerned and for the United Nations.

Having said all this, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say a few words about the basic realities. I think I am merely reiterating the well-known facts, but it is better that at this initial stage we should recall them to our mind. The population of the under-developed countries covers 2/3 of the world's population. The gap between the per capita income of the most developed country in the world to-day, i.e. the USA, \$2,500 and an Asian country at \$70-\$80 gives some measure of the vastness and complexity of the problem. When I mention the figures I do so with all admiration for the tremendous achievement accomplished by the US. The problem is thus colossal and the beginnings represented by the United Nations expanded technical assistance and the Special Fund are really small. Much more is to be done by the United Nations if it is to fulfil the mandate conferred by the Charter.

The Special Fund is welcome, nevertheless. It is the greatest common measure of understanding and agreement. It is a long delayed step in the right direction. It is our hope that all countries, including the big powers, will contribute more and more resources to the Fund to permit expansion of its scope and activity. In this connection I would entirely agree with the distinguished delegate of Yugoslavia. It would, I think, not be out of place to bring to the attention of the members of the Council two aspects of the Fund to which my delegation attaches importance. May I invite attention to para 3 of the U.N. General Assembly resolution 1219 of 14 December 1957 which was reaffirmed in part C of the resolution 1240 of the last session of the General Assembly and paragraph 56 of the

resolution which set up the Fund ? It is clear from these that the Special Fund is a kind of a stage in a larger and more extended goal, and it is the view of my delegation that our deliberations and our discussions should always keep in view the larger objectives which the U.N. itself has laid down. In the resolution, for reasons with which we are all familiar, we were not able to achieve too much. It is also relevant to note in this connection that under-developed countries are really crying for technological development. It will not do to over-emphasise the agricultural aspect. Under-developed countries are convinced that without a balanced agricultural and technological development they cannot really reach any standards of improvement or succeed in augmenting the standards of living. Therefore, as a general comment I would say that in our projects we should be careful not to over-emphasise those aspects which relate to agriculture, livestock and other related developments.

I was deeply impressed by the words of the Managing Director that we must not be content with the old concepts of how the interests of the people of the world can best be advanced or the rate at which they can be advanced. In this day of startling scientific achievements and rapidly advancing technology old standards are not good enough. We dare not be pedestrian either in our thinking or in our actions. We entirely agree. I think we shall justify ourselves and the hopes, however feeble, of the under-developed countries, in the Special Fund, if our discussions, deliberations and decisions are animated by these broad concepts and imagination is brought to bear on his question. We think that it should be the 3

purpose of the U.N. Special Fund and of the Governing Council to act harmoniously so that more and more capital should be available from the big powers and other capital-rich countries. We hope that even if they have not been able to contribute much this year, there will be larger contributions from them in the future, and that these countries will be encouraged and justified by the work that we put in. With the Managing Director and his able Deputy this should not be difficult. A good beginning has already been made and we are confident that better things are to come.

As regards the projects, may I suggest, on a somewhat different note from what the Managing Director said, that the Fund should not be content in treating itself as a purely service organisation. It is true that the initiation of projects must lie with the under-developed countries themselves, but I believe that the Fund can safely play a useful part in suggesting and helping many underdeveloped countries to take proposals. Many countries have not the equipment, technical knowledge and personnel, etc. for the formulation of these projects and assessment of their needs and we feel that the Fund should not fight shy of taking the initiative even if it is likely to be slightly misunderstood. We feel that assistance such as that will be very welcome in many countries. I can certainly say that in my country such an initiative will always be welcome, although we ourselves have the equipment and the personnel necessary to formulate and initiate the projects.

The classification of projects as indicated in the Managing Director's report appears to be generally sound, but at this stage we should be careful not to adopt too rigid a classification, either as regards the amounts or the category of proposals. After all, we are chartering unexplored territory and we have first to get the maximum of information, the maximum of proposals from different countries, and I would support the suggestion made by the Yugoslav delegation that there should be a preliminary phase followed by subsequent phases of programme. I think this is very essential in the initial stage. We know that it is not very easy, but we leave it to the Managing Director to consider this matter and let the Special Fund have programmes on that basis.

Mr. Chairman, these are the general remarks that I wish to make. I would like to conclude by wishing the Fund the maximum of success. I hope that our deliberations will be animated by the larger considerations and that we do not convert ourselves merely into a body dispensing a certain amount of money, fifty million or a hundred million dollars. We should, I think, keep our objectives in view with the faith which has inspired this Fund. It really is a materialisation of the desires of large numbers of people all over the world that the United Nations is the best forum of channelling economic assistance. The Special Fund is a very humble effort, but let us make it a bigger affair through our deliberations.

INDIA USA YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND GHANA

Dr. Nkrumah's Speech

At the invitation of the Government of India, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana, paid a visit to India from December 22, 1958 to January 8, 1959. On January 2, Dr. Nkrumah gave a Banquet in honour of Prime Minister Nehru in New Delhi. Speaking on the occasion Dr. Nkrumah said:

My dear Prime Minister, Your excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I thank you for the welcome accorded to us, Mr. Prime Minister, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you personally for making it possible for me through your invitation to visit India. And secondly I want to thank on behalf of myself and my party the Government and the people of India for the warm welcome and the spontaneous reception which has been accorded to me and my party wherever we have been since our arrival in India a fortnight ago. We have enjoyed ourselves immensely and we carry back with us to Ghana, and for that matter Africa, sweet memories of our visit. We have learned a lot and as I said somewhere else we have in many other ways followed the footsteps of India, except in one thing. We have not as yet been able to declare Ghana a Republic within the Commonwealth, but I hope that it will not be long when we shall take that step to declare Ghana a Republic within the Commonwealth.

Since our arrival here we have been around and we have seen many things and we go back I won't say sad-and I know how sad it is to part in circumstances such as these, but I hope what we have observed and what we have seen will go with us, so that it would be the basis for continuing the cement which, we hope, will be established between the people of Ghana, and India. There exists friendship and goodwill, but I hope that my visit here would strengthen that friendship and that goodwill, so that that also ran be a basis for further development in Africa which would bring India closer to Ghana and to Africa and for that matter Africa and Asia. It is in this spirit, Mr. Prime Minister, that we leave you and I hope that other opportunities also will come for us to come this way. Before I leave, I do not want to solicit any promise from you, but I hope it will not be long before you will make it possible to visit Ghana and some other parts of the African continent.

So, with these few words, Your Excellencies, let us all get up and drink the toast to my esteemed friend, Mr. Prime Minister, and the Government and the people of India.

GHANA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND GHANA

Prime Minister's Reply

Replying to Dr. Nkrumah Shri Nehru said:

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: Some days ago we welcomed you here, and today we are in a sense bidding you good-bye from Delhi at least. I am very glad that you are spending some more days in India and going to the southern part of this big country. I am glad of that, because I hope you will have some good rest there as you intend having, and secondly because any person who comes to India and does not go to the south of India has not seen India. South of India is of course an essential part of India, but it is a particular part of India with its own charm, and therefore to form some idea of India it is necessary to see both the north and the south. But even so, you will have seen only a small part of this country, and during the last many years I have seen only a part of this country in spite of efforts and a good deal of travelling.

We welcomed you and you came here for a variety of reasons, personally as a great leader of your people and of Africa and also as the symbol of the African people who are emerging into freedom. That freedom will have no doubt come to them. But perhaps almost the first essential of that freedom is not the political change that comes but the inner freedom of the spirit that comes to a people when they resolve to be free. I remember how our great leader Gandhiji used to tell us that you will be free when you feel free and that the rest will follow. I think that there is a great deal of truth in that. Any kind of freedom that comes by some change of circumstances without that inner feeling is not a very firm freedom. What one observes in Africa from a distance is that inner spirit of freedom rising among the people, and if that is there, the rest of course follows. Unfortunately we live in a world full of quarrel and trouble, struggle and tension, and often enough the problem is looked at, the struggle is looked at as between two parties involving the victory of one party and possibly the defeat of another which is unfortunate. If it could be so arranged that the victory of one party is also the victory of the other, how good it would be I remember some words said by a very great son of India who lived long long ago, and he said : the true victory is one in which everybody is victorious and none is defeated. I do not know if that is feasible or possible in this world of ours wholly, but certainly it might be partly possible. At any rate it would be a good thing if we tried to gain our victories in this way even though we do not wholly succeed in conveying

the sense of victory to all concerned. Probably we are arriving at a stage in the world's affairs when there really cannot be an ultimate victory of one or the defeat of one without involving the defeat of so many, and so I hope that in this freedom of the people of Africa to which we all look forward so much, in this freedom there will be a sense of victory to all people or nearly all and not a feeling that some one has been defeated.

Well, that is a hope which when, I do not know, will be wholly realised, but, at any rate, if we approach the question in this way, it does tone down the bitterness of struggle. And what is more important still, when the struggle is ended, it leads to reconciliation much more easily than otherwise. You know, Mr. Prime Minister, and you have seen for yourself the amount of fellow feeling that there is here in India for your country and for the people of Africa as a whole, and your coming here has been very welcome. It would have been welcome in any event, but this helps not merely us, the few gathered here around this table or a select few in thinking of these matters, but it brings

5

the question more vividly to the great masses of people and the individual brings it who comes and with you, in a sense, comes a whiff of the air of Africa here and the beliefs and the longings and the hopes and aspirations of those people, and the masses of India, who had also struggled and had those hopes and aspirations and had a measure of satisfaction in reaching their goal for the time being, can easily understand that and can easily put themselves in the place of others, and so your coming here has been helpful in creating that feeling and sensation in larger numbers of our people that vivid realisation of something that was known to them, about which they read and intellectually appreciated, but now it is something more than intellectual appreciation; it is an emotional appreciation and that is a deeper understanding and appreciation than merely an intellectual one. So, in the larger causes that you and we have at heart, your coming has been of help, and I am sure it will lead to that greater understanding, sympathy and affectionate following of events as they unravel themselves than what merely thinking of distant

events might have done.

You know that you will go back from here with all our goodwill and affection, if I may say so, and that goodwill and affection will be with you even when you are far away from us.

You referred to the possibility of my going to your country. I cannot at the present moment say when I will be fortunate enough to be able to go there, but I can tell you this that I am anxious and eager to go there and I hope to go there.

And now may I ask Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the good health and to the good fortune of the Prime Minister of Ghana and the people of Ghana ?

GHANA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND GHANA

Press Communique

Dr. Kwame Nkrumah. Prime Minister of Ghana, paid a visit to India from December 22, 1958 to January 8, 1959. The Ghana Prime Minister had talks with Prime Minister Nehru in Delhi on various subjects. On the conclusion of the talks a Press Communique was issued by the Ministry of External Affairs on January 3, 1959. The Communique says :

During his stay in Delhi, the Prime Minister of Ghana had many informal and friendly talks with the Prime Minister of India on current international problems and other matters of mutual interest. In particular, the two Prime Ministers discussed recent developments on the African continent and welcomed the awakening amongst the people of Africa and their great desire for freedom and independence. They expressed the hope that the countries of Africa, which are not free at present, will gain their independence through constructive and peaceful methods. They welcomed the closer association of Ghana and Guinea, and hoped that other countries in Africa will also develop closer cooperation for their mutual benefit and in the cause of world peace.

The two Prime Ministers deplored the policies of racial discrimination and the denial of fundamental human rights in some parts of Africa, which were opposed to the basic conceptions of the Charter of the United Nations as well as friendly relations between nations.

The two Prime Ministers agreed that, in the present context, international problems cannot be solved by war, and it is only through peaceful methods and mutual tolerance and understanding that satisfactory settlements can be arrived at. It is therefore towards the lessening of international tensions, the removal of colonial domination and the promotion of understanding among nations, that their Governments will address their efforts.

The most urgent tasks for both their countries, as well as for other countries in Asia and Africa, are to give economic and social content to political freedom, thus ensuring a fuller and richer life for their peoples. Advances in science and technology have opened out wonderful opportunities for the betterment of mankind. It is a tragedy that these scientific and technological advances are being largely used for increasing armaments and, in particular, for the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. Effective steps towards disarmament are, therefore, essential in order to reduce the tensions that afflict the world. An immediate step should be the stoppage of all nuclear tests.

The two Prime Ministers are happy at the friendly relations existing between their two countries, which have been further strengthened by the visit of the Prime Minister of Ghana to India.

6

GHANA INDIA USA GUINEA RUSSIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Trade Agreement Extended,

Letters were exchanged in Jakarta on January 10, 1959 between the Ambassador of India to Indonesia on behalf of the Government of India and the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, extending upto June 30, 1959, the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries.

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 household utensils.

Among the items listed for exports from Indonesia to India are copra and cocoanut 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 :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Promotion of Trade

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on January 14, 1959 between Shri B.B. Saksena, Director of the State Trading Corporation of India, and Mr. Chimdin Avirmit, Vice-Minister of Foreign Trade, Mongolia, on behalf of the Mongolian foreign trade organisations for the purpose of promoting trade between the two countries.

It was affirmed by both parties that all commercial and non-commercial payments between them would be effected in non-transferable Indian rupees. The sale and purchase of goods between the two countries would be by means of contracts entered into by the foreign trade organisations of the Mongolian People's Republic on the one hand and the State Trading Corporation of India as well as private parties in India on the other.

Lists of goods available for export from either country were exchanged. Goods available for export from India include such traditional items as jute goods, tea, coffee, mica, shellac, manganese ore, coir and coir manufactures, tobacco, carpets and also such comparatively new items as leather manufactures, handloom products, light engineering goods and electrical appliances. The main items available for export from Mongolia are wool, hides and skins, furs, meat and butter, live animals and minerals.

It is hoped that the arrangement between the two organisations will lead to development of trade between the two countries and the eventual conclusion of a trade agreement.

MONGOLIA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

SWEDEN

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

Instruments ratifying the Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation between India and Sweden which had been initialled at official level during the Indian Tax Delegation's visit to Stockholm in July, 1958, were exchanged in New Delhi on January 23, 1959 between Her Excellency Mrs. Alva Myrdal, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Sweden and Shri E.S. Krishnamoorthy, Chairman, Central Board of Revenue, Ministry of Finance. A notification under the Income-tax Act has been issued in a Gazette of India Extraordinary. With the completion of these formalities, the Agreement will come into force in both countries.

7

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

The Agreement will be effective in India for and from the assessment year beginning on April 1, 1959.

SWEDEN INDIA MALI USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Cooperation Programme Extended

The Indo-U.S. Technical Cooperation Programme, under which 5 Land Grant colleges of the U.S.A. are cooperating with Indian institutions engaged in agricultural education and research, is to be extended for a period of two years-from 1960 to 1962.

Also, it is proposed to constitute a new joint Indo-American team to suggest measures for the improvement of facilities in the field of agricultural education and research in India. The first team was constituted in 1954.

The new joint Indo-American team proposed to be constituted by the Government of India will evaluate the progress made in the last five years, make recommendations with special reference to the Third Five Year Plan and measure the extent to which the inter-institutional arrangements have helped in the development of agricultural education, research and extension programmes in the country and the need for continuing the arrangement during the Third Five Year Plan.

The agreement concluded with the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission in March 1955 provided for the deputation of experienced staff members from the American Universities for teaching and research work in India, fellowships for advanced training of Indian staff members in selected subjects in the U.S.A. and supply of laboratory equipment and books not ordinarily available in India. The five U.S. Land Grant colleges participating in the programme are (1) Illinois University, (2) Ohio University, (3) Missouri University, (4) Kansas State College and (5) Tennessee University.

Under the agreement, 43 American technicians were assigned to various Indian institutions and of these 24 are still working in India. Of the 148 Indian participants to receive advanced training in the U.S.A., 36 have completed their training while 82 are at present undergoing training. The remaining 30 are likely to leave for U.S.A. during the next three months.

The programme, which is at present confined to 40 State agricultural veterinary colleges and two Central research institutes-the Indian Veterinary Research Institute and the National Dairy Research Institute-is to be extended to three more institutions in the country. These are the Veterinary College, Nagpur, the Avinashilingham Home Science College, Coimbatore, and Mysore Veterinary College, Bangalore.

The programme was reviewed at a recent meeting in Delhi of the officials of the Union Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission and American University teachers.

The meeting, which was presided over by Shri K.R. Damle, Secretary, Union Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, also considered suggestions for the development of library services, integration of teaching, research and extension, delegation of greater powers to college principals by the State Governments and the need to replace the existing external examinations by internal examinations.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Air Services Agreement Reviewed

The Government of India issued the following Press Communique on January 29, 1959 on the conclusion of the civil air transport talks between officials of the Governments of India and

8

the United Kingdom :

The civil air transport discussions between officials of the Indian and the U.K. Governments which have been taking place in Delhi since January 12, 1959, concluded on January 28.

The inter-Governmental Air Services Agree-

merit provides for these periodical reviews, of which the most recent was in London in 1956. The present review has taken place in an atmosphere of the utmost cordiality and no difficulty has been found in extending: with mutually acceptable adjustments, the arrangements agreed in 1956.

A further inter-governmental meeting will be necessary later, when talks between A.I.I and BOAC, which have been in progress for some time, on the possibility of commercial pooling of operations, have been concluded.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

The Instruments of Ratification of the Cultural Agreement between the Governments of India and the United Arab Republic were exchanged in New Delhi on January 13, 1959.

The Instruments were exchanged between Prof. M.S. Thacker, Secretary, Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, on behalf of India and His Excellency Prof. Omar Abou-Richeh, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary for the United Arab Republic in India, on behalf of his country.

Welcoming the agreement, Prof. Thacker expressed the hope that it "will renew the ancient cultural ties between us and pave the way for closer understanding and cooperation between the peoples of our countries and promote thereby international cooperation and peace."

Reciprocating the sentiments, His Excellency Prof. Omar Abou-Richeh said "the agreement will help link our past with our present and establish a nobler and richer heritage for our future generations."

The Cultural Agreement between India and the U.A.R., which consists of twelve articles, declares that the two Governments desire to establish and strengthen the bonds of friendship, promote cultural relations and develop mutual cooperation in scientific, educational and cultural fields between the two countries.

Under the Agreement, the two governments desire to exchange teachers at appropriate levels and members of scientific and cultural institutions of the two countries, grant scholarships to enable students to pursue higher study in the scientific and technical fields etc., mutual recognition of the degrees and diplomas awarded by universities and educational authorities in the two countries.

The two Governments shall also consider the question of establishing cultural institutes in their countries.

The two countries, according to the Agreement, will also promote exchange in the field of sports and scout organisations.

The Agreement further contemplates training of employees or other nationals of one government in scientific, technical and industrial institutions maintained by the other government.

It also envisages the setting up of a Committee consisting of representatives of the two governments which will meet in New Delhi and Cairo by rotation for watching the working of the Agreement in either country.

The Agreement will remain in force for a period of ten years and will come into force 15 days after the exchange of Instruments of Ratification.

INDIA USA EGYPT **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

WEST GERMANY

Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement was signed in Bonn on January 6, 1959 making available a credit of 168 million

9

deutsche marks (forty million dollars) to the Government of India through the German Reconstruction Loan Corporation.

Shri B. F. H. T. Tyabji, India's Ambassador to West Germany, and Dr. Von Brentano, West German Foreign Minister, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective governments.

The agreement is based on the results of the conference held under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in Washington in August, 1958 and on the negotiations conducted between the representative officials of both the governments in Bonn and New Delhi during the visit of Prof. Ludwig Erhard, West German Economics Minister and Vice-Chancellor, to India in October, 1958.

The object of the agreement is to assist India in the implementation of her second fiveyear plan and to ease her foreign exchange situation. It is intended that the credit will be utilised in meeting the commitments in respect of import of goods from the Federal Republic. Both the governments hope that the assistance thus provided will further the implementation of India's second five-year plan and pave the way for further economic co-operation between the two countries.

GERMANY INDIA USA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

YUGOSLAVIA

Marshal Tito's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India His Excellency Marshal Josip Broz Tito, President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, paid a visit to India. He arrived in New Delhi on January 14, 1959 and on the same day a State Banquet was held in his honour by the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Welcoming Marshal Tito, the President said :

Mr. President and Madame Broz, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

You, Mr. President, have been to India as our distinguished guest before, but we are particularly happy that you are accompanied this time by Madame Broz. Mr. President, since your last visit to India, our two countries have come so much closer that you are no longer a stranger in this country. Your last visit was remarkable for the results it achieved. A great reserve of goodwill and understanding towards each other was built up and our two countries have co-operated in various ways since then. In the fields of trade and commerce, technical assistance, culture and education, this close co-operation is particularly noticeable. In the United Nations the delegation of India and of Yugoslavia have on numerous occasions proposed jointly solutions to many complicated problems.

No problem is more urgent or more difficult to solve today than the problem of disarmament and it is a matter of gratification to me personally and to my Government that our common aspirations are likely to be fulfilled to a degree if the progress made at Geneva recently is continued and agreement on the question of suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests is achieved. We sincerely hope that the efforts by the powers at Geneva will succeed. Once this important agreement is reached, it would be possible to move to the next stages. The agreement itself will reduce tension and create that atmosphere in which co-existence, to which both Yugoslavia and India are firmly committed, will be a reality and cold war will gradually disappear.

It is not necessary for me to recount here on this occasion all the common factors that bring our two countries closer. I should, however, briefly mention that neither of our two countries is affiliated to any military blocs, and this fact alone makes it easier for us to understand each other better and to work together for the furthering of peace.

We regret that it has not been possible for you, Mr. President and Madame Broz to spend more time in India during your present visit. At the same time, we appreciate the friendly gesture and the sacrifice you have made in spending a few days with us in the middle of your several engagements. When you return home, you will have visited several Asian countries, and I am confident that your experience of those countries as also your knowledge of their affairs will greatly stimulate that appreciation of each other's interests and culture which is so essential if the world is to move towards peace, not only in the military sense, but also, if I may use the word, in a spiritual sense as well. The ancient

10

civilisations of Asia and Europe have much in common and it is well to remember these common factors in these anxious days rather than stress only the differences.

Madame Broz, as an able and constant companion of the distinguished leader of the people of Yugoslavia, you have contributed a great deal, not only to your country's welfare, but to the greater international understanding. All of us here, I am sure, are happy to see you in India.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have great pleasure in offering a toast of welcome and of good health to our honoured and distinguished guests, Mr. President Tito and Madame Broz.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Marshal Tito's Speech

Mr. President,

Dear Friends,

Allow me first of all to thank you most cordially for the extraordinary warm welcome you and the members of the Government of India, headed by Prime Minister Shri Nehru have accorded to us. I must also say that we were particularly moved by the friendship and sympathy your citizens have expressed towards us and towards our country.

We are on an informal visit this time and therefore the cordial reception which has been extended to us demonstrates even more and to a full extent the friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples of our countries. This is only too natural as we know that we have the same aspirations, that we share the same desire of safeguarding peace, that we want mankind to be free of the constant fear for its destiny, still threatened by a permanent possibility of war. We are particularly concerned by the fact that the greatest discovery of the human genius, the atomic and thermonuclear power is still being used as a deterrent and means of destruction, not as means of peaceful progress, nor as means to secure a happier life for human beings on earth.

We do have much in common. Common are our efforts to safeguard our independence and to attain the stage at which our peoples will have a better and happier life. Common are also our endeavours in the international field, primarily those concerning the peaceful and active co-existence among nations and states with different social systems. We both equally resolutely condemn war as a way of settling international disputes. We have been taught by history that wars do not only bring destruction to human achievements and annihilate the results of the efforts of mankind in general but also create new, even more difficult problems. We resolutely stand for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, by constructive negotiations, because this is the way to assure better and more lasting results.

I should like to emphasize on this occasion that experience hitherto has shown that peaceloving countries which do not belong to blocs have achieved success. They take an active part in international affairs, in the United Nations Organization and outside of it, and contribute to the allaying and decreasing of international tension. In some cases they help to arrest aggression, i.e. war conflicts.

Our country is persistent in the implementation of her policy of peace. The substance of this policy is embodied also in the principles of the Bandung Conference, and that is what firmly links us together in our activities.

Now, I am not a pessimist. I believe in the fulfilment of the great aspiration of mankindthe victory of peace. The international situation is still clouded and does not allow for complacency. And yet, I think that there are signs which foretell the easing of tension. It is only necessary that all the peace-loving forces strengthen their activity and their persistent efforts for the preservation of peace, for peaceful co-operation among nations on the basis of equality, that they intensify their struggle against colonial oppression and against interference in internal affairs of other nations.

I say that it will not be possible to strengthen peace if all nations are not allowed to decide their destiny, if the tendencies of interfering in the internal affairs of other countries further persist. There are many elements which have to be eliminated from the present international practice in the relations between big and small States. If that is done, it will be possible to avert an increase of tension and the danger of war. If that is done, the way will be cleared for constructive international co-operation. These are the problems the responsible leaders of the big powers should always bear in mind, and, obviously, all of us too.

In our bilateral relations, in economic, cultural and other fields, very good results have been achieved so far. I sincerely believe that our countries have great possibilities to expand and deepen even more their co-operation to the benefit of our peoples.

As to the international situation, although we still have causes for concern, I do believe that the peace-loving forces, with Yugoslavia and India among them, will succeed to save mankind from the disaster of a new war. I believe that they will succeed to preserving the peace so irresistably striven for by mankind.

With this great desire in mind, and wishing the realisation of an even closer all-round co-Operation between our two countries in the future, I propose this toast to your health, Mr. President, to the happiness and prosperity of your great country and to the well-being of the Indian people.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA INDONESIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Press Communique

His Excellency Marshal Josip Broz Tito, President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, paid a visit to India in January, 1959. During his stay in the capital Marshal Tito had a series of talks with Prime Minister Nehru on subjects of mutual interest. On the conclusion of their talks, a Press Communique was issued in New Delhi on January 16, 1959.

11

Following is the text of the Communique

During President Josip Broz Tito's brief visit to Delhi, opportunity was taken by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to have discussions with him on a number of subjects of mutual interest.

Talks were held between the two leaders on three different occasions and lasted several hours. The discussion covered current international problems in Europe and Asia. President Tito gave a brief account and impression of his recent visit to several countries.

The exchanges were conducted in an atmosphere of complete frankness and intimate cordiality. Both the leaders expressed their determination to continue to do their utmost for the preservation of peace and the solution of international problems by peaceful methods and negotiations in accordance with the principles of co-existence and the policy of non-alignment to any blocs.

Both the President and the Prime Minister expressed the hope that the present negotiations at Geneva for the cessation of nuclear tests would meet with success at an early date.

The President and the Prime Minister noted with satisfaction that the relations between India and Yugoslavia continued to grow in all spheres and were confident that this trend would be maintained and further strengthened.

Prime Minister Nehru expressed his gratitude and satisfaction for President Tito's visit to India and President Tito conveyed to the Government and people of India his sincere thanks for the cordial welcome given to him.

12

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

AFGHANISTAN

Afghan Prime Minister's Visit:

His Royal Highness Limer-E-Ali Sardar Mohammad Daud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, paid a visit to India in February, 1959. He arrived in New Delhi on February 5, 1959 and on the same day Prime Minister Nehru gave a banquet in his honour. Welcoming the Afghan Prime Minister, Shri Nehru said:

Your Royal Highness, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I was waiting at our airport today eagerly expecting your Highness's arrival, my mind went back to the long past of our countries. When your Highness arrived, I saw the word Ariana inscribed on your Highness's aircraft. I was again reminded of the long ages during which we were connected. It was inevitable that we should be so connected because we were neighbours, and geography is a powerful thing which cannot be ignored. But apart from that, these long ages of contact, sometimes of conflict too, but nevertheless, trade, cultural and other contacts which affected each other so much, came to my mind. Then I thought of the period relatively short in our long history when we were rather cut off from each other, because we were under foreign rule and your Highness's country was also faced with many difficulties, and other great countries from the far were pressing in on your Highness's country. Then came another change when we became independent; not only we, but the change came all over Asia and in Africa also. Now we live in this period of change, and any one can see that one of the major aspects of the modern world, apart from the tremendous discoveries of science which are changing it, has been this re-awakening of the hundreds of millions of people in Asia and the new life that is coursing from the veins of the people of Africa. I am not quite clear if people in other continents have fully realised the strength and the vigour of this new life and also, of course, the tremendous difficulties that have to be faced by these countries of Asia. We became independent, and as a result of that

other things happened which separated our two countries. The partition of India separated direct boundaries and direct contacts. But that made little difference to our age long community of interests, and our old friendship survived. And ever since then we have grown closer to each other for a variety of reasons, among them being mutual interest which is always a Powerful reason. The long memory of our past contacts was there and the moment it was possible to renew them, we renewed them. And then came, as I said, mutual interest. Ever since then in the many important matters that affect the world there has been a very great community of interests between our two countries. Both our countries decided that we should not in the modern international conflicts become a part of them, become associated with what has been known as the cold war, and military alliances and blocs of great and respected countries. And so there was this basic identity of views in regard to these unfortunate developments of the modern world. That also brought us nearer to each other and so we have followed these policies in spite of difficulties and pressures, and whether at the United Nations or elsewhere, we have often seen eve to eve with each other. For all these reasons it has always been a pleasure to us to welcome distinguished visitors from Afghanistan.

Last year we had the privilege of welcoming His Majesty the King of Afghanistan who during his brief stay here won all the people who met him with his charm and with his friendly feelings towards India. Today we have you, your Royal Highness here and we are happy to have you as our distinguished and honoured guest, and if I may say so, our friend. Your visit here has been long awaited. You have been here in the past, rather many years ago, to Delhi, as your Royal Highness was telling me, when the first foundations of this New Delhi were being laid and the rest was a wilderness, well, that wilderness has been encroached upon now and New Delhi has grown up into a big city and the centre of this Republic of ours. But even though that might be the nerve centre, the country is big and is not like New Delhi. It is a country of small villages, small towns and a few big towns, and we have to struggle against the burden of ages, the burden of poverty of our people, and because of that we labour to remove it. We have our plans, the Five-Year Plans and the

like, and your Royal Highness knows very well that when such problems face a nation, even progress itself brings difficulties and greater problems. The moment one solves one problem, others appear on the scene. So we are struggling, struggling with good heart and with faith and confidence in our country and in our people, and if I may say so, in the friendship and co-operation of our friends elsewhere, and more especially your country. We have seen in the past decade this growing friendship between the countries of Asia, even though sometimes they differ from each other. As between Afghanistan and India

13

I cannot remember any point of real difference and it is odd that when two countries have no particular points of difference, they take each other for granted. There is not much to argue, because we agree more or less. And that has been the case with India and Afghanistan in these ten or twelve years. We may have discussed occasionally matters of trade or some other minor matters, but broadly speaking, we have always been in agreement, and this has been a great satisfaction to us. So when your Royal Highness comes here today, we should like you to feel that you are among friends, among people who not only wish your country well, but who wish your country and our country to co-operate with each other, to help each other and to march together to the many common goals that we have together with other countries.

Today, the biggest thing is peace in the world, because without that no country is going to progress, and indeed, every country might meet with disaster. And after that comes the advancement and progress of the countries of Asia, of your country and our country. In this work to which your Royal Highness is devoted in your country and we are devoted in our country, we may be of help to each other. And certainly our friendship itself gives us strength, and so, we welcome you here with all goodwill and friendship, and we hope that after your brief stay in India when your Royal Highness goes back to Afghanistan, you will carry our good wishes to His Majesty the King and to the people of Afghanistan.

May I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and

Gentlemen, to drink to the good health of his Royal Highness.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Sardar Mohammad Daud's Reply

Your Excellency, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very happy to extend my thanks to Your Excellency for your kind words and amicable sentiments.

Ever since our arrival in your great and beautiful country the hospitality and the cordial welcome extended to me and to my companions have reaffirmed to me a fact which takes its inspirations from the friendship and goodwill which the people of Afghanistan and the people of India entertain for each other. These ties of friendship are not new ; they can be traced back through numerous eras in the history of this part of the world, during which period adversities have placed our peoples under test, and they have gone together through brighter or darker days. The history of this region which witnesses the mutual goodwill of our peoples form in reality the foundation of the friendship between Afghanistan and India. While mentioning this truth I am happy, indeed, to represent the people of Afghanistan in their sincere desire for furtherance and consolidation of these ties with the people of this great country.

Throughout its various periods the history of this region stands a witness to the common struggles of the peoples of Afghanistan, India and other countries in this part of the world, for their deliverance from colonialism. The sympathies of the people of Afghanistan have always been with the people of India in their trying days, and likewise, the sympathy and moral support which the people of India have offered to our people during our fight for freedom remain pleasant memories with the people of Afghanistan which they cherish and always appreciate.

Today when this ancient land enjoys in the world a worthy position as a free, young and vigorous country, a mention of that fact gives me sincere pleasure.

The troubled condition of the world today imposes upon nations, large and small alike, the obligation to seek, more than ever before, the promotion of understanding, consolidation of good relations on the basis of mutual confidence and esteem, and creation of an atmosphere of goodwill and close co-operation amongst themselves. If our efforts are not directed towards attainment of this objective, the primary concern of which is the consolidation of peace-this peace which is being threatened today-then our responsibilities are great. This responsibility is to ourselves, to our descendants and to the world in which we live in the hope of a better future. We believe that in our concern for a brighter tomorrow we should take lesson from our past unpleasant experiences. A secure future embodying the peace and security of the world may well be guaranteed by promoting among all nations a spirit of sincere cooperation based on mutual confidence and esteem in economic, social and cultural fields.

The military pacts and armament races are not only creating additional strain and tension, but they are preparing as well the ground for the spirit of lack of confidence which is a great source of concern. We believe that for us the nations

14

of the East, from whom greater efforts are required to meet our necessities of life, a better path exists, and that is to assign our national resources, and direct the energies of our peoples to promotion of better economic conditions and attainment of a higher standard of living, for we know that happier and more prosperous peoples are in better positions to retain and to safeguard their individualities as free and independent nations. I am happy indeed that I see clearly that the tireless efforts of the Government and the people of this great country for reconstruction of their land convey the promise of a prosperous future for the people of India.

Afghanistan's domestic and foreign policies are inspired by our desire to serve the cause of peace in the world. We are fully aware that our needs will be met only in an atmosphere of peace and tranquility. On international issues Afghanistan has always and on every occasion followed a policy of neutrality based on free judgment. This stand based on the aspirations of our people forms the foundation of our policy. In following this policy, which by now has taken the force of a tradition, Afghanistan wishes to see the furtherance of friendly relations and cooperation with all peoples and nations of the world.

It should be mentioned that the existing harmony in the stand of our two countries in the sphere of international affairs, stemming from Afghanistan's policy of neutrality and the policy of neutrality followed by India, is another factor in bringing closer together our respective countries.

I wish to extend my thanks to Your Excellency once again for the opportunity offered me through this kind invitation to get better acquainted with your great country and to convey on behalf of the people of Afghanistan their message of friendship and goodwill to the people of India.

Expressing once more my sincere wishes for greater success of the people of India in their march towards prosperity, I pray for Your Excellency's personal well-being and happiness.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Sardar Mohammad Daud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, visited India from February 5 to February 8, 1959. During his stay in Delhi, the Afghan Prime Minister had talks with Prime Minister Nehru on various subjects of mutual interest. On the conclusion of the talks, a Press Communique was issued by the Ministry of External Affairs on February 8, 1959.

Following is the text of the Communique:

At the invitation of the Government of India, Sardar Mohammad Daud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan, accompanied by Dr. Mohamad Yusuf, Minister of Mines and Industries, and other members of his party. Is now on a visit to India. During his stay in Delhi, Sardar Mohammad Daud had talks with the Prime Minister of India. The discussions which were frank and cordial, covered a variety of subjects of mutual interest, including the current international situation with particular reference to the neighbouring countries. Both the Prime Ministers expressed satisfaction at the close and friendly relations existing between the two countries which are of great help to them both in meeting difficult problems in the present day world.

The talks have disclosed a similarity of outlook on many matters of importance, particularly in the firm rejection by the Governments of India and Afghanistan of military agreements and in their reliance on co-operation and good neighbourly relations between all nations as a surer basis for the maintenance of world peace. The two leaders looked to the recent trend towards a shift in the conflict between the big powers from military to economic composition as an encouraging development.

The two Prime Ministers re-affirmed the common aim of their Governments to strengthen the close and friendly relations which already exist between the two countries.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. Rajendra Parsad, delivered an address to Parliament on February 9, 1959. 15

Following is the full text of his address

Members of Parliament,-

I welcome you once again to your labours in a new session of Parliament.

We are near the end of the third year of the Second Five Year Plan. In my address to you last February I drew your attention to the stresses and strains to which our economy is subject. I expressed the concern of my Government that our temporary difficulties should not lead us in the direction of retarding development and progress. Difficulties should be overcome by reconsideration and revision of methods and by planned mobilisation of resources.

In May, and again in November 1958, the National Development Council took into consideration the problems of resources, of production and of phasing relevant to the Second Plan and decided that the Plan outley should be Rs. 4,500 crores and this total should be reached by conservation of and addition to resources.

The economic policy of my Government has this end in view. Measures have been adopted to limit and phase foreign exchange commitments and expenditure, to arrest rise in internal prices and to increase foreign earnings. Export duties on a number of commodities lave been reduced or abolished and export quotas have been liberalised. In August 1958, as a result of comprehensive review of regulations, export control was removed from as many as 200 commodities and the number of commodities subject to quota restrictions severely curtailed.

My Government have made successful attempts, to secure foreign assistance by way of aid and loans to tide us over our temporary difficulties. Negotiations for further aid are in progress. Aid or loans from foreign countries for which my Government and our people are duly grateful are not governed by the attachment of any political conditions to them. Negotiations in regard to future assistance will also be on the same basis.

Our Second Plan is only part of the whole process of planned development of our economy. The steps we now take are but stages along the long and arduous road to planned prosperity and my Government, through the Planning Commission, have already initiated consideration and studies of the Third Plan. It is hoped that by the end of the Third Plan, a sound foundation will have been laid for future progress in regard to our basic industries, agricultural production and rural development, thus leading to self-reliant and self-generating economy.

Planning is a national undertaking requiring the efforts of the whole nation and the co-operation of all at every stage. My Government have therefore called for, and look forward to a constructive, even if critical, approach by all and contribution in ideas from the different shades of opinion in Parliament and outside. To this end, my Prime Minister and the Planning Commission are seeking the co-operation of all parties.

It is proposed to prepare a preliminary Draft Outline or Plan Frame for the Third Plan by the end of this year. After the preliminary Draft Outline has been discussed and approved, detailed consideration of Central and State Plans will commence. The principal objectives which we have accepted are : a substantial increase in national income, rapid industrialisation, expansion of employment on a sufficient scale, and a reduction in inequalities of income and wealth. The Government will continue to aid and support small and cottage industries. The tempo of development already attained must be maintained and accelerated. Food and food prices are the most important factors in the regulation of our ecomomy. On these largely depend other factors vital to our planning and progress, such as availability of foreign resources for development, the balance of payments position, the maintenance of internal price levels and the arrest of inflation, if and when it tends to set in.

To check the rise in prices of foodgrains, in early 1958, following failure of rains and widespread damage to crops, my Government imported 2.74 million tons of foodgrains in the first eleven months of 1958, regulated internal movement of foodgrains and made supplies available to the consumer through fair price shops. The Reserve Bank enforced its policy of restraint on availability of Bank credit for buying up of foodgrains by private parties.

In this respect self-sufficiency in food alone can provide a satisfactory solution. Increased yields by greater and sustained efforts and the adoption of improved methods in agriculture combined with the necessary agrarian reforms, which would make agriculture both gainful and economic, are imperative. To this end, my Government will seek to promote agrarian reforms, cooperation and devolution of functions to village units.

16

The crop prospects for 1959-60 are in refreshing contrast to our plight the previous year. Nature is being kinder to us this year, and the outlook both in regard to food and commercial crops is promising. We have a very good rice crop and prices of rice have already recorded a marked fall. It is intended to build up considerable stocks and to widen the scope of State trading. Wheat and. gram prices have risen but, according to present indications, the Rabi crop will be good. Our developmental efforts, in regard to the major crops, by intensive production campaigns, greater stress on minor irrigation projects, proper utilisation and maintenance of existing works, increased momentum in the establishment of seed farms, more promising tendencies to adopt better methods, and extension of soil conservation programmes, account in a considerable measure for the more hopeful horizon in agriculture.

The Community Development programme, on which largely depend the effective extension and implementation of democracy in meaningful terms to the large masses of our people, now covers 300,000 villages roughly a rural population of 165 millions. Measures for more effective participation of the people in this vital development are being implemented. The basic unit of our democracy, the Panchayat, is being provided with increased resources and functions. Village Co-operatives are being organised and developed so as ultimately to cover the entire rural area.

Industrial production, as a whole, showed progress, but some industries, notably textiles, have suffered a set-back. Among the industries, both in the public and private sectors, which achieved a substantial increase in output were machine tools, penicillin, insecticides, paper and board, diesel engines, electric motors, sulphuric acid, caustic soda, tyres, sewing machines, bicycles and electric fans. New schemes of development and expansion in the public sector, which are in progress, cover machine building, fertilizers and drugs. Plants to build heavy electrical equipment, heavy industrial machinery and mining machinery are being set up at Bhopal, Ranchi and Durgapur. New fertilizer plants are being established at Nangal, Rourkela and Neyveli, while Sindri has been expanded. Projects for the manufacture of drugs and antibiotics are also among the new development schemes in progress.

I had the pleasure of inaugurating the two large steel plants at Rourkela and Bhilai last week, where production of pig iron has now started. It is expected that steel will be produced in these plants before the end of the year. It is also expected that the first blast furnace at Durgapur will begin to function before the end of the year. The programme of expansion of the steel plant at Jamshedpure has been almost completed and full production will be achieved within a few months. The steel works at Burnpur will complete their expansion programme by the end of the year.

Coal production has increased. Further steps have been taken towards implementing the Neyveli Lignite Project. The Project Report of Neyveli Thermal Power Station has been accepted and action for construction initiated. There have been advances in the development of mineralogy by way of intensive surveys and exploration, and the National Mineral Development Corporation has been established. New deposits of coal, copper and gypsum have been discovered.

The search for oil and natural gas was intensified and has yielded promising results. Drilling for oil has been continued at Jwalamukhi and Hoshiarpur in the Punjab, and will be started soon in the Shibsagar area in Assam. The most significant development has been in the Cambay area of Bombay where oil under considerable pressure has been discovered, and there are indications of several promising oil horizons. It is hoped that by an intensive programme of test drilling, the extent of the potential oil reserves of the Cambay area will be established during this year. Considerable reserves of natural gas have also been found in Naharkatiya Oil Fields.

An agreement has been concluded with the Government of Rumania for the supply of equipment and assistance in the construction of an oil refinery in Assam.

The National Laboratories have played an important part in the plans of industrialisation. They have harnessed the results of their research to production by erection of pilot plants, particularly for the development of coal resources for the steel plants, raw materials for refractories, and in assisting the private sector in certain problems. The Laboratories have in a number of cases made possible the use of indigenous in place of imported material, and also assisted in the utilisation of low grade ores.

My Government have taken steps in several directions to implement the purposes contained in the Scientific Policy Resolution of the 4th of March 1958. Close liaison exists between the National Laboratories and Industry. Laboratory training courses, and grants-in-aid schemes for

17

research promote these relations as well as the scientific approach and the availability of scientificcally skilled manpower. It has been decided to establish National Laboratories for research and development in Mechanical Engineering at Durgapur and Public Health Engineering at Nagpur.

Two more Higher Technological institutes will be opened this year, one in Bombay with the aid of the U.S.S.R. and UNESCO, and the other in Madras with the aid of the Federal Republic of Germany. A College of Engineering is being established in Delhi with United Kingdom aid. The foundation-stone of this institution was laid by His Royal Highness Prince Philip, The Duke of Edinburgh, during his recent visit.

A new Atomic Energy Commission, with executive and financial powers, within the limits of the expenditure sanctioned by Parliament, has been established. Considerable advance and expansion in the field of atomic energy, and exclusively for peaceful purposes, has been made and continues satisfactorily. The aim of planning in this field is the production of all the basic materials required for the utilisation of atomic energy for power. While large-scale achievement in this field of nuclear power must await the later stages of the Third Plan, my Government have decided to install nuclear powered plants to produce electricity of a minimun capacity of 250 thousand kilowatts.

In my address to you last year I said that uranium metal of atomic purity and fuel elements for the reactors will be in production before the end of the current year. I am glad to say that the construction of the uranium metal plant has been completed and has undergone trial runs successfully. The first ingot of atomically pure uranium metal was produced on January 30, 1959. The construction of the facility for producing fuel elements is also far advanced.

The work on the River Valley Multi-Purpose Schemes has progressed during the year according to schedule. The Report of the High Level Committee on Flood Control is under consideration of my Government.

The ports of Calcutta and Madras are to be improved at a cost of 20 crores of rupees, for which the Port authorities have entered into financial agreements with the World Bank.

My Government have met with success in their

endeavours to promote industrial relations on a voluntary and agreed basis. A Code of Discipline", which stresses the need for recognition by employers and workers of both the rights and responsibilities of either side, has been ratified by all Central Organisations of employers and workers. This Code also prescribes certain norms of behaviour. It provides that unilateral action by either side should not be taken, lockouts and strikes should be avoided and the machinery for the settlement of disputes should be utilised expeditiously. The Code also prescribes sanctions to be invoked by the workers and employers organisations in regard to their respective defaulting members. A Tripartite Committee has been constituted to assess the extent of the non-implementation of Labour Enactments and Awards and also to secure their proper implementation. The Employees' State Insurance Scheme, which already covers nearly fourteen lakhs of workers, is being further extended. A beginning has been made in workers' participation in management and Joint Councils have been set up in several industrial undertakings, both in the public and private sectors.

There has been a substantial increase in the output of the Ordnance Factories which has enabled my Government to effect appreciable savings in foreign exchange. There have also been advances in scientific and industrial research and development, and the expansion of facilities in this respect. This has enabled progress in the indigenous production of the materials required for the manufacture of Defence equipment.

The Committee of Members of Parliament constituted in accordance with Article 344 of the Constitution to examine the recommendations of the Official Language Commission has submitted its report. You will have the opportunity of considering it during the current session.

The situation in the Naga Hills shows appreciable improvement. Cases of violence and lawlessness have markedly declined. The Nagas, generally, have appreciated the policy of my Government. In May 1958 the All-Tribal Convention reinforced the decisions of the Kohima. Convention of August 1957. Large numbers of Naps who were previously hostile and had gone underground are now pursuing normal and peaceful avocations. The Sikkim Development Plan, which is financed by India, is making good progress. The road from Gangtok to Nathu La has been completed and is open to vehicular traffic. This road passes through a very difficult mountain terrain and our engineers are to be congratulated on the success of this undertaking. A tripartite

18

agreement to which Nepal, the United States of America and India are parties for the construction of 900 miles of road was signed in January last year. An agreement for the construction of the Trisuli Hydro-Electric Project has been concluded and work begun. This Project will generate 12,000 kilowatts of electricity for the Kathmandu Valley.

Considerable progress has been achieved in the rehabilitation of displaced persons from Pakistan. So far as the displaced persons from West Pakistan are concerned, it is hoped that the last stage of rehabilitation, that is, payment of compensation, will be completed during this year. In regard to displaced persons from East Pakistan, about sixty thousand have moved from camps to rehabilitation sites-during the past year. It has been decided to close the camps in West Bengal before the end of July this year. It is expected that the remaining thirty-five thousand displaced families will have moved by that time from the camps either for work and rehabilitation in Dandakaranya, or to rehabilitation sites in other States.

My Government have recently made certain important changes in regard to arrangements for budgeting and financial control over expenditure from the Civil estimates. In order to secure a speedier implemenation of our development plans, the administrative Ministries have been given wider financial powers to issue expenditure sanctions to schemes which have been included in the Budget Estimates after scrutiny by the Finance Ministry.

An Ordinance, namely, "The Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1959", has been promulgated since the last session of Parliament. A Bill dealing with this Ordinance will be placed before Parliament. Forty-nine Bills were passed by Parliament during the year 1958. Thirteen Bills are pending before you. My Government intend to introduce a number of legislative proposals both by way of new Bills and amendments. Such proposals will include :-

- (1) The Companies (Amendment) Bill.
- (2) Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill.
- (3) The State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Bill.
- (4) The Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund (Amendment) Bill.
- (5) The All-India Maternity Benefit Bill.
- (6) Bill to provide for compulsory notification of vacancies by employers to Employment Exchanges.
- (7) The Geneva Convention Bill.
- (8) The Savings Bank (Amendment) Bill.
- (9) The Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.
- (10) The Children Bill.
- (11) A Bill for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

A statement of the estimated receipts and the expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year, 1959-60, will be laid before you.

My Government note with concern the continuance of world tensions and that basic improvements in the world situation are not yet on the horizon. My Government, however, continue to pursue their policy of non-alignment with the great Power Blocs and of making their contribution wherever possible for the relaxation of tensions.

The vast advances in science and technology have enabled man to dare to explore interplanetary space and have opened up before him great vistas which are full of possibilities for human progress. My Government share with others the concern that these great scientific developments have hitherto been used principally for the making of weapons of mass destruction which threaten the world with annihilation.

My Government note with regret that while some progress has been made at Geneva in regard to the termination of nuclear and thermonuclear explosions, neither in this nor in the more fundamental problem of the prohibition of these weapons of mass destruction or in the general field of disarmament, real progress, much less a settlement, is in sight.

In September last year, my Prime Minister reached agreements with the then Prime Minister of Pakistan in regard to certain border disputes and border problems. These included an agreement for the exchange of Cooch-Behar enclaves in Pakistan with Pakistan enclaves in India. My Government will place before you legislation to implement these agreements.

19

Our own relations with the countries far and near have continued to be friendly.

On the invitation of the Emperor of Japan, I visited Japan at the end of September 1958 and received a warm welcome from the Emperor and the people of Japan.

In December 1958 I paid visits to Indonesia and Malaya on the invitation of the President of Indonesia and the Paramount Ruler of Malaya. In both these countries I was accorded a generous welcome by the Government and the people.

My Prime Minister, in September last year, visited Bhutan with which country we are in special Treaty relationship. He met with an affectionate welcome from the Ruler and the people of Bhutan. He has assured' them of our deep and abiding friendship and our determination not to interfere in their internal affairs. We may hope that improved communications between Bhutan and India will provide closer links between our two peoples.

My Government accorded diplomatic recognition to the new regimes in Sudan, Iraq,

Guinea and Cuba soon after they were established.

We had the privilege of welcoming in this country as our honoured guests during the year : His Majesty the King of Afghanistan; Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal; the President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; the President of Yugoslavia ; the Prime Ministers of New Zealand, Turkey, Cambodia, Pakistan, Canada, Ghana, Norway, Rumania and Afghanistan ; the German Federal Minister of Economics; Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Head of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations, and the Duke of Edinburgh.

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam and Cambodia continued during the year. In Laos, however, the Commission adjourned sine die with the provision that it may be reconvened in accordance with normal procedures. My Government deeply regret that the situation in Laos has worsened and that the hopes to which I gave expression last year of a welcome development in that country have not been justified by events. My Government continue, however, to believe that the peace established by the Geneva Agreements will continue to endure and that the members of the International Commission will co-operate fully with one another and obtain the cooperation of the Laotian Government in the maintenance of peace.

India participated in the United Nations Observation Group in the Lebanon and was able to make its modest contribution in the termination of a potentially grave situation in that area.

The happenings inside the Union of South Africa, resulting from the policy of Apartheid relentlessly pursued by the Government of the Union, inflicting suffering and indignity on the majority of the people of that country and involving the violation of human rights under the United Nations Charter, is of deep concern to us. We may, however, note with some gratification that these policies have been met with overwhelming disapproval by the United Nations. We continue to nurse the hope that the Union Government will respond to the call of world opinion and also recognise that such policies in a resurgent Africa will lead to increased racial bitterness and ultimately to conflicts which may

become widespread.

My Government have welcomed the opening of the Office of the High Commissioner of New Zealand in India last year.

A number of International Conferences have been held in this country in the past year. My Government have been happy to accord the hospitality and welcome of our land and people to our visitors and to contribute in a small measure to world understanding and the mutual exchanges that arise from such meetings.

Members of Parliament, I have placed before you some of the main events and achievements of the past year. We have reason to congratulate ourselves to some extent in regard to our national development and progress. We have, however, even more than ever before, the duty and the opportunity to endeavour with greater determination, discipline and sense of purpose to make our democracy a reality in terms of the masses of our people.

It is the policy, and it will continue to be the endeavour of my Government, to seek in all possible ways to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people and to promote our unity and social well-being and to build a democratic and socialist society, in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent.

Members of Parliament, I bid you to your labours and wish you success. May your endeavours, your unity of ultimate purpose and

20

your high sense of public duty bring increasing prosperity and contentment to our people, stability and security to our motherland, and assist to promote peace and co-operation in the world.

USA LATVIA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA GERMANY NEPAL PAKISTAN SENEGAL SWITZERLAND JAPAN INDONESIA BHUTAN IRAQ SUDAN CUBA GUINEA AFGHANISTAN VIETNAM YUGOSLAVIA CAMBODIA NEW ZEALAND TURKEY CANADA GHANA NORWAY LAOS LEBANON

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on February 12, 1959 on the President's Address to Parliament.

In the course of his statement the Prime Minister referred to various subjects, both national and international, and said, "It is the policy, and it will continue to be the endeavour of my Government to seek in all possible ways to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people and to promote our unity and social well-being and to build a democratic and socialist society, in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent".

Speaking of Goa Shri Nehru said:

Our policy in regard to Goa is absolutely clear. We can never agree to, or tolerate, the idea of any foreign foothold in India, and by India I mean not the Union of India as it is today, but that Union of India plus Goa which is part of India whosoever may, at the present moment, be there.

At the same time we have said that we shall try to achieve our end through peaceful methods not only as a matter of principle but as a matter of practical politics. In the world, as it is today, it is dangerous to try to solve problems by military methods. No one knows where it may lead. And if we try to do it, it would be a negation of the policy that we have proclaimed and try to act up to through all these years. I realise that is distressing. I realise, above all, that it is exasperating. Sometimes we find-even now-that in spite of this policy of ours large numbers of political prisoners exist in Goasome of them still Indian nationals, others may be technically Portuguese nationals, but they belong as much to India as anyone else. It is distressing that they should be kept there, and kept there under very bad conditions. Now, I do not like to criticise other countries, but this House knows that this problem of Goa, well, is connected obviously with Portugal itself, and the conditions in Portugal are not of a bright and shining example of freedom, liberty, democracy or anything. In fact, it is the exact opposite of that and it becomes tied up with other problems in the world. So, while Goa may be a small piece of territory in India, but not at present belonging to India, it is tied up with all kinds of major problems in the world and to seek a solution of it by military methods in the wider context of the world would be to ignore all this wider context and to give up the policy we have sought to pursue. That policy has, I believe, been more and more understood by other countries. That fact that in Portugal itself things have happened which have elicited the strong disapproval of most countries itself indicates the state of affairs in Goa. If in the so-called mother or father country, i.e. Portugal, this kind of thing happens what can you expect in a colonial territory which belongs to it here or in Africa.

Then, about Pakistan. There are various amendments expressing displeasure because we are continually, it is said, trying to appease Pakistan, because we do not hold up the honour of India with sufficient force and claim. Well, Sir, I do not quite know what to say about it, about this matter, because the Pakistan problem or the problems of Indo-Pakistan relations are always with us. We are constantly dealing with them-whether in the shape of questions and answers in this House or in many other ways. We can never forget it. It is too near a problem, near not only geographically but in so many other ways that we just cannot getaway from it even if we want to.

But when we are charged with appeasing Pakistan-on the other hand, other people, of course in Pakistan, charge us with something the very opposite of this-what exactly are the facts or, at any rate, the policy we seek to pursue ? What does appeasement mean ? If appeasement means trying to win over Pakistan, trying to be friendly with Pakistan, trying to create an atmosphere of friendliness between us and help the solution of problems then certainly we appease Pakistan and we will continue to appease Pakistan. If appeasement means giving up any right of ours, giving up any principle of ours or surrendering to any threat then we are entirely opposed to

21

that and we shall always be opposed to that. So, these words do not have any particular meaning ; it depends on how you approach a problem. Sometimes something happens which exasperates us, irritates us and we react for the moment strongly ; Sometimes something happens which on the whole has a more favourable reception. Well, we react accordingly but, the basic policy is something higher than that.

Now, talking about immediate issues, a certain announcement the other day by the Pakistan Government has been welcome to us and that was an announcement giving directions to the broadcasting stations in Pakistan that they should not indulge in anti-Indian propaganda and, to some extent, as far as I know, that direction has been observed thus far. Well, we welcome it and we always try to avoid this kind of mutual recriminations. These are all reactions, expressions from time to time but the basic questions are deeper, as the House knows. The most basic question is this: India and Pakistan, being what they are, geographically, historically, culturally and all that, should obviously have a common policy of co-operating with each other, to be friends with each other; they may go their different ways that they like politically or economically but they should not be hostile to each other all the time. We suffer. both of us. It is now a dozen years since partition and the passions of those days have cooled down to some extent and we can view the problem with a measure of objectiveness but that does not and cannot mean any question of surrendering the basic right or interest of India or surrendering to threats from the other side. We have to find some kind of balance between these and, at any rate, whatever we may say or feel. I believe that in the relations of India and Pakistan, as I hope in the relations of other countries, there should always be an attempt at a friendly approach and we should avoid recrimination and condemnation. I realise that we cannot always do that. Sometimes truth

compels us to say something which is not of liking to the other party but even the bitterest truth could be expressed in non-bitter language at least. To some extent we learnt that in our apprenticeship under Gandhiji and, in this connection, may I say this ? Many of the amendments here protest against the address not having said this or that, not having said, let us say, about the Baghdad Pact or the attempts at a bilateral treaty between Pakistan and the United States of America or something that has happened in Africa or in Western Asia. All these amendments are in terms of condemnation, recrimination and brave words and gestures. I would hope that we would grow out of this somewhat immature references to difficult problems. I can understand strong feelings sometimes about things that are happening but the major thing is that we do not help even in solving the problem or even help going towards a solution. Either we realise that we must solve problems, whether they are world problems or internal problems or we feel that a conflict is inevitable and, therefore, we should keep our swords shining and bright and should be up and about all the time. We must decide which kind of approach we should make. Now, I am not discussing the problem. I am not for giving up of any principle which we consider important but what I am discussing is the manner of approach, either holding to our principles vet not being offensive and trying to soothen, or, the other way of using threatening language and threatening gestures which has become so common in the world today. I would beg of this House and our country in this matter, quite apart from anything else, to at least remember the way in which Gandhiji dealt with his declared opponents of the time, against whom he was struggling.

Having said this, I dispose of, if I may say so with respect, the various amendments dealing with what the President has not said in his Address. They do not like many of the things that are happening in the world. We also do not approve of the Baghdad Pact; we never approved of it and we have expressed that many times. We do not approve of all these military alliances and we have viewed with apprehension the military aid that has been given by the United States to Pakistan because we have felt that that was something which had an unsettling effect. We believe that all these military pacts instead of ensuring security wherever they had come-perhaps I will not make that sweeping remark, but certainly I would say that most of these military pacts to the East or to the West of India have had an unsettling effect and even the existing security such as it was has been lessened and not increased. We have expressed that. So far as the Baghdad Pact is concerned and this military aid that has been given to Pakistan, it has been our firm opinion that this has not been good for anybody concerned, to no one I say, not to India, not for Pakistan and not for the United States. We have expressed that very clearly but there is no good our condemning anybody about it. I believe, in fact I am certain, that our views are felt in the United States and further that they have had some considerable influence. We are, if you look at this wide world, in a curious state today regard to international problems and all the

22

minor problems, whether it is the military aid to Pakistan, whether it is the Baghdad Pact or the NATO or the SEATO or the Warsaw Pact, are all offshoots of the basic struggle, of the basic tug of war that goes on between the two major groups. I do not propose at this stage to discuss this matter except again to affirm that the policy that India has followed in this matter, that is the policy of non-alignment has, I believe, not only justified itself completely but has been appreciated by many people who used to criticise it previously and it has won recognition even where people did not like it. I do believe that it is along those lines that we can render some service not only to ourselves but to the world and we propose to continue it fully. It is only when we are in some matters rather friendly to another country, the country opposed to it imagines that we are weakening in our policy of non-alignment, while it is our declared policy, intention and objective to try to be friendly all the time to all the countries.

Again, I repeat, friendliness does not mean giving up a principle or an interest, because a country that is friendly through fear is not friendly at all. That is not friendliness, if you are afraid of the other party and you shape your policy because of fear. Just if I may quote, in another context, even Gandhiji who was such an apostle of 'Ahimsa' said he did not believe, he did not accept a man calling himself a 'satyagrahi', who was a coward or who was afraid. That is not 'satyagraha". In fact he went further. He said if you have a sword in your heart, it is better to take it out and use it than talk softly outside and keep the sword in your heart and be false to yourself and to others. So, it is not through fear that way, I hope, we have these policies or that we are trying to be friendly with others but because we do believe that that is the best way of putting across our own ideas to others, because that opens the mind of others, make them receptive to what we have to say. When two countries are hating each other, minds are closed and no one can influence the other, and you have a basis of fear than which there can be no worse companion for an individual or a country.

The situation is pretty serious all over the world. Nevertheless, there are some signs, some ray of hope. And may I say that I welcome the fact that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, will soon be going to the Soviet Union for talks there ? I do not mean to say that some sudden settlement is going to emerge from that. Problems are much too intricate and difficult, but all these visits, even if they tend to lessen tensions somewhat, even if they encourage just talks with each other, are helpful and, therefore, are to be welcomed.

USA INDIA PORTUGAL PAKISTAN IRAQ POLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Tanganyika

Shri C.S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on February 9, 1959 on

Tanganyika. He said :

During the past week the Council has been engaged in examining the Report of the Administering Authority on Tanganyika for the year 1957. We have had the advantage of the able and lucid presentation by the Special Representative for Tanganyika, Mr. Fletcher-Cooke, which has helped us to understand the conditions in Tanganyika and to bring our knowledge up-to-date. My delegation would like to pay a special tribute to Mr. Fletcher-Cooke for his forthrightness and patience and for the wealth of information he has provided to the Council in answer to the many questions put to him.

For this Council, Mr. President, Tanganyika in many ways has special importance. It is the largest of the territories which came under the trusteeship system of the United Nations. It is one of the last remaining Trust Territories which have still to attain freedom or independence which is the goal of the trusteeship system. More than these, it covers a considerable part of the great Continent of Africa where the current of freedom, in spite of the suppressions, iniquities and discriminations prevailing in many parts of the Continent against the indigenous and Asian populations, is more and more assuming the form of a mighty irresistible stream. The most significant fact of our times is the resurgence of Asia and Africa. Asia perhaps led the way in this resurgence. The Continent of Africa is now on the march. The fact that Tanganyika is an African territory inhabited predominantly by the African people is a fact of major significance of which the Trusteeship Council cannot afford to

23

lose sight It is at once the noble burden and privilege of the Government of the United Kingdom as the Administering Authority to prepare the peoples of Tanganyika to join in the procession of free countries in Africa.

I had the privilege of visiting Tanganyika over 12 years ago as a member of an Indian Mission to East Africa. We were impressed by the efficiency of the civil administration of Tanganyika. Even more than that, we got the feeling that unlike many of its neighbouring territories at that time, Tanganyika had a largely congenial racial atmosphere. It seemed that Tanganyika might be able to achieve the harmonious adjustment of relations between the indigenous people, the Africans, and the Europeans and the Asians who had made Tanganyika their home. It seemed to us then that Tanganyika might well show the way to a solution of the most momentous question on the Continent of Africa.

Mr. President, I am happy to say that despite ups and downs which were inevitable in the intervening years the latest Report of the Administering Authority and the statement made by the Special Representative, by and large, confirm the impressions that I then formed in Tanganyika. The political situation, in so far as it concerns the development of relations between the Africans, Europeans and Asians, seems to be developing in a harmonious way. We are happy to note that the Tanganyika African National Union, which is now the largest African political party in the Territory, and its able President, Mr. Nyerere, are imbued with a broad and statesmanlike approach towards the peoples and political organizations of the other two races. Mr. Nyerere's statement on the Governor's address at the October meeting of the Legislative Council was in our view most appropriate in this connection, namely that once the onus of responsibility is thrown on the Africans, as indeed it should be theirs because of their overwhelming majority in Tanganyika, they should take the necessary responsible attitude towards other races. Likewise the Governor's statement in his address to the October meeting of the Legislative Council that "it is intended, and has always been intended, that the fact that when self-government is eventually attained, both the Legislature and the Government are likely to be predominantly African" is a significant step in the right direction. I will have more to say on this subject a little later in my statement, but here I would only like to express the approbation of my delegation to such statements on behalf of the Administering Authority and of the predominant element of the Tanganyika population. We hope that these ideas are further developed with speed and given practical shape, both by the Administering Authority and the TANU and other African political organizations, since the true foundations of the future independent democratic Tanganyika, progressing in inter-racial harmony, can only be laid on the basis of these principles.

We are also happy to note, Mr. President, that the relations between the Government and the political parties in general are harmonious. The true function of an Administering Authority in a Trust Territory should be to help the people to reach the trusteeship system's goal of independence -in fact to be the people's guide, philosopher and friend. We feel sure that in the coming years, which in many ways will be the vital preparatory years for the Territory, the Government will perform its role of facilitating the development of sound political organizations, of impartially dealing with such organizations, and of helping public opinion to develop in the right direction.

We have to remember, however, that good government is no substitute for self-government and it is self-government or independence which is the ultimate goal of the trusteeship system. Policies and measures in a trust territory must be aimed at the speedy attainment of this goal. In our view the speed of the attainment of independence is to be determined not on the basis of any narrow or static concepts ; it has to be decided in the context of a variety of factors. The most significant of these are often not internal factors, important as they are, but external ones. It is these latter that have a powerful impact and usually stimulate political developments of a profound character. We mention this, Mr. President, to draw attention again to the tremendous forces that are convulsing the African Continent today. We have no doubt that these are known to, and well understood by, the Administering Authority, but I think it will bear repetition to say that unless they are taken into account and the speed of preparation and development is attuned thereto, Tanganyika is likely to be left far behind-out of tune and a straggler on the African Continent.

Bearing in mind the considerations which I have just stated, the objectives of the trusteeship system and the obligations the Administering Authority has undertaken thereunder, it should be the pre-eminent task of the Administering Authority to prepare the peoples of the Territory for the grave responsibilities, which will be theirs when the Territory becomes independent, in the shortest possible time. Such preparation has to be on comprehensive basis, namely with a view to the balanced and integrated development in the political, social and economic fields. There should be detailed planning of various measures and policies to enable smooth and orderly transfer of power to the people of Tanganyika, whose privilege and responsibility it would be thereafter to carry the torch of freedom forward in conditions of social and economic progress.

The General Assembly in its Resolution 558 (VI) of 18 January 1952 and subsequent resolutions on the same subject culminating in Resolution 1274 (XIII) has time and again emphasized the importance of such planning and has invited the Administering Authorities to fix early successive intermediate targets and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational development in trust territories; so as to create, as soon as possible, the pre-conditions for the attainment of self-government or independence. My delegation feels that in the case of Tanganvika the time has come when the determination of such targets should no longer be postponed. We would recommend once again that in consultation with the elected representatives of Tanganyika the Administering Authority should proceed with the fixation of targets for the introduction of universal suffrage, abolition of official representatives in the Legislature and the executive government and in other spheres.

In 1957, when two African representatives made statements before the Council, they touched upon the question of the date when Tanganyika could become independent. Mr. Nyerere President of the Tanganyika African National Union, said: "How long did I think our country was going to take to be independent? I said ten to twelve years. Is that not believing in gradualness? I could have said 'self-government now' "; and the Chief Marcalle estimated the period as ten to fifteen years.

Though only two years have elapsed since then, events and ideas have moved fast not only in Africa where one territory after another has attained or is about to attain independence, but if I may be permitted to refer to this, the world outside has moved from the atomic age into the new age of space. The estimates made in 1957 are already far out of date and the period before attainment of independence for Tanganyika has to be a very much shorter one.

In the light of these general observations, Mr. President, I would like to make some comments on the political, economic and social conditions in the Territory. There is no doubt that the elections to the Legislative Council which partly took place in five constituencies last September and are due in another five today represent a political advance, but it will be admitted that the measure of political progress represented by these elections is very small. It has to be remembered that out of eight and a half million African and 123,000 non-Africans according to 1957 census the total electorate was only about 58,000. This is indeed like a drop in the ocean and no elective system in which the franchise is so limited as to confer voting rights only on .007% of the total population can be viewed with any satisfaction. We are aware that a large number of those who were eligible failed to register as voters. Nevertheless, the main conclusion is not affected thereby.

On another matter of detail we would like to observe that the existing constituencies are too large; each of the ten provinces is a constituency. It is well known that these areas are not highly developed and lack adequate communications. In the circumstances both contacts by candidates with the voters and the exercise of votes by the electors must inevitably be difficult. The most satisfactory system of course is to have single-member constituencies, and the constituencies themselves should not be too large and unmanageable. In particular the obligation on the voter to record his vote for all the seats even if he does not know all the candidates seems curious and somewhat anachronistic. It is important, in our view, if the democratic experiment which the Administering Authority has started is to have much meaning and substance, that these reforms should be seriously considered and introduced as early as possible.

Mr. President, we know by experience that the democratic system is expensive and the holding of nationwide elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage needs considerable organization. Experience elsewhere, however, shows that the exercise of universal adult suffrage has neither been administratively so difficult nor has it produced the consequences feared by those who have had to take a decision in that regard. On the other hand the conferment of the exercise of universal adult franchise is the best means of creating political consciousness and political education of masses of people, which in the final resort are the cornerstones of a free democratic society. It is also the experience of many countries, including India, that illiteracy is no bar to intelligent voting. Indeed if one were to wait for a high literacy rate before the introduction of adult suffrage, the development of real democracy in many countries would be postponed for many generations. We believe that it should not

25

be administratively difficult to introduce adult suffrage immediately. On the basis that the adult voting population is usually a little under 50 per cent of the total, Tanganyika should have about four million voters, the average number of voters in each province being no more than 500,000 which the machinery of administration and elections in Tanganyika should, we feel, be easily able to handle. We would therefore urge on the Administering Authority to give serious consideration to the question of introduction of adult suffrage.

I would now like to take up a somewhat larger question, namely the manner and pattern of race relationship in Tanganyika. As I have observed earlier, the conditions for the evolution of a harmonious multi-racial society are favourable in the Trust Territory. The Administering Authority is itself showing commendable understanding of the problem despite criticism of detail that may sometimes be levelled against the administration of the Territory. It is, however, important to visualise the ultimate pattern and to work towards it with sincerity and singleness of purpose. In our view, the ultimate pattern should be, and indeed can be none other than, a society in which different racial elements in the Territory are bound together in a single Tanganyikan nationhood, an egalitarian society in which members of all races enjoy equal rights and privileges without discrimination of any kind. It is only in that kind of society that freedom and democracy can grow and flourish. In the view of our delegation, as a natural corollary to this, the Africans who form an overwhelming population of the Territory must have an overwhelming share in the government and administration of the Territory and in other spheres of national life. Any principle of parity of racial representation is inconsistent with the development of such a society and thus with the development of sound democratic institutions in a free Tanganvika. It is gratifying to note that the Administering Authority, as indicated in the speech of the Governor of the Territory before the Legislative Council in October, does not now consider parity to be a permanent feature of the Tanganyika scene and that in the final picture both the Legislature and the Government are likely to be predominantly African. This principle needs to be more categorically stated and applied in practice. At the same time, the minority races, who have made their home in Tanganyika should have the feeling and assurance that they would enjoy equal rights under the law with the entire population. We are happy to see an implicit recognition of this in Mr. Nyerere's speech in the debate on the Governor's address. We feel that this principle also needs to be more explicitly stated and emphasized especially by the representatives of the African political organizations. We hope that African leaders will recognize the need for reorientating the people in these salutary principles.

Recently elections were held in the Territory for the Legislative Assembly for the first time and though the range of elections was unnecessarily restricted, we are happy to see that the results achieved have been entirely satisfactory. The largest political party, namely the Tanganvika African National Union, has now emerged on the constitutional scene of the Territory, and perhaps of greater significance is the fact that Tanganyika has now a leader in the person of Mr. Julius Nverere, who is acclaimed by all to be endowed with vision, wisdom and moderation. This is a matter of great good fortune for the Territory. Nothing is more important for a newly emerging country than the calibre of its leaders. We hope that under leaders like Mr. Nyerere political life in Tanganyika will be moulded on lines which augur well for the future of the Territory and for inter-racial harmony.

My delegation hopes that now that there will be thirty elected members in the Legislative Council, steps will be taken to have non-official Ministers chosen from the elected representatives. As the Special Representative has stated, things have moved rapidly since the time when well over eighteen months ago some non-officials were brought into the Executive Council at the Assistant Ministers' level. We were glad to hear from the Special Representative that the Administering Authority was now thinking in terms of appointment of non-official Ministers.

We learn from the Special Representative that the best way of associating the Chiefs with the Central Government of the Territory was being considered through the establishment of a Territorial Council composed largely, but not exclusively, of Chiefs. We were glad to have the Special Representative's assurance that "that body would not be a second Chamber in the accepted sense of the term, but rather an advisory organ which would consider controversial matters without the authority to have the right of decision of the Legislative Council". We are aware of the important position occupied by Chiefs in African society, but we feel that the contemplated Territorial Council should be complementary and in no way an impediment to the development of parliamentary institutions and of a democratic society in Tanganyika.

26

My delegation, Mr. President, is glad to note that the Administering Authority has taken substantial steps in the direction of organization of local government. At present there are 10 Town Councils, I Municipality, namely at Dares-Salaam, 9 District Councils and a local Council at Newala. We welcome the setting up of these Councils as a political and administrative training ground for the Africans. Since these bodies are entrusted with many nation-building activities, they can also do much for the rural development of Tanganyika. All these will be useful preparations for the transfer of power at the time of the independence of the Territory. We note that there have been instances of some of these bodies not functioning satisfactorily. But this is no cause for discouragement. The Administering Authority can do much through advice, encouragement and assistance towards the healthy development of local self-governing institutions. The election system has already been introduced

in Town Councils. We see no reason why District Councils also should not be elective bodies.

It is unnecessary for me to emphasise that the backbone of any administration or government must be the civil services. Efficiency in the civil services is necessary not only for the purpose of administering Tanganvika, but for giving the territory the right start when it becomes independent. In recent times many newly independent states have found themselves in serious difficulties owing to the inadequacy of their trained civil cadres. We note that the Administering Authority is aware of this and is increasing the number of Africans in higher services. The increase, however, is not fast enough, even though we may recognise practical difficulties. We cannot too strongly emphasise that Africanisation of the services should proceed at an accelerated pace and that the aim should be to have all posts of District Officers and below manned by the inhabitants of the territory in the next two or three years. To say that no qualified Africans were available for a particular post or that there are only nine African doctors in Tanganyika is hardly complimentary to the Administering Authority after so many decades of mandate or trusteeship for Tanganyika. While we note with satisfaction the availability of bursaries and other training facilities, we would like the Administering Authority to engage in a determined and more extensive programme for training more and more Africans for the higher ranks of the civil services. The Administering Authority should, in this connection, avail of such training facilities in public administration as may be available in the United Nations.

Finally, while I am dealing with the political developments in the territory, I should like to express the hope, on behalf of my Delegation, that there will be no avoidable delay in the formation of the Committee on Constitutional Reforms. We attach the greatest importance to the task before this Committee. The time is now appropriate for the Constitutional Committee to go into the whole question of the future of Tanganyika, lay down sound future lines of political development, e.g. by giving up the principle of parity, revising the machinery of government so as to give just and adequate African representation thereon etc., etc.

It would be well to remember that freedom itself is of illusory value if it is accompanied by economic weakness. If, therefore, Tanganyika is to be prepared for independence, it is obvious that its economic strength should be developed to the fullest extent. Experience shows that the development of the economic strength of an under-developed country is a tremendous task. It is now generally accepted that integrated and long-range economic planning are necessary. In our view, the Administering Authority should devote the greatest efforts to this end. Balanced schemes of development of agriculture and industry are necessary and the industrial potential of the territory needs to be developed. It is also necessary that in these developments the Africans should have full and adequate share. The Administering Authority appear to be fully aware of the need for economic development and have a revised five-year development plan 1956-61 totalling 32 million pounds. Planning, however, seems at present to be compartmental. Integrated planning with priorities carefully laid down in full co-operation and discussion with the main political parties and associations seems called for.

The foundation of such a plan must be a careful survey of the resources of the territory. It is understood that some occasional surveys have been made, but it is desirable to have more comprehensive and integrated surveys than hitherto. It would be appropriate for the Administering Authority to increasingly call upon the assistance of the United Nations bodies and Specialised Agencies to help them in such surveys. We are happy to note the assistance given by the FAO in regard to the Rufiji basin scheme, and we are sure that more such assistance will be forthcoming from them and from other U.N. Agencies.

The availability of finance for development is of course a matter of great difficulty. The

27

Administering Authority appear already to have made a good beginning by instituting a development plan reserve into which moneys from revenue and other sources are credited for development purposes. It is also satisfactory to note that the Administering Authority have been able to raise money on the commercial market for financing development projects. We trust that they will find ways and means of augmenting the development funds both at the Central Government and the local authority level. It is of the utmost importance that in the financial stringency caused by the fall in commodity prices, which we hope is only temporary, development expenditure will not be curtailed.

The report of the Administering Authority shows a healthy expansion of the co-operative movement. At the end of 1957, there were 474 Registered Societies with a total membership of 300,279. Co-operative Societies now operate in all the eight provinces and their services include bulk marketing facilities, bulk purchase of trade goods, distribution of consumer goods, seeds and planting material, agricultural requisites, loans, finance saving facilities and education. It is of the utmost importance that the co-operative movement should be expanded and that not merely marketing societies but multi-purpose co-operative societies be established throughout the territory. In our view, in an under-developed country with inefficient agriculture, village co-operatives can play the most important part in building up the economy and in preparing the people for their economic responsibilities as a free nation.

It seems necessary that immediate steps should be taken to encourage capital-formation, to whatever extent possible, through the accumulation of co-operative capital, development loans and compulsory and voluntary savings, both small and big. The Administering Authority's efforts towards the establishment of cooperatives have been sufficiently successful to justify more accelerated progress in that direction. The large majority of existing co-operatives seem to be functioning well. We wish to suggest that Government should further encourage, to the maximum possible extent, the inhabitants of the territory to organise themselves freely into cooperative societies of various kinds.

Tanganyika is an agricultural country with but few industries. Agriculture forms the principal wealth and occupation of the people. Therefore, if the national wealth of Tanganyika is to be increased, its agriculture must needs be improved. For the improvement of agriculture, the first essential condition is the establishment of a satisfactory system of land tenure. The best guarantee for maximum agricultural production is that the farmer must have security of tenure and occupancy, should be free from impositions by the State or by the landlord, and should have all the incentive in the world to increase production. We note that the Tanganyika Government have the formulation of a new land tenure policy under consideration.

Mr. President, the Administering Authority's Report deals with the subject of land alienation. This is an important subject in a territory where there is perpetual land hunger among the Africans and there have been allegations-and with justice -of mal-distribution of land as between the various races. Members of the Trusteeship Council also have commented on this subject at previous meetings of the Council. We note that out of ten new grants during 1958, six went to Africans and two to public or semi-public bodies. We take note with satisfaction of this improvement which meets to some extent the criticism that has been made in the past. We hope that this trend will continue.

The statistical appendices to the Report reveal a chronic food deficit which has persisted over the last four or five years. Consequently, food worth over two million pounds has been imported annually, and to that extent the territory's financial resources continue to suffer a set back. The formation of capital for development purposes in agricultural countries depends to a large extent on the availability or otherwise of exportable surpluses of food. The elimination of this food deficit should, therefore, receive the highest priority, and the burden of the attack should fall on the tsetse fly. Attention should then be paid to the development of water resources. Rainfall in the territory seems somewhat haphazard and unpredictable. Large dams of high capacity are, of course, the final answer to this problem, but a profitable beginning could be made with the building of small dams, water-collecting artificial lakes and pools in the villages. In our view adequate attention has not been paid in the past to the development of the territory's agriculture which should receive priority attention. On the average, expenditure on agriculture has amounted to less than 3 per cent of the total annual expenditure.

Nearly two-thirds of land in Tanganyika is said to be covered with bushes infested with tsetse fly. If the land at present under the tsetse fly menace was made available for cultivation, that would mean a vast increase in the agricultural wealth of the territory. According to the Special

28

Representative the average holding of an African farmer in the moderately to intensively cultivated areas is no more than two acres. This indeed explains his poverty. If more land were available to him, if more working capital were at his disposal, if arrangements could be made for supply of water to his fields, if the farmer could, get better seeds and if possible fertilisers, he would no doubt emerge from his abject state of povertythe average per capita income per year is said to be not more than 18 to 20 pounds-to a state of comparative wealth and prosperity. He would then himself find the means for his social and educational advancement and the burden on the State would be correspondingly diminished. We are of course fully aware that these conditions are difficult of attainment without a great deal of finance and capital and many years of organisation, which at present are not at the disposal of the Government of Tanganyika. Nevertheless the goal of planned and extensive as well as intensive agricultural development should, in our view, be kept in mind, and, to start with the campaign against the tsetse fly should be intensified. We feel sure that in any project towards this end, the Administering Authority can count on the help of the U.N. organs and its Specialised Agencies and of charitable foundations.

We are happy to note that considerable progress has been made during the last year in the development of natural resources in the field of agriculture. Coming from a country, Mr. President, with some of the most extensive irrigation systems in the world and where many large schemes of irrigation are now in progress, we view with great admiration and hope the Rufiji Basin Scheme, in respect of which surveys have already been completed and initial work started. The scheme is expected to confer benefits to an area of several hundred square miles. This certainly is imaginative planning, and it is planning such as this that is needed for under-developed areas. We wish this scheme every success and we hope that similar imaginative schemes will be undertaken in other areas and in other fields too, with the help of international organisations.

Side by side with agricultural development, industrial development should not be neglected if Tanganyika is to be prepared adequately for its future responsibilities as an independent nation. It is obvious that the territory at present cannot afford the capital and the financial resources to build up organised industries on a large scale. But a start has to be made. Conditions have to be created in the territory to facilitate investment from outside on a non-political basis. In this direction African national organisations can play a very useful part. It is they who will have to extend the assurances of fair treatment so as to attract foreign capital and investment in the territory.

The Special Representative has given us detailed information about the financial situation in the territory. While we appreciate the difficulties caused by the fall in prices of the primary commodities which are exported from Tanganyika, namely sisal, coffee, etc., it is our view that the probable deficit of nearly over a million and a half sterling for the current financial year should not be allowed to deter the Administering Authority from economic and social planning. We hope, as the Special Representative envisages, that much of the deficit which indeed is not of a very high order will be eliminated through economies in departmental expenditure.

We feel, Mr. President, that the economy of the territory is basically sound, and if persistent and well thought out measures are taken, it should be possible to raise higher revenues. Sources of income-tax revenue can perhaps be tapped afresh, and a more extensive exploration and exploitation of the territory's mineral wealth offers attractive prospects.

We believe that Government have so far not offered adequate facilities to Asian and African prospectors. It should also be possible for Government to set up industries utilising the sisal, cotton, etc., which are grown in the territory as raw materials. In any case, We feel that there should be no inroads into the social services on account of the expected budgetary deficit.

To put it in a nutshell, Mr. President, the vast gap between the per capita income of the more advanced countries and that of the Africans has to be substantially bridged. For no free and democratic institutions can flourish in the soil of poverty, illiteracy and disease. The Administering Authority should give attention to this allimportant task and tap all resources not only within the territory but also all sources of international finance and capital. We believe that since Tanganvika is a Trust Territory and it is the noble aim of the Trusteeship System to prepare the people of Tanganyika for independence, the Administering Authority will find a great deal of sympathy in many quarters for its economic plans.

I would now like to touch, Mr. President, on the question of education. It is obvious that there is a great urge for education among the Africans. We are glad to note the progress that

29

has been made during the last two years. The Special Representative's statement in which he gives the details of students at the various higher technical and other institutions in Makerere, Nairobi and outside Africa is impressive. It is also satisfactory to know that large numbers of teachers are being systematically trained at the Teacher Training Centres, and facilities for vocational and technical training are being expanded. However, the Administering Authority will, we hope, take careful note of the comments made by the UNESCO. It is obvious that even though efforts have been intensified during the last few years, the problem of education, especially African education, is a vast one and requires a large organisation and financial expenditure. The UNESCO has commented on the low percentage of appropriations from general revenues for recurrent educational expenditure. We hope that it will be possible to increase the appropriations.

It was disquieting to learn from the Special Representative's statement that in spite of the appalling illiteracy in the Territory there were 14,000 places unfilled in Standard I in primary schools and more than 91,000 unfilled in Standards II, III and IV of the same schools. In the middle schools likewise there were 5,000 unfilled places. We realise that part of the apathy or inability to utilise the vacancies is probably traceable to economic reasons, that is to say, the need for a family to draft their children to work at a very early age to aid in the income of the family. But it is important, if education is to make progress in the Territory, that this initial formidable obstacle should be overcome. We trust that the Administering Anthority will give their earnest consideration to this problem and popularize education through local government bodies and social welfare organisations among the people. In this connection adult education, the beginnings of which have already been undertaken in the territory, is of great importance. If parents themselves become literate and acquire the keenness to learn, they are better able to appreciate the need for their children's education. Thus, measures for adult education, apart from being intrinsically important, may also assist in removing the apathy towards elementary and secondary education of children.

There are two other aspects of education in the territory that my delegation would like to comment on. First there is the question of integration of schools. This, as we all know, is a burning question not only in Tanganyika but in many other parts of the world where the problem of education of children of different races exists. The intensity of the problem and its potentialities for causing racial tension are not admitted on all hands. It is our view that there should be no separate schools for racial or religious groups. Education should be integrated at all levels as a fundamental policy.

We note that the Administering Authority have shown awareness of the problem by appointing a Committee to go into the whole question of integration of schools. We trust that the Committee will make significant recommendations.

In a territory, especially in a Trust Territory. the population of which comprises groups of different religious faiths and beliefs, it is appropriate and desirable that government should develop an educational policy which is completely secular. We are not opposed to denominational education, but we feel that this should be left to the organisations and the communities concerned. In Tanganyika, as the Special Representative has pointed out, there are financial difficulties and funds available for the promotion of education are limited. It is therefore necessary that public funds should be devoted to the spread of education which will benefit the community as a whole and not for any theological or denominational education.

I am sorry, Mr. President, to have spoken at such length. My reason for doing so is that my delegation has always followed developments in Tanganyika with great interest. I hope my remarks, even if critical, will be taken in the constructive spirit in which they were made. Any comments we have made do not detract from our appreciation of the work which is being done in Tanganyika. The United Kingdom have a tradition of good government and the recent history of Africa and of many countries in Asia bears testimony to their statesmanship and farsightedness. Under their trusteeship we look forward to the emergence of Tanganyika in the near future as an independent country taking an honoured place at the United Nations.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FIJI LATVIA KENYA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Cameroons

Shri C. S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on February 16, 1959 on the Cameroons under French

30

Administration :

For about a week now, the Trusteeship Council has been considering the question of the future of the Cameroons under French administration. This task has been laid before us by the General Assembly's resolution 1282 adopted at its last session. The Assembly asked the Trusteeship Council to examine the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in West Africa in 1958, and to transmit the same with its observations and recommendations to the General Assembly not later than 20 February, 1959.

We had the advantage, Mr. President, of studying the Visiting Mission's report and of hearing the Special Representative from the Trust Territory. Many questions have been asked of the delegate of France and of the Special Representative. We are thankful to them for having replied with candour. We have also listened carefully to the observations made by many members in the Council.

At the outset, I may be permitted to express the appreciation of my delegation for the work of the Visiting Mission under the able chairmanship of Mr. Benjamin Gerig. Their report bears eloquent testimony to the great pains that they have taken for ascertaining the facts, evaluating them and for making balanced and sound recommendations. We regard the Visiting Mission's report as a valuable contribution and of great importance in the examination of the question referred to the Trusteeship Council by the General Assembly.

Before proceeding to express our views on the specific conclusions and recommendations of the Visiting Mission, I would like to make some general observations. In the first place, the prospect before us-and indeed it is our privilege to be associated with such a prospect-is the birth of a new nation. The moments in history when nations arise in full freedom and independence are not too many, and such moments when they come are always moving and of great significance to mankind. The Trusteeship Council have by their labours during the past few years contributed in no small measure to the early attainment of freedom by many countries in Africa. My delegation is happy to have had the privilege of being associated with the work of the Trusteeship Council. We have always urged the Administering Authorities to prepare the

territories under their trust for independence at the earliest date. Our constant advocacy of freedom for dependent peoples has been not only in the territorial sense but in the sense of enjoyment of fundamental freedoms and liberties by the peoples of the countries concerned.

In the view of my delegation the question of the future of the Cameroons is one of the most important on which the Council has been called upon to pronounce an opinion. We are dealing with nothing less than the freedom and future of five million people in the Cameroons of whom over three million are in French Cameroons and French administration in respect of whom my remarks will be confined this morning. And the question, Mr. President, has to be considered in the context of the provisions of the Charter relating to trusteeship and the terms of the trusteeship agreement.

Article 76 of the Charter lays down the basic objectives of the Trusteeship system. These are progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement. Under Article 76 (c) it is among the objectives of the trusteeship system to "encourage respect for human Tights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion". Article 76 thus provides the soil in which trust territories are to grow and develop towards independence. What the UN Charter envisages is the eventual emergence of trust territories into independent nations according to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples and enjoying fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights. It would be against the spirit of the Charter if the UN General Assembly were to become a party to the creation of a State previously under the trusteeship system in which the people did not enjoy fundamental freedoms and human rights and there was no equality under the law.

The principle of consultations, which is embodied in Article 76 (b) of the Charter is thus an important one. Trusteeship agreements provide for consultations with populations concerned at the termination of agreements and this is also contemplated in Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Cameroons under the French administration.

In regard to Cameroons under French administration, we find that there has been progressive development of democratic institutions -even though in the opinion of some the development has been tardy to the point when there is a Legislative Assembly elected on universal

31

adult suffrage. The present Assembly was elected in December 1956 on this basis. There was a very high degree of participation in the voting. It is claimed that this was extremely high for Africa and higher than is sometimes the case in old established democracies. Such elections were held for all but two seats in Sanaga-Maritime area where unfortunately there were disturbances. Another two seats in the same area were disputed and elections to these were set aside. Consequently there are four seats unfilled in the Legislative Assembly out of 70. The fact that no elections could be held for two constituencies was indeed deplorable. However, these disturbances and the fact that four seats are vacant do not in our opinion affect the main question of the independence of the Cameroons nor are they in themselves valid reasons for delaying it.

My delegation is impressed by what has been stated in paragraphs 134 and 135 of the report. To quote from the latter "the Mission did not find any evidence of any desire in the Territory for an objective short of independence. All the Cameroonians with whom the Mission spoke stated, often emphatically, that they desired independence. The Mission did not hear a single dissenting voice on that subject, nor was any alternative to independence proposed to it. It accordingly considers itself justified in concluding that the overwhelming majority of the population desires independence. There is some difference of opinion among the population regarding the date of the proclamation of independence. Some approve the date of I January 1960, which was the Government's choice, while others advocate an earlier date. But on the basis of the information the Mission was able to obtain in the Territory, it seems safe to suggest

that the latter constitute only a small minority".

To my delegation the position appears to be as follows :-

The people of the Cameroons under French administration have been clamouring for independence for a long time. The urge for independence is deep among all sections of the people and many consider that freedom has already been long delayed. There is no disposition among any section of the people to delay independence beyond I January 1960. There are, indeed, some who would like the Territory to become independent earlier. The Legislative Assembly of the Territory which was elected on the basis of universal adult franchise adopted a resolution on 24 October 1958 solemnly proclaiming the will of the Cameroonian people that the State of the Cameroons should attain national independence on 1 January 1960. The Legislative Assembly, as the Visiting Mission has pointed out in paras 140 and 141 of its report, is representative in character. The Administering Authority have declared their intention of granting full independence to the Cameroons under French administration on the same date. The Visiting Mission found that this is the desire of the overwhelming majority of the population. To quote the words of the Mission's report, "the request that the Territory should become independent on I January 1960 which was approved by the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons by a large majority is also supported by a large majority of the population."

We have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the desire for independence in the Trust Territory is universal. We believe that this is the noble aspiration of the people of the French Cameroons. We also feel that after many initial hesitations the Administering Authority has itself come to believe in the independence of the French Cameroons, and has responded magnanimously to the aspirations of the Territory.

My delegation is of the view that while the principle of popular consultation is essential, and in the normal course we would have considered it more appropriate if consultation had been made under the auspices of the United Nations, in the circumstances of the Cameroons under French administration we should nevertheless agree with the Visiting Mission's conclusions, that no further consultation of the population is necessary on the subject of their independence. All concerned are agreed on the independence of the Territory on I January 1960 and there is no need for going through the time taking formality of specific consultation under UN auspices, which could not give any other result.

We now address ourselves to the question-

- (a) whether the Cameroons under French administration that is likely to emerge as an independent country on I January 1960 will have all the attributes of independence and sovereignty-and
- (b) whether the people of the Territory enjoy at present and will enjoy on I January 1960 all the fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights without any distinction as envisaged in Article 76 (c) of the Charter.

On the question of sovereignty we find that

32

in Ordinance 58-1375 of 30 December 1958 the Government of France has transferred to the Government of the Cameroons all the powers of internal legislation and administration including judiciary, retaining to itself the responsibility for monetary and foreign exchange policy, foreign policy, frontier security and defence of the State of Cameroons. We take note of the declaration of the representative of France to the effect that it constitutes the last stage of the evolution of the Cameroons' institutions before independence and the ending of trusteeship as outlined in the preamble to the Statute. The Government of France have also stated in the preamble to the Ordinance that it is their desire to comply with the wishes of the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons that they should attain full independence on 1 January 1960. In the same connection we take note again of the statement of the representative of France that "on I January 1960 autonomy will step aside for independence and the final external powers will pass into the hands of the Cameroons authorities". We also note the statement of the Special Representative that the existing conventions governing the relations

between France and the Cameroons which are annexed to the Statute of 30 December 1958 will automatically end on 31 December 1959 and independent Cameroons will thus be free to negotiate and enter into new conventions with France or any other State.

My delegation wants particularly-and indeed there is an obligation on the UN to that effectthat fundamental freedoms prevail in the Territory and that the State that emerges on I January 1960 is one in which democratic forms of Government and democratic liberties flourish. This recalls to us at once the disturbances that took place in certain parts of the Territory in 1955 and later in 1957 and which have sporadically continued during 1958. We have also to take note of the fact that one of the several political parties in the Territory is banned and does not as such enjoy liberty of speech and association. It is not our intention to go into the sequence of events which led to these unfortunate happenings nor to justify or condemn the alleged organised violence by that party and the alleged repression by Government. The lesson of these disturbances is that where freedom is delayed, it inevitably causes deep frustrations which often lead to violence and bitter conflicts. We deplore these happenings as much as anyone else. It is our earnest wish that the bitterness and conflicts that took place some time ago should become matters of the past and should not be carried over into the new era that is dawning for the Territory.

States born in violence, internal bitterness and conflict do not lay sound foundations for their future. It would be the path of wisdom for the Government of the Cameroons to take measures so that the new State comes into being in harmony and internal goodwill. We would strongly recommend the immediate grant of amnesty on the widest possible basis. In fact, it would be an act of statesmanship to grant unconditional amnesty. Amnesty is based on the principle of forgiveness; and forgiveness itself, if ungenerous or hesitating, loses its value. We are constrained to observe that the further measure of political amnesty proposed in the Legislative Assembly, a summary of which was given to us by the Special Representative, does not go far enough. We hope that further details of the amnesty measures will be made available

to the members of the General Assembly. At the same time, with the principles and traditions of non-violence, which have governed the thinking of the Indian people, we cannot approve of any methods of violence to attain political ends, and I hope our appeal to the political parties and individuals in the Territory to eschew violence will not be misunderstood. To the extent that the people of the Cameroons are able to eliminate violence, bitterness and conflict, to that extent will the future happiness of the Cameroonian people be assured.

It is also our fervent hope that elections will be held very soon to the four vacant seats in the Legislative Assembly allocated to Sanaga-Maritime area. These elections should be held in conditions of maximum freedom and political amnesty. My delegation was glad to have the assurance of the representative of the Administering Authority that French troops are being withdrawn and will be totally withdrawn from this area well before the elections. We commend to the Government of the Cameroons that elections be held in these conditions at the earliest possible date.

We were happy to receive the assurance that those who are at present out of the Cameroons will have complete freedom to return without fear of reprisal and that political amnesty will be applicable to them.

The Trusteeship Council is not competent to take a decision concerning the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. As the Representative of France pointed out the other day, we are here to pave the way, as it were, for the work and the judgment of the General Assembly. We would, therefore, recommend that the General Assembly should take a decision in the light of the Visiting

33

Mission's report and after hearing such parties as may choose to appear before it, to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement with effect from January 1, 1960, upon the attainment by the French Cameroons of full national independence.

My delegation, Mr. President, will lend its support to any resolution in the Council, which is in consonance with the views that I have expressed.

Before concluding, I should like to express on behalf of my delegation, our great joy at the prospect of the emergence of the Cameroons as an independent State. We wish the people of the Cameroons every happiness and success in their adventure as an independent nation. In their struggle for freedom and independence during the last decade of trusteeship, the people of the Cameroons have shown strength and courage. We feel sure that when the General Assembly terminates the Trusteeship Agreement and freedom comes these will be valuable assets to the people of the Cameroons in solving their internal problems and in playing their full part in the comity of nations.

INDIA CAMEROON USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Pre-War Claims Settled

Letters were exchanged in Tokyo in February between the Government of Japan and the Indian Embassy at Tokyo recording the conclusion of negotiations initiated in April 1958 for settlement of outstanding Indian pre-war claims against Japan.

The total amount of claims thus determined and paid by the Government of Japan is about Rs. 20.7 lakhs. The Government of Japan had, in addition, settled certain claims before the commencement of these negotiations, amounting to about Rs. 15.3 lakhs.

The Japanese pre-war assets situated in India at the outbreak of war with Japan and taken over by the Indian Custodian of Enemy Property were returned to their pre-war owners in terms of letters exchanged in New Delhi on July 15, 1958 between the Governments of India and Japan. The total value of assets thus returned is about Rs. 2 crores.

JAPAN INDIA USA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995 KOREA

Prisoners of War

In reply to a question Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on February 17, 1959 that there were eleven ex-Korean prisoners of war still in India.

She added:

"Five of them were originally optees for India and employment suitable to their training has been found for them. The remaining six were originally optees for other neutral countries. None of the neutral countries to which these prisoners desired to settle have yet accepted them. The Government is at present awaiting replies from one neutral country and is also considering other methods of rehabilitating them. For the time being they live in a Government camp where lodging is free and a monthly pocket allowance of Rs. 50/- is paid to each one of them in addition to a ration allowance of Rs. 50/- per month."

KOREA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

NORWAY

Indo-Norwegian Agreement Signed

As a result of talks held in Delhi for a few days between a two-member Norwegian delegation

34

and officials of the Central Board of Revenue, a draft Agreement for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between India and Norway was initialled in February, 1959.

Upon ratification of the Agreement by the respective Governments, it will become effective in India for and from the assessment year commencing on 1st April, 1959.

NORWAY INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

NETHERLANDS

Memorandum Signed

Technical and financial assistance from the Government of the Netherlands for accelerating the reclamation of saline soils in the Bhal area along the Saurashtra coast of Bombay State will shortly be available.

Agreement was reached on a Memorandum, setting out details of the assistance to be provided by the Government of the Netherlands and contributions to be made by the Government of India and the Bombay State, in New Delhi on February 17, 1959 between Shri K.R. Damle, Secretary, Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, and Mr. D.W.R. Los, Acting Agricultural Attache of the Royal Netherlands Embassy. The agreement reached will be formalized by an exchange of Letters of Understanding between the two Governments and be subject to Dutch parliamentary approval.

The total project, which aims at raising the standard of living of the local population by increasing the productivity of local soils, is expected to benefit ultimately a net area of 55,800 acres and yield produce worth about Rs. 75 lakhs a year.

The Netherlands Government will pay for the construction of a pilot polder (reclamation of low-lying land) of 6,520 acres and provide technical assistance for its running and management, besides carrying out a number of tests and measurements at various stages of desalinization.

Work on the pilot polder-the execution of which will be entrusted by the Netherlands Government to a firm, Netherlands Engineering Consultants (NEDECO), who will co-operate with their Indian counterparts-will start during the current year and is expected to be completed in 1960.

The Netherlands assistance will be continued till 1963, by which time the pilot polder is expected to be brought progressively under cultivation. The Government of India and the State Government of Bombay will provide funds and necessary staff for the successful execution of the scheme.

The Bombay Government have agreed to set up a "Coordination Committee" on which will be represented the Departments of Public Works, Agriculture, Revenue, Community Development, Civil Administration and Co-operation. A representative of the NEDECO will be associated with this Committee in an advisory capacity. The Committee's functions will be : development of the reclaimed land and settlement of farmers on it, organisation of social and economic activities including research required for the attainment of these objectives. The Bhal Reclamation Scheme is included in the Second Five Year Plan.

THE NETHERLANDS INDIA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Dues

Replying to a question on canal water dues from Pakistan, Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation and Power, said in the Lok Sabha on February 16, 1959 that the whole subject relating to the disputed as well as the balance outstanding towards undisputed charges was under correspondence between the Governments of India and Pakistan.

He said : "In regard to the 'disputed' charges, the latest position is that the Government of Pakistan have intimated that they have deposited a sum of Rs. 97,19,980/- in the State Bank of Pakistan as a credit in favour of the Reserve Bank

35

of India with a suggestion that an agreement should be reached between the Governments of India and Pakistan before August 16, 1959, for a decision as to the respective rights of the parties in respect of this amount and the amount of Rs. 29,36,485/previously deposited by them with the Reserve Bank of India.

"The Government of India are of the view that they would be willing to discuss with the Government of Pakistan arrangements, including reference to arbitration if necessary, for a final settlement of the entire amount of the disputed charges as soon as the Government of Pakistan have complied with their obligations under the Agreement of 4th May, 1948 and deposited with the Reserve Bank of India, all the disputed charges intimated to them from time to time by the Prime Minister of India.

"As the Government of Pakistan have not done this as yet, the matter is under further correspondence.

"As to the 'undisputed' charges, the Government of Pakistan have so far paid a sum of Rs. 3,11,60,874 for the period ending 30th September, 1957 and discontinued payment thereafter. As such a sum of Rs. 25,97,931 is still due from them for the period up to 31st March, 1959."

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique

The Indo-Pakistan talks on the border disputes in the western region held in Karachi at the Secretary-level from February 23 to 25, 1959 ended without any agreement.

Shri M.J. Desai, Commonwealth Secretary of India, and Mr. M.S.A. Baig, Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, led the delegations of their respective Governments.

After the talks a Joint Communique was issued simultaneously in New Delhi and Karachi on February 25, 1959.

Following is the text of the Communique

At the meeting between the two Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India held in New Delhi from the 9th to the 11th September, 1958, it was decided that, in regard to 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.

In accordance with this decision, a further Conference on Indo-Pakistan border problems was held at Karachi from the 23rd to the 25th February, 1959. The Delegations were led respectively by Mr. M.S.A. Baig, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations (Pakistan) and Shri M.J. Desai, Commonwealth Secretary of the Ministry of External Affairs (India). Prior to their meeting, the leaders of the two Delegations had visited the sites of the disputes.

The discussions, which were frank and friendly, resulted in a free exchange of views regarding the respective positions of the two Delegations oil these disputes. The two Secretaries will now report report to their respective Governments.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Occupation of Charland

In a written reply to a question Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on February 17, 1959 that on the 14th December, 1958, twenty-five Pakistani nationals encroached upon the Teesta-Payesti Charland in Village Jharsingheswar, P. S. Haldibari, Dist. Cooch-Behar. They left the area when Indian Police arrived. He said : "On the 29th December about 200 Pakistani nationals along with 25 members of the Pakistan Armed Forces collected on the Pakistan side of the border and shouted slogans like "Alaho-Akbar". The Pakistan forces were also reported to be digging trenches and taking positions."

"On the 31st December, the Deputy Commissioner of Cooch-Behar and the District Magistrate of Rangpur, agreed to withdraw all forces other than normal patrol from the border area."

Replying to another part of the question Shri Nehru said :

"There is no dispute about this charland between India and Pakistan ; therefore, the question of an agreement with Pakistan does not arise".

36

PAKISTAN INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Unidentified Planes

Replying to a question in the Lok Sabha on February 26, 1959 Prime Minister Nehru said that some unidentified aircraft were seen flying over Jammu area on January 13, 14, 16 and 17. 1959. In three cases the aircraft were seen flying in the direction of Sialkot.

The Prime Minister said : "No enquiries were made from the Pakistan Government in this matter, but a complaint was lodged with the UN Chief Military Observer, who said that it was not possible to fix the identity of the aircraft. He added, however, that in regard to two of our complaints, aircraft did fly as stated by us. It was, however, very difficult to identify jet aircraft flying at very high altitudes and any enquiry was not likely to produce practical results commensurate with the time and expense involved.

It might be added that where an aircraft is flying at 30,000 ft. or more above groundlevel, national boundaries cannot easily be ascertained. The speed of jet aircraft being several hundred miles per hour, even a very slight error or mis-judgement might take an aircraft 30 or 40 miles across the border. Thus the border might be crossed unintentionally as of course it might also be crossed intentionally. The safe course would be for aircraft not to go anywhere near the border."

PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

T.C.M. Grant For Productivity Project

India's national productivity project will receive grant assistance this year from the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission totalling more than Rs. 48 lakhs (\$1 million).

Under an agreement signed in New Delhi, on February 10, 1959 by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Ralph L. Trisko, Acting Director of the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission, a sum of Rs. 25 lakhs (\$534,000) was made available immediately.

Under this project, the Government of India have established a National Productivity Council

in New Delhi and four regional branches. It is the intention to establish thirty local productivity councils by 1961.

The purpose of the Council is to ensure efficient utilization of the available resources of men, machines, materials, power and capital to propagate technical know-how and management skills, to increase agricultural and industrial production, to reduce prices and improve the standard of living and reduce the burden on India's foreign exchange expenditure.

The U.S. assistance for this project will take the form of technicians, consultants, commodities, and training opportunities abroad in this specialised field for Indian participants.

Under the grant, T.C.M. will make available \$134,000 to procure automotive and audio-visual equipment, product samples for productivity analysis, publications, and other commodities. \$400,000 has been earmarked for the services of eight technicians for three years each, three technicians for one year each, and a team of three short-term consultants.

Later in the year, a further grant of \$487,000 will be made available to provide four additional technicians and training opportunities for seven Indian productivity teams of 10 persons each and 40 one-year participants to study abroad.

Last year, under T.C.M. auspices, the Executive Director and 10 members of the National Productivity Council undertook a study tour of productivity centres and industries of Europe, the U.K. and the U.S.A.

T.C.M. provided a total of \$56,000 to the project last year.

37

USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

VIET NAM

Prime Minister's Reply in Lok Sabha

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on February 18, 1959, Prime Minister Nehru said that the International Commission for Super-vision and Control in Viet Nam, under Indian Chairmanship "continues its efforts to maintain peace in the area".

The Prime Minister was replying to an Hon. Member of the House, who had asked whether any further efforts had been made by India to end the deadlock in Indo-China and if so with what results.

Shri Nehru added : "It is presumed that the Member refers to the deadlock over the reunification of Viet Nam. No tangible progress has been made towards reunification. The primary responsibility for the execution of the Geneva Agreement rests with the parties to the Agreement".

INDIA USA CHINA SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Balance of Payments

According to the latest available data,

there was a current account deficit of Rs. 50.7 crores in India's balance of payments with West Germany during April-September 1958, as compared to that of Rs. 72.5 crores during the corresponding period of 1957, said the Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri B.R. Bhagat, in the Lok Sabha on February 20, 1959 in reply to a question by an Hon. Member of the House.

The Deputy Minister explained that a deficit with one country or a group of countries did not matter if resources were available to finance the over-all gap in the balance of payments. For bridging this gap, the measures adopted were severe restrictions on imports, export promotion and securing additional foreign assistance.

38

GERMANY INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

CAMBODIA

President's Speech at State Banquet

During his visit to Cambodia the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a speech at a State Banquet given in his honour by the King and Queen of Cambodia on March 15, 1959.

Following is the text of his speech :

Your Majesty, Your Royal Highness, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish to thank Your Majesty for the gracious words you have spoken about me and my country and the generous hospitality you have extended to me and to my party.

In the brief period that I have been here I have been greatly touched by the many expres-

sions of affection and friendship that the people of Cambodia have shown towards me and my country. On account of our old historic relations no less than on account of the similarity in some respects in the situations in both our countries arising out of attainment of independence, we are able to understand each other's aspirations and each other's problems because they are basically the same. We are both full of the existing responsibilities that freedom has brought us. We have also realised that in order to be masters of our country we have to be true servants of the country. I understand that your great Prime Minister participates with all sections of his people in manual labour on the land. It is a fortunate country where every citizen seizes the opportunity to serve.

Many among us must have thought at one time that once freedom was won our troubles would be over. When freedom came we found that it was only the first if not also the easiest step forward. The harder task lies ahead-the task of developing the land, of giving economic content to political freedom, of providing for every citizen an adequate standard of life. Fortunately, we are living in an age of co-operation, when people in many countries realise this need and do actually take a hand according to their ability in developing other countries besides their own. Exchange of technical knowledge and training facilities, gifts and loans of money and equipment, cultural exchanges-all these make the load of each a little lighter and the relations between countries kindlier and healthier. This is the kind of relationship that is worth sustaining. Our two countries are fortunately among those who realise that these relationships should not be interfered with by political considerations or ideological differences ; hence our policy of friendship with all countries which in our view is the greatest insurance of peace. This like any other great step is not without its difficulties and setbacks. We cannot do better than meet such situations with fortitude and faith, preparedness and determination. We should count upon the good sense and public opinion of the world at large and depend upon the rightness of our cause and the efficacy of settlement of disputes by negotiation of ironing out and smoothening all such awkward problems and situations.

Ladies and Gentleman, we in India value

greatly the friendship of Cambodia and her leaders and I am privileged to give you today the toast of my great and good friend, His Majesty the King.

CAMBODIA USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

CAMBODIA

Speech by King of Cambodia

Welcoming President Prasad, the King of Cambodia said

Mr. President,

It is difficult for us to express all the happiness and satisfaction which your presence brings us tonight.

We are honoured, and our people with us, that the first visit, since our Independence, of the Head of a Foreign State, should be that of the venerated President of the Great Friendly Republic.

Our greatest wish would have been to honour your stay with the pomp worthy of the highest ranking Indian Leader. But we have supplemented the simplicity of our welcome with the warmth and sincerity of our feelings towards Your Person and the Indian Nation.

India and Cambodia are bound by the links of a prodigious past in which their civilizations were blended. A community of thought and a search for the same high ideals have led our two peoples to the same struggles and the same victories.

This solidarity which has withstood the test

of time still finds expression in our own times through the active and generous part which your country took in the winning of our independence.

Today, we have no stronger support and no keener understanding than yours of the policy of neutrality which the Royal Government follows, and of its scrupulous respect of the principles of the Panch Sheela.

This is, therefore, the occasion for us to renew the expression of the deep gratitude of our people and to assure your country that we shall always be at its side to defend our common ideal, of peace and liberty.

We raise our glass to your health, Mr. President, to the prosperity of the Indian Republic and to the eternal friendship between India and Cambodia.

CAMBODIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

CAMBODIA

President's Speech at Farewell Banquet

On the conclusion of his visit to Cambodia President Prasad gave a Banquet in honour of the King and Queen of Cambodia on March 18, 1959. Speaking on the occasion, the President said :

I am grateful to you for honouring me by your presence here this evening and giving me this opportunity to express my esteem and affection for you and the people of Cambodia.

My sojourn here has meant for me a deepening emphasis on the ties of old kindred

civilizations that bind our two countries.

Our ties are much more substantial and of a more enduring character than mere brick and stone can make them. I do not minimize the great monuments of art and architecture, every brick and stone of which proclaims our affinity, and is reminiscent of those glorious days when people on both sides defied the elements and established those unbreakable links which have subsisted through centuries. But as I believe that ideas and spiritual values are even more lasting and powerful than the strongest links which human endeavour and enterprise can forge on the mere physical plane, I hold that we are even more intimately associated and more inviolably linked by the message of the great Buddha, the fundamentals of whose teachings are and have ever remained the basic principles of our life, religion and culture, and are living symbols of the faith that inspires the people of Kamboja in their dayto-day life.

In that great teaching we have the 'Mantram' or the master key for solution of the evils from which the world is suffering today. In this age of unimaginable advance of science and technology which have posed the great problem of life and death before the world, non-violence based on truth offers the one solution which can preserve and conserve all that is worth preserving in human society. That was the essence of the message of the great Buddha, reinforced by practical application to modern conditions by Mahatma Gandhi. I have no doubt in my mind, and my belief is reinforced and strengthened by what I have seen in your country and hope to see in others similarly situated, that spiritual and cultural ties are of infinitely greater value and of incredibly longer durability than a mere political or territorial conquest can establish.

Yesterday I was at your famed temple city of Angkor seeing the eloquent monuments of Khmer civilisation. Hundreds of people of diverse nationalities and diverse creeds visit Angkor. It must give all these people, as it gave me, a stirring sense of history and a consciousness of the growing closeness of the countries of the world which they can visit so conveniently and so comfortably and stand before and admire monuments belonging to an age when people of different lands knew so little about each other and travel was so difficult and so rare.

In a world now so tightly knit, peace and war can no longer be localised. Both now tend to be global phenomena. Hence it is that though our own countries have neither nuclear weapons nor military strength of any other kind nor the ambition to acquire such strength, we look with anxiety and concern at the accumulation of armaments anywhere in the world and plead for disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests. Through the United Nations and every other available forum we repeat our appeal that nuclear energy should be harnessed solely for peaceful purpose and for the benefit of mankind.

We know that the friendship of our two countries is based on a kinship of interestsinterest in peace and in the Panch Sheela, interest in the permanence of freedom. We know too that friendship based on such kindred interests is bound to endure.

I recall with special pleasure the coincidence

40

that today, the 18th of March, 1959, sees the completion of four years when the distinguished Prime Minister of your country and mine proclaimed their and their countries faith in Panch Sheela on the 18th March, 1955.

Let me hope that we shall find more and more opportunities to renew facilities and reinforce that faith and have better and wider opportunities for exchange of ideas and goods and for being of service in whatever way possible to each other.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen-I give you the toast of my great and good friend, His Majesty the King.

CAMBODIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

CAMBODIA

Reply by King of Cambodia

Replying to the President's speech, H. M. the Queen made the following speech in the name of H. M. the King of Cambodia;

Mr. President,

You have expressed, in very eloquent words, the delicate feelings prompted by our mutual friendship.

You can rest assured that your kind words will long ring in our hearts and conscience.

As for us, we wish to express how happy we feel to take part this evening in this new manifestation of the solidarity between our two countries.

It was indeed with a true emotion that we have been listening to the words you used to recall the ties that bind our two countries, the common ideal that actuates them, and also the great principles without which the world would, of a certainty, be doomed to catastrophe.

We know how much we are indebted to India and to her old culture. Even today, in this shaken world of ours, India remains the indispensable mediator whose judgment constitutes the surest guarantees of world peace.

We, for our part, believe, more than ever before, in the necessity of a true co-operation between nations.

The example of India and Cambodia clearly illustrates the fact that a loyal collaboration can be promoted not only for the material and moral benefit of two peoples, but also for the maintenance and preservation of collective security.

Mr. President,

In expressing again our feelings of thanks,

we raise our glass to your health.

CAMBODIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

President's Speech at State Banquet

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a speech at the State Banquet given in his honour on March 22, 1959 by the President of North Vietnam, Dr. Ho Chi Minh, during his visit to North Vietnam. Dr. Prasad said :

Thank you Mr. President, for your charming words of welcome.

When you visited our country, the people of India had a very special opportunity of welcoming you to our ancient soil and of coming to know you. Visiting you now in your country with its gracious traditions of hospitality is a very treasured experience. I have noted with deep feeling your people's spontaneous welcome of me which is an expression of their regard for my country and its people.

The memory of our fight for freedom is still fresh in our minds and we are always interested to know how other countries who were in subjection, like ours, find this expansive universe without fetters. Speaking for ourselves, I can confidently say that to realise the fullness of freedom involves a great deal more than just the attainment of political emancipation. It demands the highest in us without letting up for an instant. The highest is more easily described than practically achieved and in reaching up to it, there seems to be an eternity of pitiful todays to be reckoned with for one potential ideal tomorrow. The human predicament has always been the same. The mind can rise to great heights in a moment

41

but the weak bodies that have to be fed, clothed and tolerably sheltered, have to pass through slow hours and days and weeks and years of toil before the shining moment can be realised. It was Mahatma Gandhi who taught us to transfigure the common and the local and to give significance to the very toil. I do not know that we have quite learnt it, but at least we know that it is possible. With a magic of his own, Gandhiji touched off the leaven in everyone who came to his neighbourhood and kept him indefinitely in a state of dedication. Even now despite the lapse of years, the syllables of his name conjure up an atmosphere of single-mindedness and selfless service, and it would. I am sure, not be wrong to say, that his life and message had a similar impact in other countries than our own.

The Buddha, many centuries ago, spoke of 'Mahakaruna' or compassion and brought to all the kingdoms of Asia a powerful reservoir of energy and perception. Our countries have gained in heritage by this message that still softly echoes in our blood and makes us often pause to consider, in the midst of the stress and strain of our daily life.

In this age which is witnessing the tremendous resurgence of Asiatic and African countries into a growing and irresistible power determined to free themselves from foreign domination and internal weaknesses, we owe it to generations yet unknown to fashion the affairs in a manner that a global catastrophe in the form of a world war does not come about. Fortunately signs are visible of greater and greater appreciation of the inevitability of peace for the mere survival of mankind and in that lies the hope of the future. We as a people, have consciously and purposely adopted the course of purposeful peace, and shall be devoting our best energies to its cause. May the days that lie ahead see one after another the solution of the problems which face us as nations and countries, and may peace with contentment ail round grow and prosper is our heartfelt desire, and may we have the strength to make our humble contribution is our prayer.

Mr. President, your people new-born to freedom like ours, have before them problem as

complex, work as strenuous, as our own. They are fortunate to have in you an example of a tireless worker of great courage and devotion.

Friends, I propose a toast to President Ho Chi Minh.

VIETNAM INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

Dr. Ho Chi Minh's Speech

Welcoming the President, Dr. Ho Chi Minh said :

Dear Mr., President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends,

It is a great pleasure for me to receive today His Excellency the President of the Republic of India.

His Excellency the President of the Republic of India is a man who during his whole life has been fighting for the cause of national liberation of the Indian people. He is an old combatant with great experience, who has continually struggled for peace in the world and friendship among nations. His virtues set a brilliant example for us to follow.

His Excellency, although of old age and having heavy responsibilities in his country, has not minded the long distance and, for the sake of peace and friendship among nations, has personally come to us to bring to the Vietnamese people the friendship of the Indian people.

At present, in the international situation, there are many developments favourable to peace

the forces of peace and democracy in the world have gained new strength and achieved unprecedented progress.

In the task of safeguarding peace against war, of strengthening friendship among nations, the Republic of India, under the leadership of His Excellency the President, has made very valuable contributions.

Between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of India, friendly relations have been developing with every passing-day on the basis of Panch Sheela. The Vietnamese people are very grateful to the Indian people for their sympathy and support for their national liberation struggle. At present, the entire Vietnamese people, from North to South, are struggling for national reunification. A reunified Vietnam is the most ardent aspiration of the Vietnamese people and also a factor contributing to the preservation of peace in South-East Asia and in the world. The Vietnamese people greatly appreciate the contribution made by India to the defence of peace in the world, and especially in Indo-China where India assumes a heavy respon-

42

sibility as Chairman of the Inetrnational Commission for Supervision and Control. The Vietnamese people hope that the Geneva Agreements on Indo-China will be fully implemented. I am sure that His Excellency the President's visit to our country will further strengthen and develop the friendship between the peoples of our two countries.

May I propose a toast

-to the health of His Excellency the President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

-to the health of all the Ladies and Gentlemen here present.

-to the prosperity of the Republic of India

-to the increasingly strengthened friendship between the Vietnamese and Indian peoples.

-Long live peace in the world.

VIETNAM INDIA USA CHINA SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

President's Speech at Dinner

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following Speech at a Dinner given in his honour on March 23, 1959 by the Prime Minister of North Vietnam, Mr. Pham Van Dong, during his State visit to North Vietnam

Mr. Prime Minister,

I warmly appreciate your kind sentiments for me and my country. I am grateful to you for the words of welcome and good cheer you have spoken.

I need hardly assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that we are deeply interested in peace. We know that in the present stage of scientific and technological development which has annihilated distance and devised arms which may well annihilate humanity, if war breaks out, any serious conflict in any corner of the world may well spread like wild fire in tropical jungles and cover within its devastating flames continents across the wide seas. We are therefore firmly convinced that all differences between country and country and people and people should be settled and resolved by the method of discussion and negotiation. We have therefore regarded it not only as a great honour but also a heavy and serious responsibility to do whatever is possible for us to do to help in such discussion and negotiation. Shall I say that any such noble effort is always beset with difficulties and patience and perseverance are required not only by parties to a dispute but also on the part of those engaged in helping such

negotiations. In howsoever humble a way it may be. As an Indian I am proud that our services were requisitioned here and our representatives have had the privilege of receiving co-operation and enjoying the confidence of all ; and I must thank you Mr. Prime Minister and your country, for your trust in us. That trust sterns from our common belief in, and acceptance of the principles of Panch Sheela, which in itself is a modem version in a political and international form of what has been the common heritage of mankind of centuries, and especially of countries like yours and mine.

Please accept my thanks for all the hospitality and kindness I have received from His Excellency the President and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the masses of men and women who have assembled in their thousands at all hours and all places to show their affection to me and to my country. I propose, Ladies and Gentlemen, the toast of His Excellency the President Ho Chi Minh of Vietnam, the toast of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the men and women of Vietnam.

VIETNAM USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

Prime Minister Dong's Speech

Welcoming President Prasad, the Prime Minister of North Vietnam, Mr. Pham Van Dong said :

Your Excellency Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends,

I feel honoured and very happy, on behalf of

the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to welcome His Excellency Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the great Republic of India, the beloved and respected leader of the Indian people who is visiting our country, bringing to the Vietnamese people the warm friendship of the four hundred million-strong Indian people.

With its magnificent centuries old culture, India has made great contributions to the culture of Asia and the world. For many centuries the

43

Indian people have heroically and tenaciously struggled for their own liberation and for the building of a free and happy life. The Mahatma Gandhi, symbol of the struggle for the liberation of India, enjoys a most profound respect from the Indian people and a great admiration from the people the world over. Since their independence, the people of India have scored many great achievements in the building of their country under the guidance of their respected leaders, President Rajendra Prasad and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. The Indian Government and people have greatly contributed to one of the most noble causes of mankind. That is to safeguard world peace, to promote international co-operation and to strengthen the friendship among nations. The five principles of Panch Sheela have become widely accepted, and more and more supported by the people the world over, and have happy effects on international relations.

The Indian people are determined to defend their own interests, they also have at heart the interests of the oppressed peoples in Asia. In Africa and in the world. The Indian people have always manifested their sympathy and support to the struggle for independence and national sovereignty of the Vietnamese people and have actively contributed to the re-establishment of peace in Indo-China. Since the restoration of peace, India has consistently sympathised with and supported the Vietnamese people's struggle for the consolidation of peace and for national reunification on the basis of the Geneva Agreements. The Government and people of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are sincerely grateful for the sympathy and support shown by the Indian people and welcome the efforts of India, the country which assumes the Chairmanship of he international Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam.

Your Excellency Mr. President,

Bound together by an ever-growing friendship based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, our two countries are consolidating and developing day after day friendly relations and cooperation in the economic, cultural and other fields. The visit to our country in 1954 immediately after the restoration of peace of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, the great leader of the Indian people, the visit of Vice-President Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan to Vietnam in 1957, the visit to the Republic of India early in 1958 of our President Ho Chi Minh who was solemnly and warmly welcomed by the Indian people and Government, and the present visit to our country of President Rajendra Prasad who is welcomed by the Vietnamese people with all their deep friendship towards the Indian people and their respect to a veteran leader of the Indian people, all those visits are important political events in the friendly relations between the two countries and are at the same time important contributions to the cause of peace and the strengthening of friendship among the nations of the great family of Asia and Africa.

On the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam sincerely wishes to develop friendly relations with all countries in the world, first and foremost with the neighbouring countries, with the countries in Asia and Africa. We sincerely wish to solve all disputes through peaceful negotiations. At present, peace in Indo-China is being threatened. The people and Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are of the view that the Geneva Agreements should be respected and correctly implemented and are determined to fulfil their responsibilities towards these international agreements. Vietnam is one and the Vietnamese people are one. The Vietnamese people are determined to unite and struggle for national reunification on the basis of independence and democracy through peaceful means, in keeping with the spirit of the Geneva Agreements.

The Vietnamese people are firmly confident that, with the sympathy and support of the

Indian people and the peoples the world over, their just struggle will certainly be victorious.

Dear and respected President Rajendra Prasad,

Today, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are very happy indeed to welcome Your Excellency. I propose to bring a toast,

-to the health and longevity of His Excellency President Rajendra Prasad, the respected leader of the great Indian people.

-to the health and longevity of President Ho Chi Minh.

-to the ever-lasting friendship between the peoples of Vietnam and India.

-to the safeguarding and consolidation of peace in Indo-China, in South-East Asia and in the world.

44

VIETNAM INDIA USA CHINA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

President's Speech at Farewell Banquet

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad gave a Farewell Banquet on March 24, 1959 in honour of President Ho Chi Minh. Speaking on the occasion, Dr. Prasad said :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies and Friends,

It is an occasion for much rejoicing for me to have you here tonight. As a man of indomitable courage and selflessness, you, Mr. President, have a special place in the hearts of many millions of Indians. During your visit to India last year, many Indians have got to know you and the kindliness and the affection which were part of your personality have endeared you to them.

Our heritage Bowed into a very enriching channel 2,000 years ago through a message that transcended the barriers of geography and came to your land and to other countries of Asia from India. The echoes of that message still vibrate within us and will continue to colour and shape our lives for all time.

In your personal achievement, Mr. President, you have symbolised the force and power of dedicated vitality and have, by your half century of struggle and final success, become a part of the history of Asia. Generations yet in the future will draw inspiration and intellectual solace from your story and the part you played in the events of your time. There are bound to be problems at all stages of the history of a nation and every rising generation would be seized with their solutions. In their ordeals your example will be a guiding light to Your people not necessarily in presenting contingent solutions but in showing a manner, and above all, an example of those personal qualities of the human mind without which no achievement, however trifling, can be realised.

Our interest in the maintenance of peace in the world and in the principles of Panch Sheela is deep and abiding, and is backed by the determination of the people to do what they canto further them- It is only by a practical application on a vast global scale of the principles of peace that humanity can be saved from utter ruination which scientific advance and technological development have made inevitable, if humanity does not see the wisdom and does not adopt the course of action for maintaining it at all costs. Let us hope that we all, each in our own way, make our contribution. You have your own problems just as we have ours, and my earnest plea to you as to all others including ourselves, is that whatever differences we have should be settled by negotiation and discussion. Given goodwill and a determination, no problem should be intractable and insoluble. It is given to us to further and strengthen that goodwill and that determination, and my hope is that the sheer necessity of survival will make itself too insistent to brook any deviation from the straight narrow path of peace and integrity, material prosperity and spiritual uplift.

Ladies and gentlemen, I give you the toast of my great and good friend, President Ho Chi Minh.

VIETNAM INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM (North Vietnam)

Dr. Ho Chi Minh's Reply

Replying to the speech delivered by President Rajendra Prasad at the farewell banquet, President Ho Chi Minh said:

Dear Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends,

I am very grateful to His Excellency for his kind words about the Vietnamese people.

His Excellency President Rajendra Prasad has made great contributions to the revolution for national liberation, to the work of strengthening friendship among Asian and African countries and to the cause of safeguarding place in the world. The Vietnamese people and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are very grateful to His Excellency, to the Government and the people of India for their sympathy and support for the Vietnamese people in their past struggle for national liberation and in their present struggle for national reunification. His Excellency's life which has been devoted to a selfless struggle for national independence, peace and friendship, and His Excellency's great virtues, have set a shining example for all patriots and all peace-loving people to follow.

On this occasion of His Excellency the President's visit to our country, the Vietnamese people welcome in the person of His Excellency the great symbol of the patriotic virtues, the industriousness and the courage of the brotherly Indian people. In spite of his too short stay in

45

our country, His Excellency has left in the heart of every Vietnamese the most cherished Memory.

I am sure that this visit of His Excellency to our country still further strengthens the existing friendship between our two peoples. With the solidarity between the Vietnamese and Indian peoples, that of the Asian and African, nations and of the peace-loving people the world over, our two countries will certainly overcome all difficulties and will be successful in their respective task of building a prosperous country and of contributing to the defence of peace in Asia and in the world.

I wish to propose a toast :

-to the health of His Excellency President Rajendra Prasad.

-to the health of all members of the President's party.

-Long live friendship between Vietnam and India !

-Long live peace in the world !

VIETNAM USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Tax Agreement Signed

An Agreement for the avoidance of double taxation between India and Federal Republic of Germany was signed in New Delhi on March 18, 1959. Dr. William Melchers, Ambassador of West Germany to India and Dr. B. Gopala Reddi, Minister for Revenue and Civil Expenditure, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective Governments. The agreement now requires to be ratified after which it will be effective in India for and from the assessment year commencing from April 1, 1958.

The Agreement was initialled in Bonn in June 1958 during the visit of an Indian Tax Delegation which visited several European countries.

GERMANY INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate

Prime Minister Nehru made a statement in Lok Sabha on March 17, 1959 in reply to the debate on the demands of grants for the Ministry of External Affairs.

Following is the text of his statement

Mr. Speaker, Sir, just before the House rose

last evening, I ventured to point out that the debate had largely dealt with wider matters of policy and not so much with the organisation of the Foreign Service or the Ministry of External Affairs, except for a few remarks made hem and there. I shall, therefore, deal presently with some of these wider aspects which were referred to by Hon. Members.

But, before that, I should just like to say a few words about our foreign service. I pointed out in my initial remarks in opening the debate that the demand under the head of External Affairs includes really many items which, normally, have nothing to do with External Affairs, also many items which are fixed, items which we cannot touch, the fixed items being large sums of money which we pay to the United Nations as our annual contribution, some subsidies which we pay to governments and the other items being like the Tuengsang, Naga Hills Division, NEFA and the State of Pondicherry. These are really, to a large extent, in the domain of my colleague, the Home Minister ; but, for a variety of reasons it is decided to include them in the External Affairs Ministry. In fact, the sums include, I believe, considerable sums of money for the Assam Rifles, so that these sums swell up in this way. The actual sums spent on the external services of India are-I have not got the exact figure, but I think it is-in the region of between Rs. 6 and Rs. 7 crores. While we should always try to economise and we continue to do so, I should like to point out that it

46

compares very favourably with the expenditures of other countries-I am not talking of very big countries like the United States or the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom--of even other countries.

The work of the foreign office and the foreign services can be judged broadly by the way it serves the country's interests and the interest of the cause the country has at heart and abroad. It is often said that our publicity is criticised. Sometimes people make certain rather remarkable statements which are far removed from the truth as anything can be. For instance, the statements that we have no friend in the world and all countries are against us and so on so forth, are perfectly remarkable and show an amazing capacity for not knowing what is happening in the world and what the world is thinking about India. I do not pretend-and I cannot pretendto say that we do not make mistakes. We make mistakes so often enough. Our publicity, certainly, is not ideal, and can be improved. Nevertheless the basic fact remains that,--whether it is publicity, whether it is some other work of our Ministry or of the Government of India-the basic fact remains that the name of India stands high in the world and that is, after all, the test.

The bonafides of India stand high. The respect for India stands high because of its policy, because of what we have done. The criticism about our publicity, as I said, may be justified as all these other criticisms are partly justified because improvement can take place. But the reaction of a country to another country's policy does not depend so much on the publicity that is done.

There are plenty of foreign newspaper correspondents in India reporting about India. They mould the opinion in their countries, probably, more than any official work that we may do. But the real thing is whether the policy we pursue fits in with the outlook and the mentality of the other country or not. If it does not, then, all the publicity that we may do will not help much.

What is happening in our case is that originally there was always a certain respect for India, I am glad to say ; but a certain amount of resentment, and a certain feeling in foreign countries that because we considered ourselves rather above the milling crowd and adopted a high and pious attitude of not being with this or that-we, really, under cover of that exploit the situation to our advantage, that it is not a high moral attitude but something much lower than that ;-and thought we took shelter under high moral phrases.

I do not wish to seek any shelter under high moral phrases. I am not a person who is at all conditioned to speak in high moral terms. But, what we have sought to do is to follow a policy which seems to us to be correct. both in regard to our own interests, short-range and long-range, but also which helps, somewhat, in serving the very broad cause we have in the world, the cause of peace etc.

And, so what happened was this. Originally there was this doubt that the way India functioned was somewhat different from the way other countries functioned not became we did not join these big military blocs-other countries also did not join military blocs-bat because there was a slight but significant difference in our approach to problems or rather in the way we expressed ourselves in regard to problems, a difference which was no great virtue in us but which came to us because we had rather inherited it to some extent in the course of our national movement for freedom etc; how we even dealt with the British in India whom we were opposing how we dealt with them courteously, politely and with the door open and all that, though we did not bend before them. All that was conditioned by ourselves not only on the side of the House but the Hon. Members on every side of the House. And there was this basic difference which did not affect other people and people talking about neutrality. I do not like the word 'neutrality' in this connection, but non-alignment and the like. There are many other countries in the world but the other countries did not fight all through with that experience. Therefore, it is because of his that people are taken aback when we talk about a purer than thou attitude. It is all wrong: it is not a question of purer than thou attitude or high morality.

We know our faults very well and we know the virtues of others, sometimes even those whom we criticise. But, gradually, in the course of years, people came to realise that we were not posing that we were not moralising but that we were following a certain policy in all good faith and that policy while being one deliberately of friendship to other cauntries was yet one not only of non-alignment as such but something deeper than that, of doing something that we thought right, in the circumstances, of course.

I am perfectly prepared to admit mat it is not easy for any government as for any individual

47

to follow a 100 per cent policy of rightness

because it is conditioned by factors, by other countries' policies. But broadly speaking, we followed our policy even though it was displeasing to others. And it is this realisation of other countries that we endeavour to the best of our ability to follow a policy, an independent policy without trying to displease others that has gradually brought in a certain respect for what we do, even though there is a difference of opinion.

There can be no doubt-and I try to submit that with all humility-that India's voice and India herself is looked upon with very considerable respect in international assemblies, wherever you may go in the wide world and among great nations and small nations alike, although we have no military power which is supposed to be the principal reason why countries are, respected, nor do we have any financial power. That is to say, we try to look at things through our own eyes, even though, sometimes, our eyes may be rather dim. We do not try to look through other people's eyes or minds or through coloured glasses which affect our own sight and sometimes distort or colour the vision.

I should like this House to judge our activities from that point of view, certainly not refraining from criticism but always thinking of this basic thing, the basic approach, which is not even that of policy, although policy is important, but the basic approach of how to interpret a policy, how to approach the other countries and how to deal with any problem.

The Hon. Members sometimes accuse, as indeed the Hon. Lady Member did vesterday. about our complacence in regard to the US-Pakistan Pact, that we have toned down our. opposition to these things and broadly hinted that this might be due to our desire to get American dollars for our development and not to say or do anything which might perhaps come in the way of that. Well, we have not been ashamed to get help from the United States, from the Soviet Union and we propose to get that help from any country which gives aid on the fair, terms and expressly on terms that has nothing to do with our policy. I am really grieved at this idea being put out that our policy is governed by the lure of dollars or whatever it may be. We are liable to error but

one thing, I think, might be taken for granted. That is where the honour and interests of India are concerned, we are not going to give in whatever the consequences may be not only in terms of financial help, even other consequences.

In the old days when the United Nations or elsewhere we adopted an attitude in support of some proposition, if that proposition was, let us say, supported also by the Soviet Group, then it was suggested : these people under cover of their non-alignment and the so-called neutrality are secretly assisting the Soviet Group'. If we voted for the other group led by the United States then it was said: 'There you are, in search of dollars; they are doing this in search of something else. People did not seem to realise that a country can act just on the merits of a question and not under pressures and fears. I do believe that in spite of our numerous problems and numerous difficulties, India is a country today in the wide world which is least afraid of the other countries, whatever they may be. Certainly today the greatest and the biggest powers are the most afraid just like the man of property is afraid lest some thieves might steal it. So, the bigger the power, the bigger the interests it has to protect, the more the apprehension of somebody else overtopping, that strength and creating difficulties. I do not know what will happen to us when India becomes much more prosperous, whether we would also, with prosperity, begin to be afraid. I do not know. It is an odd thing that fear has nothing to do with weakness ; it comes with strength. It is almost an extraordinary proposition I am putting forward because then there is the antagonism of various strengths going against each other.

However, the position is this, that our approach has all along been, apart from policies, not to condemn as far as possible, not to irritate as far as possible any country, not to say any word which comes in the way of a calm consideration of the problem, or which comes in the way of moving towards a peaceful settlement of any problem. I do not say that we have always been able to act up to this. We lose our tempers; we get angry. That may be so. But anyhow the attempt is to do this because in the world today the most painful thing is not the real difficulty of the problems-they are very difficult-but the manner of approach which Is full of abuses and condemnation of the other party. Now, there are plenty of things happening in the world today which, according to our judgment, and probably the judgment of this House, ought to be condemned. But Surely it is not wise always to throw about your weight condemning people. There are plenty of things that are happening in India which can equally be condemned by others outside. It is a bad habit ; it does not help you to reach the other persons' mind. This habit of condemnation

48

and vituperation simply closes the door to any possibility of real discussion. Ultimately it may come of course. Especially when the danger is so great, the danger of war, everybody knows what a war means today and one has to be particularly careful, persons in responsible position in Governments are not worthy, of the job they do unless they can restrain their language and sometimes restrain their actions.

Today there are many problems. Yet from the world point of view the biggest problem, judged from the point of view of war or peace, is still the problem of Berlin in Germany. I am not going into that. I have always avoided going into that because one cannot make oneself responsible for the big problems of the world. Naturally, because it is an important problem, we have given thought to it; we have discussed it with other people; we have in our own way made some minor suggestions as to what should be done. But all those, even the suggestions that we have made are also not on what policies should be pursued but that any policy should be pursued with a measure of gentleness and not abuse. That, I submit, is a slightly distinctive feature of India, not from today but certainly from Buddha and Asoka's time and right down to Gandhi's time and it makes all the difference how you do a thing. If you do a right thing with abuse that right thing becomes a wrong thing and it does not lead to results while even a wrong thing may become a right thing if it is done gently and in a friendly way. Please judge our actions from that point of view and condemn us if we fail and lose our tempers and do not praise us for wielding the big stick or showing our fists to other countries and saying

how brave we are. It is easy to show big fists from here to another country and for the other country to show the big fist. Nothing happens to the man who shows the big fist; he is quite safe there. But by that he creates an atmosphere which is bad at any time and more so in the world today.

I said about Berlin and Germany. It is a very big problem, a tremendous problem. On that depends the future of war and peace-may be this very year, may be six months or three months' time. What is the good of my sitting down and according to my thinking logically, condemning this person or that nation ? Maybe everybody is wrong. Nobody can say that everybody is right; then every thing would happen rightly. But here we sit on the verge of a precipice all the time and we get used to it because the thing is a continuing affair. But you never know when the world may topple over the abyss.

Therefore, when we have met the representatives of one side over this problem or the other and it has been our privilege to discuss with both, we have found, and I say so quite honestly, good valid arguments advanced by either party or both parties, both based essentially and ultimately on the fear of the other. It is fear that is the worst companion. We have agreed with them largely because we try to understand them. We do not abuse them or shut our minds to them. And we have ventured to suggest that the matter should be proceeded with by friendly consultations even though they might differ completely from each other. It is not for us to suggest that you should do this or that, you should give in or not give in. It is not for us to do so. It would be presumptuous on our part to do so. But all that we could suggest was that we should pursue the path of consultation and discussion as much as possible, because it is realised by every responsible and even irresponsible man in the world that war must be avoided.

I think that in spite of our unhappy utterances from time to time we are moving in that direction of consultation-'we' meaning not India, but those great countries-and attempts are being made to find some way out.

I am glad to learn, only this morning, that

President Eisenhower has accepted the idea of having a summit conference; that is to say, he has suggested, I believe, first of all, that a meeting of foreign ministers might take place and later a summit conference this summer-that is, in the next two or three months. So I do think that the pressure of events and the general feeling among people in all countries is driving governments and the leaders of countries towards this approach of consultation. I do not know what the result would be when this takes place, because it becomes so tied up with people's passions, prejudices and fears, and yet there is the overwhelming fear of possibility of war. So, between the two fears some kind of a course is followed. Let us hope it will take them out of this dangerous zone.

Now, take another. In the last month or two, or more perhaps, the developments in the Middle-Eastern region have been unfortunate-Conflicts and, again, recriminations are going on between the new Iraq Republic and the United Arab Republic. These things have been unfortunate and most deplorable. I am not going into these things. I have my views but I do not want to express those views unless I can be helpful.

49

What is the point in burdening myself like some superior person and air my views on the world at large and say who is in the right and who is in the wrong ? First of all, I do not think I am competent to do so, and even if I was competent to do so it would be the uttermost folly for me to endeavour to do so. It is my business as a Foreign Minister to win people, to win countries and leaders to our side, not to estrange them still further. I can say that I am distressed with the developments that are happening in the Middle East amongst our own friends.

Then, take Africa. Africa stands on a somewhat separate footing. So are the countries which are not free, which are still under colonial domination. They do stand on a separate footing from other type of countries. We are committed by our history, by our thinking, for a generation past or more, by our policy, by our sentiments, everything, towards sympathising with the countries under colonial domination seeking for freedom. That, indeed, is supposed to be the policy of the United Nations. The United Nations has this in its Charter. But for us it is not only an intellectual exercise of policy, but there is an emotional feeling too about it; because having gone through the same mill we react constantly to something happening elsewhere.

In the last several years much has happened in Africa which has been very painful, much has happened recently in Africa which has been full of hope and we have seen several countries of Africa gaining freedom and independent status. And, we have congratulated the United Kingdom because of following a policy which has led to this progressive widening of the sphere of freedom in Africa-may be, we thought that the process should be faster ; anyhow, it was in the right direction.

Now, of course, even so there was always that amazing survival in the realm of, well, policy and administration,-that is, the Union of South Africa-a survival, I say, from a remote past with all kinds of atavistic activities of emotion and feeling which has no place today and it can only lead to utmost disaster in Africa and elsewhere. We have come pretty near to that disaster unless policies are changed, the policies of racial suppression and racial discrimination.

The House knows how in the United Nations. as matters come up again and again, the South African Union has ignored the advice and the resolutions of the United Nations. The only good aspect of it is that progressively, in spite of all kinds of pressures, the countries in the United Nations, barring a very few, have come round to dissociating themselves in various ways from South African policy. I am sorry that when in spite of other associations some countries of the Commonwealth have voted in the United Nations against South African policies, but I regret that the United Kingdom did not do so. I do not mean that they agree with that policy ; but for some pressures and pulls they could not do so,-because it would make a difference if the United Kingdom also functioned in accordance with its own declared policy in this matter as in others. Of course, when they did so they always said that they did not always vote on the merits of the question but for some other reason like the question of

jurisdiction. However, the United Kingdom has followed a policy, broadly speaking, in the last two or three years which has resulted in the freedom of Ghana, which will result in the freedom of the Nigeria, and them are movements afoot in the Eastern Africa also, in that direction.

Now, we have outburst in Nyasaland and, to some extent, in the entire Central African Federation. Well, it need rot be said by any of us here in this House that all our sympathies are with the people of Nvasaland in this matter. and I trust that in spite of the fact that the Africans there in their excitement have looted a number of Indian shops and done them considerable damage, in property I mean, nevertheless, I hope that the Indians there will always remember the policy that we have pursued and the advice that we have always given. And that advice is that they must, if they live there, naturally, sympathise with the legitimate demands of the people. They must play friends with them and in fact they must only remain friends with them. We do not wish to impose our will on others; at this rather very difficult moment when the people of Nyasaland and other parts of the Central African Federation are facing a crisis, it is particularly necessary that Indians should not do anything which is against the interests or the feelings of the African people.

Every person who is at all watching the development of the African situation will have seen that the whole continent is in a ferment. I have repeatedly said in this House and elsewhere that unless this matter is dealt with some foresight now we might have to face a most terrible catastrophe, a catastrophe not only of a colonial war but racial war and the bitterness that comes out of long suppression suddenly finding an outlet and violence and then the suppression of violence. We are always near this

50

kind or thing and unless great care is taken, we might overshoot the mark and that will be a terrible tragedy for Africa, just when the people were coming on the verge of freedom to have to face this conflict.

But I have no doubt that it is too late for any power to suppress these feelings that are passing

through Africa. One bright spot recently has been the agreement about Cyprus. Again, it is not for me to sit down and examine the agreement and say that it is "Oh, this might be better, or worse". It is rather an odd agreement. I might say, but the point is that the people concerned have agreed to it and got out of that terrible mess in which they were and in which they had suffered so much.

In talking about Africa, I think the Hon. Lady Member spoke at some length about the Cameroons. I shall just briefly say that the policy we have adopted in the Cameroons has been, according to our thinking, the policy that the people of the Cameroons want; the great majority of them want. And what is more, that is a policy which has been accepted by a very large majority in the United Nations, in fact including most of the Asio-African countries and others. I have, a vague idea, though I speak with some diffidence-I do not quite remember-that at one stage or part of this voting, practically nobody was against; only some abstained. So, it is rather difficult for any country like us to go about throwing our weight in another country. On general principles, yes, but when the representatives of that country, a great majority of them-their neighbours and others-want something done, for us to say, "No, you must not do it", it is very difficult. Also, according to our thinking, if this psychological moment in the Cameroons had not been taken advantage of, there was a danger of its slipping away and the independence of the Cameroons would have been postponed and one does not know what might have happened. The whole argument has been about the plebiscite or something in the nature of a plebiscite before independence. Now, it is admitted that elections must take place and will take place before or after. It is admitted that there should be an open, free voting : that the people imprisoned, etc., should be released and no suppression. It is also admitted that although there have been no elections there has been a Commission which has gone over the Cameroons, eliciting public opinion, and it has reported in favour of that Policy. It is suggested that we must reject all this. present demand of the great majority of the Cameroon people and insist on election, not realising the risk that if we did that, the election is going to take place and probably, I imagine,

and I think, it is better if it takes place in a free country than before-that would be at the risk of endangering the coming of independence, bemuse other countries are involved. France is involved. We cannot control them and then we can later sit down and merely condemn other countries, saying, "Oh, you have done this thing and that, or miss an opportunity".

An Hon. Member: I want to know whether this independence will be within the French Union and Whether it will be guided by the French Constitution, because we were worried because of the Algerican election.

The Prime Minister : It has nothing to do with the Algerian example. I cannot go into the details. It is going to be, as far as I know, full independence. It may have certain associations with France like the French language; let us say, like Ghana, as the English language; it may be some other thing, may be some laws. But Algeria is completely different. As the House knows, there is a big conflict going on and all kinds of restrictions. But here as far as I know, it is going to be as complete an independence as any of the African countries possess.

Some brief reference from various parts of the House has been made about Tibet. I have seldom referred to Tibet except in answer to some criticism. Again, it is rather, embarrassing to discuss events happening in a neighbouring country about which we know something of course, but naturally what we know is limited. It is not easy to get a full picture, and something which by our expression of opinion might really make a difficult position more difficult-criticism of this and that.

Right from the beginning, eight or nine years ago, when a kind of change came over the Tibetan scene by the Chinese Government exercising its authority there, and coming to an agreement with the leaders of Tibet including the Dalai Lama. May be it was that the agreement itself under stress of circumstances, but there was an agreement. Even previous to that, we had always, not only our Government but the previous Governments in the world, you might say, recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet. That had varied ; when the Chinese Government was strong it exercised it and when weak it did not exercise it. That was for the last several hundred years. But so far as I know no country had ever recognised the independence of Tibet. We certainly did not; and it was

51

inevitable, therefore, for us to recognise the suzerainty ; call it suzerainty, call it sovereigntythese things are fine distinctions and they are determined on the power of the State how far it goes.

Now, I think that agreement was a 17-point agreement which basically was an agreement for the autonomy of Tibet, for the maintenance of its religion, institutions, etc., under the broad umbrella of the Chinese State. There have been difficulties and conflicts, sometimes on a small scale and sometimes on a somewhat bigger scale. They are continuing, and creating new situations. I do not know that it will help at all for me to go into the details--such details as we know at present-except to say that the situation is a difficult one. I do not mean to say that at present there is no large scale violence there-here and there, there has been-but it is a difficult situation. It is mere a clash of wills than. at present, a clash of arm or a clash of physical bodies.

In this connection, I believe, some reference was made to a newspaper correspondent of the name of Paterson who lives in Kalimpong or Darjeeling-I forget exactly where-and we had to issue a warning to him. That is a kind of thing which we hestitate to do. The House knows very well the kind of stuff so often has been written about India, about our neighbours, from India to outside countries. By the kind of stuff I do not mean the opinions but the false sense expressed. Yet, we have put up with them, because we do firmly believe that it is better to put up with the wrong statements, even the mischievous statements, than we have to suppress the freedom of the press. But the only thing is that if only we were concerned, we might put up a very great deal, as we have done, but where the activities of a certain individual may tend to worsen the situation then we have to consider it again. Now, Mr. Paterson sent a number of messages which were so full of exaggerations, no doubt honest messages because

possibly he believed them, but he accepted every hazard and rumour and put them in his message as a fact with the result that we were astounded to see some of the messages which are likely to create a great deal of misunderstanding. So we had to tell him-and we told him even thensend good factual messages, we will not come in the way ; this kind if sensational messages without any factual basis, only hazard basis, is not good.

I have referred to various matters but the debate yesterday was largely concerned with one matter, and that was the United States Pact of mutual aid with Pakistan. Almost every member of the House, whatever side or party he belonged to, referred to it-and referred to it in one way, although the stress or emphasis was different,that is, referred to it with disapproval, with concern. That itself indicates the amount of concern and disapproval that that arrangement has elicited throughout the country.

The Hon. Lady Member thought we were trying to play down. I do not know why she thought so. Because we have not used strong language, because we have not, according to her, condemned the United States of America ? I start by saying that we do not think condemnation is the right approach. I do believe that the United States of America has the friendliest feelings for us, by and large. It may be that its policies, moved by other considerations, push it in other directions ; that is a different matter; just as I do believe that the Soviet Union has the friendliest feelings for us. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that we can follow a policy, a policy which I say is a straightforward policy. which yet gets to us friendly feelings from great and small countries which are hostile and antagonistic to each other. And this is not due to any cleverness on our part or any wonderful feat of the policy. It is due basically, as I said right at the beginning, to that little touch-a very little touch, I am sorry to say, but still a touch-of the Gandhian in us that still functions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that from the point of view of any Pact, these military alliance pacts, we disapprove of them. We think they do not bring security; they bring insecurity.

You could not think a more vivid example of this than the consequences of the Baghdad Pact

in Western Asia during the last few years. Ever since that Pact has come it has been a symbol of disturbance, insecurity, disunity and trouble. It does not matter what the other views may be but this fact is patent. All those countries there have become disunited and troubled. SEATO has not become so obvious because SEATO has not functioned very much though it has been on paper very much. Therefore, when I have seen this, it surprised me that in spite of this a certain policy of military pacts and alliances should be followed. That is a general consideration.

So far as this particular matter is concerned, this bilateral pact, naturally we have other considerations also, because it affects India. It affects India even though the United States Government does not want it to affect India. I believe, honestly I believe, that they do not want it to

52

affect India for other reasons. But though they do not want it to affect India, it does affect India. It is a fact that it does affect India, because in the nature of things such a development has to affect India, because of Indo-Pakistan relations, because Pakistan being our neighbour country and not being in very good terms with us; apart from the nature of things, the declarations of the Pakistan leaders. They go on repeating this that they are going to use this against India. But apart from the actual use. the fact is that the type of mentality which we have had to face in Pakistan during the last, well, ever since partition practically, that type of mentality has come in the way of every peaceful settlement. And I would add rather emphatically that I do not think we are pure and guileless and blameless in these matters. We have committed mistakes, we have made mistakes, we have become angry. But, by and large, we have tried to settle disputes with them peacefully. We are interested in devoting ourselves to the development of our country and not getting entangled in border troubles and other troubles. Therefore, by and large, we have been conditioned by other factors which have conditioned the leaders of Pakistan. But in spite of every effort which has been criticised by some Hon. Members in this House or outside the House as some measure of appeasement with Pakistan or something like that, nevertheless we have followed that policy, and we have met rebuff after rebuff,

and naturally we are very unhappy about it.

Now, with all this background of this mentality which faces us in Pakistan, any help of the type given by the United States, military help, tends, and inevitably tends, whatever the belief or wishes of the United States might be, to increase the intransigence of the Pakistan Government. That is an automatic consequence and thereby it comes in the way of the solution of Indo-Pakistan problems. That is a fact, and we have said that repeatedly in mild. friendly but firm language : of course, because that is a statement of fact. I do believe that this is well appreciated, this aspect, by many people in the United States of America, even the leaders. But they have got themselves into this tangle of alliances and they find it very difficult to get out of this tangle.

The Baghdad Pact failing, practically ceasing to function soon after the revolution of Iraq, assurances were given that something else will take its place and now it is this that has taken place. Now, I do not understand; the Hon. Lady Member said we have been quiet. I do not understand what we are supposed to do about this.

Delivery of fiery speeches in this House or in the market place or send aggressive notes to other countries ? I hope not. Firmness, there should always be. But, if we are at all true to what we have inherited, there should be friendliness, politeness and a certain faith in the other peoples bonafides. It is a little difficult, perhaps, to balance all these things. But, it has to be done, if you want to live in this complicated world and play a friendly role of bringing people together rather than separating them.

I need not refer to the border troubles because we have spoken about them on several occasions in this House. It is a part of that mentality of Pakistan that goes on leading to these border troubles. We have to face it, I entirely agree, by checking every step to protect our border and give security to our people. Here we live in this rather dangerous world with dangerous problems. But I hope that, in spite of that, we shall not forget that approach to these questions, that calm, peaceful and pacific approach, that friendly approach, a friendly approach even to a deliberately hostile country to us and that we shall avoid saying things which add to the already large fund of bitterness and ill-will in this world.

Before I finish, I should just like to say a few words that I intended to say at the beginning, about our Foreign Service. Something was said on this. It is always easy to criticise any service. I can myself criticise some things that happened in our Foreign Service. But, knowing many of them myself and their work and also through other people who have known them from their reports, I can say that our Foreign Service, by and large, is a fine service and it can compare very favourably with any Foreign Service of any country in the world. It has been in existence now for well 10 years or so. It has gradually spread, becoming bigger and wider. It has had to face many difficult problems, many difficult situations all over the world and it is largely due to the activities of that Foreign Service as well as our own policies that this respect for India has grown in all the countries. An Ambassador of ours or a Minister of ours is frequently approached by other countries for advice just because he is considered to represent, in a little degree, what is said to be the wisdom of India.

It was stated by one Hon. Member that there is discontent in the Foreign Service because they are not promoted rapidly enough. There may be something in it; not much. And also that non-Foreign Service men are imported into the service either from public life or from other services. Such persons are normally in service as Heads of Missions because other people are not brought in.

53

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I do not believe in the rules and orders of seniority in any service. Seniority cannot be ignored. But this kind of automatic preferment because a person is senior, the sooner it is done away with, the better. I am afraid, not having ever been in service of that type myself, I am totally unable to comprehend the service mind. I can understand, of course, security and all that. Let us take this. In the Army, if your Commander-in-Chief and your principal officers at the top automatically came to their posts by virtue of seniority, you will have a dud army, I can tell you. It becomes essential that this rule of seniority should be tempered as soon as you reach a certain stage-in the lower stages it

does not matter-by merit. At a little higher stage, it should be given up altogether, completely, 100 per cent, and only merit should prevail. I know, the difficulty of this is that when you talk about merit, merit may often have the cover of nepotism or nepotism may be covered by the socalled merit. True, that is so. We will avoid it. But, to talk about automatic preferment to higher posts in any service is only bringing that service down to the level of mediocrity. Obviously, the mediocre survives in a rule of seniority. Of course, all these matters have to be considered.

I think that in the Embassies, Heads of Missions, we should have, we shall continue to have some public men and we will. Some places may be very important ; some places may be less important. We should balance these things. Sometimes, some senior men in other Services have been made Heads of Missions : not many; a few have been made.

Somebody referred to our Foreign Office Inspector's reports and demanded why they should not be placed on the Table of the House. If I may respectfully say so, that was a most remarkable demand. The moment we did that, these reports would cease to have the slightest value in them. The moment you place confidential talks or reports and opinions of one Member of the Service about another, senior Member about others, the result will be, there will be no confidential talks, no confidential opinions expressed but some bald statements, just bald statement. Of course, if there is some major misdemeanour that would be noted. But, these reports have seldom major misdemeanours. They refer to all kinds of idiosyncracies of the person concerned, his temperament, his virtues, his failings. These things are not even seen by every member, by all the people in my Ministry. I do not know-let us venture to say, if it is decided to appoint a Committee to inspect the lives of all our Members here and want the reports to be placed on the Table of the House, it would be rather an embarrassing position. That, of course, has no meaning. In fact, so far as these Inspection reports are concerned, I have a feeling that these inspections tended to become rather inquisitorial, petty things, petty matters and rather exasperating to some of our senior Ambassadors. We have now, in fact, lessened somewhat the inquisitorial nature of these inspections.

An Hon. Member : What are the terms of reference of these inspection teams ?

The Prime Minister : This is not an official committee of enquiry with terms of reference, but, of course, they have to go into all kinds of things, naturally into the general accounts, what is spent, how much, the relations of the people with each other, with the public there, with the Government there, what is the amount of entertainment given, what is spent-so many odd things; and when our inspectors go about asking for a detailed account of, let us say, every meal provided in the last six months, it is difficult; the poor Ambassador has to spend all his time in keeping accounts of his meals, how many guests lie has got, instead of doing his job. It is far better, after some enquiry, fixing a sum-spent so much on entertainment than asking him an account for every meal, and how many courses he gave in every meal. An impossible situation. It was becoming that, and we stopped it, but the general inspections do good work, and do give us information. That will, of course, continue.

When we talk about the foreign service, the Hon. Member who referred to this matter said that people were not so anxious, so keen, to go into the foreign service as they used to. That is partly true. I think that, although we cannot compare our terms with the big, rich countries, compared to other things in India, we pay them adequately. Even though it is adequate, sometimes it is not enough,-it depends on the family, this, that and other of the Ambassador-sometimes it becomes very difficult for him to make both ends meet, in the lower grades especially.

Then again, the normal idea of an Embassy is sitting in a great city-London, Washington, Moscow, Paris-but out of the sixty-odd foreign missions that we have got, most of them are terribly dull places. Some of them are sitting in the middle of a desert almost, with no contacts or anything.

May I give you an example of a peculiarly difficult post, our post in Tibet-not in regard to

54

the political situation, but just the physical diffi-

culties of the place? And it requires a man, and even more so, a woman, of great courage to endure that life there. Either the woman herself is the head of the mission, or is the wife, and the wife has to suffer more.

My recent visit to Bhutan-and I spent a day at Yatung-gave me some insight into these conditions of our missions in Tibet. Of course, one thing has happened in Gyantse, about four years back a tremendous flood came and it swept away the whole of our mission with 50 or 60 persons. That flood came because something broke down, some lake etc., some burst took place ; it came overnight and 50 or 60 of our men died, and since then we have had no building there. Previously there was a building. There has been talk of putting up a building, but things move slowly. In order to put up a building, one has to think of putting up some kind of protective work, so that the river might not overflow. Things, I am afraid, move slowly in India, but sometimes-sometimes I say, not always-things move even more slowly in China. We have got our plans, we have sent our engineers, but we cannot get the requisite permission to build this or that from the Chinese Government. They are considering it. And meanwhile, it is a very hard life for our people.

It is a terrible climate, I mean to say terribly cold, and if you have no proper houses, proper heating, it can be an almost unbearable climate. It has an altitude of 11,000 feet ; that itself is difficult enough. At that altitude, it is a terrible cold climate, huge, long, dark nights in the winter, no companionship, no social fife ; it really is a very hard life, and I am full of admiration for these people who work there, and even more so for their wives.

I am sorry I have taken up so much time. I beg to move these Demands be adopted.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY IRAQ SOUTH AFRICA GHANA NIGER NIGERIA CYPRUS CAMEROON FRANCE ALGERIA CHINA UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA OMAN BHUTAN PERU

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Cameroons

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on March 3, 1959 on the future of the Cameroons :

The subject matter of our discussions is an important one. It concerns not only the future of nearly five million people of the Cameroonsover three million under the French trusteeship and over a million and a half under UK trusteeshipbut the birth of a new nation in Africa.

We have had the advantage of hearing the Prime Ministers of both parts of the Cameroons as well as leaders of Opposition in the Legislative Assemblies of these Territories. We have also heard the Minister for Northern Cameroons Affairs in the Nigerian Government who spoke on behalf of the Northern Cameroons under the British administration, and we have had the benefit of hearing and questioning a large number of petitioners representing various shades of opinion in the Territories. We have also before us the resolution of the Trusteeship Council and the records of discussions in the Council relating to the Cameroons under French administration and those under the UK administration. And last but not least important, we have the detailed and comprehensive report of the Visiting Mission to the Cameroons. Various issues have been raised before us, and it is now time to pronounce on the future of the Cameroons.

It is important, in our opinion, that we should be clear as to the objectives and purposes of the United Nations in regard to Trust Territories and we should, in the light of the wealth of material before us-including of course the oral and written representations by petitioners-sort out the issues, and evaluate the available evidence with care in so far as it bears on the task before us. Indeed, it seems to us that the task of the Trusteeship Committee is quasi-judicial in the evaluation and determination of the various points of view placed before it.

I would like, first of all Mr. Chairman, to explain the fundamental approach of my Government to problems concerning the freedom of Africa. If I may recall the speech of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, at the closing session of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung on 24th April 1955, he said:

We have passed many resolutions about this country and that country, but I think there is nothing more terrible, there has been nothing more horrible

55

than the infinite tragedy of Africa in the past few hundred years. When I think of it, everything else pales into insignificance, that infinite tragedy of Africa ever since the days when millions of Africans were carried away as galley slaves to America and elsewhere, the way they were treated, the way they were taken away, half of them dying in the galleys. We must accept the responsibility for all this, all of us, even though we ourselves were not directly involved. But unfortunately in a different sense, even now the tragedy of Africa is greater than that of any other continent. Whether it is racial, whether it is political, it is there, and it is up to Asia to help Africa to the best of her ability because we are sister continents.

That was in 1955. Today four years later. the picture is much brighter. One country after another in Africa has gained independence. The current of African freedom is no longer a trickle; it is a mighty raging irresistible stream. We have since rejoiced at the independence of Tunisia and Morocco, of Sudan, of Ghana and of Guinea, and we are proud to have them sitting beside us in the United Nations. Next year we hope to have the Cameroons, Nigeria, Togoland and Somalia in the United Nations as independent nations; and if I may say so here, it is the fervent wish of all peoples of Asia and Africa to have the people of Algeria represented in their own right as fellow members of the United Nations in the very very near future. It is not only the noble privilege of the countries of Asia and Africa but indeed it is for all of us to help in the consummation of the processes leading to the freedom of the African people and to do nothing which might impede or complicate them.

The Trusteeship system of the United Nations, under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council, has made a significant contribution to the attainment of freedom by many countries in Africa. My delegation is happy to have had the privilege of being associated with the work of the Trusteeship Council. We have always urged the independence of the territories under trust at the earliest possible date. It is in this spirit Mr. Chairman that we approach the question of the forthcoming independence of the Cameroons.

Article 76 of the Charter lays down the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System. These are progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned and as may be provided by the terms of each Trusteeship Agreement. Under Article 76 (c), it is among the objectives of the Trusteeship System to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. Article 76 thus provides the soil in which the Trust Territories are to grow and blossom into independence. Thus what the United Nations has to ensure is the eventual emergence of Trust Territories into independent nations with all the attributes of sovereignty, according to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples, and enjoying fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights.

Consistently with the principles I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, we have to examine in respect of the French Cameroons, with which my observations will be concerned in the first instance-

(1) whether the Cameroons are ready for independence ;

- (2) whether the desire for independence is supported by the people ;
- (3) whether the Cameroons under French administration are likely to emerge as an independent country on 1 January 1960, having all the attributes of independence and sovereignty;
- (4) whether the people of the Territory enjoy at present and will enjoy on 1 January 1960 fundamental freedoms and respect of human rights without any distinction as envisaged under Article 76 (c) of the Charter.

As to the first question, namely the readiness for independence, there is no doubt in our mind, after reading the Visiting Mission's report and after hearing the Prime Minister of the Government of the Territory, as indeed after hearing the leader of the Opposition and other petitioners who are opposed to the present Government, that Cameroons under French administration are fully ready for independence ; in fact, if anything, independence has been too long delayed; and it was perhaps as a result of such delay that the frustrations of the people found expression in the violence that erupted in the Territory.

The Cameroons under French administration

56

enjoy representative institutions. Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Visiting Mission's report show that the Territory has highly developed local government based on the elective system and universal suffrage. There has been progressive development of democratic institutions--even though in the opinion of some the development has been tardy to the point when there is a Legislative Assembly elected on universal adult suffrage. My delegation is impressed by the calibre of the leaders in the French Cameroons, both those who are at present in the Government and those who are in the Opposition and might well form a Government in the future. We are satisfied that there will be no dearth of people either in the administration or in the Service cadres fully competent to undertake and discharge the responsibilities failing upon the Cameroons, as a free and independent nation. We accept the conclusion of the Visiting Mission's report in paragraph 134 that the Cameroonians have the capacity to assume the responsibilities of independence.

As for the good question, the desire for independence on 1 January 1960 appears to us to be fully supported by the people. My delegation is impressed by what has been stated in paragraphs 134 and 135 of the Visiting Mission's report :

"All the Cameroonians with whom the Mission spoke stated, often emphatically, that they desired independence. The Mission did not hear a single dissenting voice on that subject, nor was any alternative to independence proposed to it. It accordingly considers itself justified in concluding that the overwhelming majority of the population desires independence. There is some difference of opinion among the population regarding the date of the proclamation of independence; some approve the date of 1 January 1960, which was the Government's choice, while others advocate an earlier date. But, on the basis of the information the Mission was able to obtain in the Territory, it seems safe to suggest that the latter constitute only a small minority."

The Mission goes on to say in paragraph 136: "For the reasons given, the Mission has concluded that the request that the Territory should become independent on 1 January 1960, which was approved in the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons by a large majority, is alsosupported by the great majority of the population".

The people of the Cameroons under French administration, Mr. Chairman, have been clamouring for independence for a long time. The urge for independence is deep among all sections of the people and many consider that freedom has already been long delayed. The Legislative Assembly of the Territory, which was elected on the basis of universal adult franchise, adopted a resolution on 24 October 1958 declaring that it "solemnly proclaims the will of the Cameroonian people that the State of the Cameroons should attain national independence on 1 January 1960".

The Visiting Mission, in paragraph 141 of its report, has come to the conclusion that the Legislative Assembly is representative in character. In the hearings before this Committee the representative character of the Assembly has been questioned by some petitioners. This is an important point and requires close examination. The first ground taken is that the Assembly was elected as a Territorial Assembly to consider the draft Statute of December 1956 and that it is not therefore competent to pronounce itself on the question of independence. The elections of 1956 were held on the basis of universal suffrage and single electoral college. The candidates were returned by direct election. According to a brochure issued by the Directorate of External Relations of the High Commission of the French Republic in the Cameroons, out of 1,740,000 registered voters, 940,000 came to the polls. Elections could not be held in the Sanaga-Maritime area because of disorders and participation was low in other two areas. Excluding these areas, the participation of voters ranged between 80 per cent in the area of highest poll to a minimum of 60 per cent, which is admittedly a high rate of participation even according to the standards of advanced democratic countries. The Assembly so elected considered a draft Statute prepared by the French Government. The very fact that the Assembly of 1956 was elected on universal suffrage shows that the intention was to extend to it legislative powers. It is for this reason that the Government of France presented to it a draft Statute. The Assembly was successful in securing several important amendments to this draft, which finally became law in April 1957. Thus under the new law, a few months after the elections the Territorial Assembly was converted into a Legislative Assembly and the Cameroons ceased to be an associated Territory

57

in the French Union. Cameroonian citizenship was created and subsequently the Cameroons chose its flag, its hymn and its motto. The same Legislative Assembly on 12 June 1958 requested the French Government "to recognise the option of the State of the Cameroons for independence upon the termination of trusteeship and transfer to the State of the Cameroons all powers relating to the conduct of its domestic affairs". The resolution also invited the Cameroonian Government to negotiate on general lines the Statute of the new State of the Cameroons, which should be submitted to it and which would constitute the stage of transition to independence.

The Government undertook negotiations with the Administering Authority in accordance with the June 12 resolution and the Legislative Assembly on 24 October adopted a resolution proclaiming the wish of the Cameroonian people to attain full national independence on 1 January 1960.

This sequence of developments shows that the Assembly was successful within a comparatively short time in negotiating with the French Government the various stages of independence. This, Mr. Chairman, should not be held to derogate from its representative character or its responsibilities. On the contrary the fact that the Government responsible to this Assembly was able to secure successive stages of political advancement culminating in independence through peaceful, constitutional procedures in conformity with the concept of the Trusteeship System as opposed to the methods of violence attempted by some political parties in the territory entitles it to the confidence of the United Nations. It is the experience of many countries, including my own, that legislatures constituted on the basis of limited franchise and often with limited powers tended, as a consequence of the calibre of their members, the vigour of their peoples and the strength of their nationalist movements, to assume larger and larger powers and functions and the colonial or administering powers were compelled to yield further responsibilities to such bodies. The fact that the Legislative Assembly of the French Cameroons was within a space of two years able to secure complete domestic autonomy under the international trusteeship system and a promise of independence on 1 January 1960 only goes to show the strength and vigour of the movement for independence in the Cameroons and the success of its endeavours.

The aim of the Trusteeship System is the progressive development of self-government or independence. It seems to us, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition that every stage of the advance towards independence should be preceded by general elections to secure a specific mandate from the electors is neither practicable nor warranted by the experience in other countries. The elections of 1956 were on the basis of universal adult franchise. As reported by the Visiting Mission, all parties at the 1956 elections were talking of early independence, the nationalist movement was strong and the electoral campaign was entirely concerned with the future of the Cameroons and the theme of independence. In our view, Mr. Chairman, there was nothing improper for a Legislative Assembly constituted as a result of such elections to pronounce itself in favour of independence.

The next ground urged to impugn the representative character of the Assembly is that the elections of December 1956 were not popular since they were conducted without the participation of the UPC and two other associated groups which had been banned by the Government. Some petitioners have made large claims about the UPC enjoying the majority support of the people ; others have repudiated this claim and it has been stated that many members of the UPC have renounced the party and joined other groups. The Visiting Mission has observed that whatever the strength of the UPC in the beginning the party has lost popular support owing to its violent activities. We deeply regret the outlawing of any political party in a democratic society. The UPC is said to have been banned because it resorted to violence. Both the Visiting Missions to the Cameroons which were sent in 1955 and the last one whose report is before us, have observed that the UPC unfortunately became a violent revolutionary party. The question whether resort to violence is permissible by a political party to gain its ends, albeit this is independence, is one which is open to considerable dialectical discussion. It is, however, obvious that the General Assembly cannot get involved in such a discussion ; nor can it Jay down that a government or an authority charged with the administration of a Trust Territory should ignore violence. In this connection I would like to correct a misquotation by one of the petitioners, of Mahatma

Gandhi in favour of resort to violence for the achievement of freedom. We, in India, Mr. Chairman, ought to know what Gandhi preached. What he said was that death was preferable to slavery, but as far as I am aware, he never advocated or condoned violence as a political method for attaining independence. Indeed, this was entirely opposed to his whole philosophy which was summed up in the maxim that means were

58

more important than the ends ; if the end is good, the means adopted for it must also be good ; and if wrong means am adopted for right ends, the result is bound to be evil. It is a matter of history now that he called off the mighty movement of civil disobedience in India in 1921 because of a single instance of mob violence in the later stages of the movement. As I have said, Mr. Chairman,, we regret the dissolution of the UPC by the Government but at the same time we regret the violence that preceded its dissolution. The fact that the UPC was banned and that in consequence of the disturbances in the elections of December 1956 four seats remained unfilled cannot, in our opinion, be allowed to invalidate the elections.

In regard to the UPC suggestions have been made that it should be legalised. This is of course a matter for the Government of the Cameroons to decide taking all factors, including the need for reconciliation, into consideration. In Resolution 1211 (XII) adopted by the General Assembly on 13 December 1957, the General Assembly expressed the hope "that as a result of the application of appropriate measures in particular, the early promulgation of the amnesty law by the Administering Authority and the renunciation of the use of violence by all political parties it will be possible to achieve in the Cameroons under French administration conditions conducive to the early restoration of a normal situation in the disturbed area and to the furtherance of democratic progress and political activities in the Territory". It is noteworthy, Mr. Chairman, that the General Assembly contemplated the renunciation of violence as essential to normalisation of conditions in the French Cameroons. We waited in vain for a statement by the many representatives of the UPC and of their associate groups before this Committee for a clear and sincere declaration of renunciation of violence. We were disappointed

that instead of such a declaration there have been threats veiled, and sometimes not so veiled, of resort to violence if the UPC was not legalised and elections were not held before 1 January 1960.

Another point raised by a group of petitioners is that the Legislative Assembly as at present constituted consists of 8 persons who are Franco-Africans and that, therefore, the Assembly is not representative in character. This fact is not denied by the Government but it has been stated on behalf of the Administering Authority and the Cameroons; Government that on 31 December 1959 the membership of these, persons will automatically lapse as no one other than a Cameroonian citizen can sit thereafter in the Legislature of an independent Cameroons. It has to be remembered that what the Legislative Assembly has demanded is full and complete independence from 1 January 1960 and no Assembly, whatever its composition, could have asked for anything more. Therefore, the presence of the 8 Franco-Africans in the Legislative Assembly does not, in our opinion, vitiate the demand for independence or its representative character for this purpose.

In the same context it has been suggested that fresh general elections should be held in the Territory before 1 January 1960 when it attains independence. The demand for fresh general elections has mainly come from parties in Opposition to the Government, which is the usual experience of all elected legislatures. The Charter of the United Nations, Article 76(b) enjoins consultation with the people on the subject of self-government or independence. Such consultation is also contemplated in Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement. Normally there should be such a consultation and it is open to the United Nations, if they should so desire to institute a consultation through a referendum or a plebiscite on the subject of independence and the possible date of independence despite the unanimous wish of everyone concerned for independence on January 1, 1960. Such a consultation, however, would not affect the continuance of the existing Legislative Assembly. General elections as such are related to the composition of the Legislative Assembly. In the absence of a finding that the Legislative Assembly has not been legally and properly constituted, to insist on general elections for a new Assembly would, in our view, be not justified.

With regard to general elections, I should like to make it clear, on behalf of my delegation, that we are not opposed to general elections as such. If the Government of the French Cameroons were to decide to dissolve the present Assembly and hold general elections forthwith, such a decision would meet with our commendation. But we find no reason for forcing general elections and for making the holding of such elections a condition precedent to independence, when the issue of independence itself is so clear, enjoys the full support of all sections of the people and will on I January 1960 be full and complete. There seems to us much force in the statement made by the Prime Minister : "It would be illogical to take the position that the Assembly which was considered fit to ask for independence was now not considered suitable to receive it".

What seems important in the present case is not the holding of general elections before independence but one soon after independence.

59

On 1 January 1960 the Cameroons will emerge as an independent State. The whole context of its internal constitution and external relations will change. Final decisions in such matters should be taken by a new Government formed after independence. We note with approval what the Prime Minister has said, namely that after independence, there will be general elections since, as he says, these will be necessary and useful in order to settle various constitutional and other questions and in establishing in their final form the institutions of free and independent Cameroons. It is desirable in our opinion that elections are held with the least possible delay after 1 January 1960. We hope that as in other newly independent countries a Constituent Assembly will be created to prepare a constitution of free and independent Cameroons and to determine the pattern of its foreign relations and association with other countries, including its neighbours.

It is our hope that elections will be held to the vacant seats in the Legislative Assembly allocated to Sanaga Maritime area, under conditions of complete political freedom and amnesty. We note with satisfaction the statement made by the Prime Minister of French Cameroons that his Government had issued a Decree settling 12 April as the date of bye-elections both in Sanaga-Maritime where there are four vacant seats, and in the Mbouda sub-division, where there are two other vacant seats.

In regard to sovereignty, we find that by Ordinance 58-1375 of 30 December 1958 the Government of France has transferred to the Government of the Cameroons all the powers of internal legislation and administration, including judiciary, retaining to itself the responsibility for monetary and foreign exchange policy, foreign policy, frontier security and defence of the State of the Cameroons. It is clear from the declaration of the representative of France and of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons that this constitutes the last stage in the evolution of the Cameroonian institutions before independence and the ending of trusteeship as outlined in the preamble to the Statute. The Government of France have also stated in the preamble to the Ordinance that it is their desire to comply with the wishes of the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons that they should attain full independence on I January 1960. We note with pleasure the statement of the distinguished representative of France, M. Jacquinot, in answer to a question put by me, that on 1 January 1960 the State of the Cameroons would possess the full attributes of a sovereign State and enjoy the same freedom as any State member of the U.N. and that, France as the Administering Anthority, would sponsor its application for admission to the United Nations. The categorical statement of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons that after 1 January 1960, the Cameroons will have complete international personality confirms the declaration made on behalf of the Republic of France.

We take note of the statement made on behalf of the Administering Authority and the Governmeet of the Cameroons that the nine Conventions which am annexed to the Statute of 30 December 1958 will automatically end on 31 December 1959 and that thereafter independent Cameroons will be free to negotiate and enter into new Conventions with France or any other State. My delegation Mr. Chairman, has looked into these Conventions. Some of these are of a technical nature and do not detract from the sovereign responsibility of the Government of the Cameroons. The Conventions relating to Defence, the judicial system, intergovernmental cooperation, foreign relations and Commerce and External Trade which reserve to the Government of France varying degrees of responsibility during the period of trusteeship are necessarily a reflection of the position which the Government of France occupies and will occupy till the end of this year as Administering Authority. Similar Conventions are appended to the statet concerning Togoland under the French Administration which under resolution 1253 (XIII) of the General Assembly will be independent on a date in 1960 to be decided between France and Togoland. It will be for the Government of the Cameroons during the period between now and 1 January 1960 to take measures to eliminate their dependence on France, especially in the field of Defence. We are satisfied that the State of Cameroons which will emerge on 1 January 1960 will have all the attributes of a fully independent and sovereign State, competent to take its place in the United Nations, and to enter into such relationships with other countries as it may consider best in its interests.

A doubt has been expressed in the Committee that the independence of the Cameroons after 1 January will be nominal and illusory and the Government will form part of the French Union. Insinuations have been made about the existence of some secret agreements between the present Government and the Government of France to that effect. Not a single fact elicited in answer to questions put in this Committee to the representative of France and the Prime Minister of the Cameroons by several delegations goes to substantiate such doubts and insinuations. On the other hand, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons

60

has made a categorical statement : "With regard to the possibility of subsequent association with another country, I wish to make it clear that no such undertaking has been made by either side. The Cameroons intends to negotiate freely with the friendly countries and the neighbouring countries alike. Once more it will do so under the control of its own Assembly after accession to independence." As to the possibility that independent Cameroons might be integrated into the French Community, the Prime Minister has this to say : "It would be illogical to imagine that the Cameroons which since 1 January 1959 has had a statute conferring more privileges than the statutes of any of those States that have joined the French Community would, when it had achieved independence, take the backward step of asking for any kind of integration into the French Community." Our delegation accepts these assurances which have been given in all sincerity.

We may now address ourselves to the question whether the people of the Territory enjoy at present and will enjoy on and after 1 January 1960 all fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights without any distinction as envisaged under Article 76 (c) of the Charter. This recalls to us the disturbances that took place in certain parts of the Territory in 1955 and later in 1957 and which sporadically continued during 1958. The question of amnesty for offences alleged to have been committed in the course of the disturbances is an important one. In the Trusteeship Council the Administering Authority and the Special Representative assured us that the draft of the Amnesty Law was then being considered by the Legislative Assembly. My delegation pointed out that it would be the path of wisdom for the Government of the Cameroons to take measures so that the new State came into being in harmony and internal goodwill. We recommended the immediate grant of amnesty on the widest possible basis and suggested that it would be an act of statesmanship to grant unconditional amnesty. Our position, Mr. Chairman, remains the same. We have seen the Amnesty Law which has been passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons on 14 February. As far as we can understand, this means complete political amnesty for all execept those who have been actually sentenced by a court of law for an offence of murder or manslaughter, in whose cases the sentences will be commuted and reduced. We note in this connection the statement of the distinguished Prime Minister of the French Cameroons who said with reference to the amnesty : "Our pardon is commensurate with the wrongs done; it is great, very great and I can without fear of being proved wrong say that such a liberal Amnesty Act has never been promulgated in any country or in any other circumstances." The sincerity behind his statement on amnesty and reconciliation impressed us. The statement made by him this morning that all but 56 political offenders out of well over 2,000 such persons have been amnestied further confirms his previous

statement. All leading UPC party members have been amenstied and are invited back to the Cameroons in full freedom.

My delegation would have been happier if unconditional amnesty had been granted, but at the same time we recognise that the Amnesty Law just adopted by the Cameroons Legislative Assembly grants amnesty on a very liberal basis and we doubt if we would be justified in asking the Government to release unconditionally persons convicted and sentenced by a court of justice for heinous acts of violence like murder.

The Prime Minister of the Cameroons has, in this Committee, confirmed the statement made by the Special Representative in the Trusteeship Council that there is complete freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of association. We welcome his statement.

It is also to be noted that elective system prevails in the Territory on the basis of universal adult suffrage, both for elections to the Legislative Assembly and for those to local bodies.

In the circumstances, my delegation is satisfied that the necessary fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights are enjoyed in the Territory and the new State will emerge on I January 1960 under these conditions.

As regards unification, it is obvious that there is a unanimous demand in the French Cameroons for unification of both parts of the Cameroons. The desire for unification has naturally to be taken full account of. We do not consider that any decision with regard to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Cameroons under the French administration from 1 January 1960 is likely to prejudice this issue. In our view any delay in the ascertainment of the wishes of the people in the Cameroons under the United Kingdom administration should not delay the independence of the Cameroons under the French administration. Because of an arbitrary historical process, the Cameroons originally held by the Germans came partly under British Mandate and partly under French Mandate and the two parts of the Cameroons were continued Trust Territories under the United Kingdom and France. So far as the United Nations are

concerned they have to deal with two Trusteeship Agreements, and in respect of the Territory under each of the two Agreements, the ascertainment of the wishes of the people in accordance with Article 76(b) of the Charter is necessary. The wishes of the people of the Cameroons under the French administration are already known to be in favour of unification. It is now for the people of the Cameroons under the United Kingdom administration to pronounce on the question of unification.

I have taken some considerable time, Mr. Chairman, in analysing the various points at issue that have been raised before the Committee. We are not in favour of this party or that ; we cannot get involved in the internal politics of the Cameroons. Our concern is that the Cameroons under French administration which is ready for independence should emerge as another free and independent State in Africa with the least possible delay. It is for the people of the Cameroons to find their internal unity. We earnestly hope that the present Government will live up to its promises in the field of reconciliation and we equally hope that the troubles and difficulties and internal dissensions which the Territory has suffered during the last two or three years will become matters of the past. While the Government has to play a liberal part in this reconciliation it is equally the duty of those who are in the Opposition now to take a broad view of the future of the Cameroons and of their own responsibilities and turn their thoughts and efforts sincerely towards amicable reconciliation. My delegation is impressed by the quality of the Cameroons leaders and their patriotic fervour, both among members of the Government and those in the Opposition. They have it in them to forge unity and goodwill. We hope that no more will the Territory of the Cameroons see the eruptions of violence which have disfigured its history during the last two or three years, for violence can never be a sound foundation for freedom and for all the benefits that go with it. I hope our appeal to the political parties and others in the Territory to eschew violence will not be misunderstood. To the extent that the people of the Cameroons are able to eliminate violence, bitterness and conflict, to that extent will the future happiness of the Cameroons people be assured. The birth

of a new nation is an event of profound significance. We rejoice at the prospect of the new Cameroonian nation and we look forward to the State of Cameroons among us next year, as fellow members of the United Nations, contributing to our common task of trying to create a better world.

I will now turn to the question of the Cameroons under British administration. The Visiting Mission has also made a detailed and comprehensive report on the situation in both the Northern and, Southern Cameroons. We have given careful consideration to the initial statements as well as answers subsequently given to questions by the Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons Mr. Foncha, by the Leader of the Opposition Dr. Endeley and Mr. Mallam Abdullahi Dan Buram Jada, Minister for Northern Cameroons Affairs in the Nigerian Parliament, all of whom have presented their points of view with ability and moderation. We have also had the benefit of hearing some petitioners on the question of the future of the Cameroons under the British administration, who have expressed sentiments in favour of unification of the Cameroons under the British administration with the Cameroons under the French administration into a single State of the Cameroons.

It is quite clear from all the material before us, in the first place, that the Northern Cameroons stand on a different footing from the Southern Cameroons even though they come under the same Trusteeship Agreement. The course of administration of the Northern and Southern Cameroons has been different ; the Northern Cameroons has ever since it came under the United Kingdom mandate been administered as an integral part of Nigeria, closely linked with the northern region of Nigeria. The Southern. Cameroons has had a more chequered history. Initially administered as an integral part of Eastern Nigeria, since 1954 it has been administered as an autonomous unit with its own legislature and executive bodies. This was the consummation of the desire for autonomy in Southern Cameroons which has been great. In the Northern Cameroons such a desire has not been manifest. The political and administrative developments of the Northern and Southern Cameroons have therefore been on substantially different lines. The statements made before us by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Northern

Cameroons and their answers to the questions put to them in the Committee clearly show that their thinking about the future mainly concerns the Southern Cameroons. It seems to us that they themselves recognise a distinction between the Northern and the Southern Cameroons. We would agree with the report of the Visiting Mission that the two parts of the Cameroons, namely, the Southern and the Northern Cameroons should be treated to some extent differently in the consideration of the future of the Cameroons under the United Kingdom administration.

Secondly, there is the question of consultation.

62

In our view, Mr. Chairman, consultation with a view to ascertaining the wishes of the people in the Cameroons under British administration is essential, because what we are dealing with is not merely the termination of a Trusteeship Agreement in favour of independence but the possible merger of the territory at present under trust with either of the neighbouring countries of Nigeria or of the French Cameroons. In this view of the matter my delegation feels that consultation which is enjoined by Article 76 (b) of the Charter is not only essential but unavoidable. We take note of what the Visiting Mission has said in regard to the Northern Cameroons, namely, that all sections of opinion were in favour of integration with Nigeria. In paragraph 181 of their report on the Cameroons under the British administration, the Mission reports :

"The Mission believes it to be manifestly the opinion of the northern population as a whole as far as it can be expressed at present and in the foreseeable future that they should become permanently a part of the northern region of the Federation of Nigeria when the latter attains independence. The Mission accordingly recommends that if the General Assembly accepts such a union as the basis for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement no further consultation need be held".

Although we give due weight to the recommendation of the Visiting Mission, nevertheless we are of the opinion that the desire for integration with Nigeria needs ratification through a formal consultation with the people. Such consultation is all the more necessary as Northern Cameroons possesses no representative institutions of its own.

As regards the Southern Cameroons, it is clear that consultation through a plebiscite to ascertain the wishes of the people is necessary. Opinions in favour of association or secession from Nigeria and unification with the French Cameroons are fairly evenly divided. Both the Prime Minister of the Cameroons and the Leader of the Opposition favour such a consultation. Consultation will therefore have to be undertaken at an appropriate time. The question of the timing of a plebiscite and the questions to be asked at the plebiscite are, however, complicated by a variety of factors which have been presented to us by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. The Government which is now in power was elected just a month ago. Some further crystallisation of the political situation and of political opinions in the Territory is necessary before a plebiscite can be held. Even more important are the factors governing a possible unification with the French Cameroons under the French administration after the latter becomes independent on 1 January 1960. The final shape of Nigerian independence is not yet clear because such independence is due only in October 1960 and has to be preceded by constitutional procedure in the British Parliament and further consultations on various matters between the Nigerian and British Governments. Taking all these factors into consideration, we feel that it is not easy to determine the timing of the consultation and the questions that are to be asked.

On these matters, Mr. Chairman, I shall be grateful if I am given the opportunity of speaking later in the debate.

Mr. Chairman, we would examine the various resolutions before us in the light of the principles and views expressed above.

On March 9, Shri Jha said :

In my statement on the 3rd March I expressed certain views on behalf of my delegation indicating our approach to the question of the future of the Northern and Southern Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. We expressed the view that the two parts of the Cameroons under the United Kingdom administration should be dealt with separately. In both parts of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration we favoured a consultation through a plebiscite on the question of their future. As to the timing and the choice of questions I reserved the position of my delegation for a later intervention.

We have since a seven-power resolution (Document A/C4/L582) which while recommending the holding of a plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons between December 1959 and the end of April 1960, seeks to postpone the choice of alternatives to be put to the people in the plebiscite to be determined at the 14th session of the General Assembly, and as regards Northern Cameroons recommends a plebiscite to be held in November 1959 the question to be put being whether the people of Northern Cameroons wish to remain part of the northern region of an independent Federation of Nigeria.

We have given the most careful consideration to the proposals set forth in this resolution. We are in agreement with its recommendations regarding the Southern Cameroons under the United Kingdom administration. As regards the

63

Northern Cameroons, in our view, the most straightforward question to be put would have been whether the people of Northern Cameroons desire association with Nigeria or unification with the French Cameroons. In our Committee we have heard strong views in favour of unification of all Cameroons and some petitioners have advocated the union equally strongly both in regard to Southern and Northern Cameroons. We feel, however, that the stage has not been reached for a formulation of such a precise nature at the present time. With regard to Southern Cameroons it is admitted-and both Prime Minister Foncha and Mr. Endeley the Leader of the Opposition have emphasised this in their statements-that the appropriate time has not vet arrived for asking the people to choose between union with Nigeria and unification with the French Cameroons. Mr. Foncha has said that he would have to negotiate with the government of the French Cameroons as to the

nature and details of unification. If the Southern Cameroons is not yet ready for answering the question as regards unification it is our view that the Northern Cameroons is even less ready to answer such a question. It would not, therefore, seem altogether timely to put before the electorate of the Northern Cameroons the choice of association with Nigeria or unification. at this stage. At the same time, the mere question whether the people of Northern Cameroons wish to remain part of the northern region of an independent Federation of Nigeria is in our view not suitable. In the first place, the use of the expression 'remain part of the northern region' has the implication that the Northern Cameroons is at present a part of the Northern region of Nigeria, which it is not. It is a Trust Territory administered for the sake of convenience as an integral part of the Northern region of the Federation of Nigeria. Secondly, the proposed question, the alternative to which is purely negative, seems to ignore even the existence of any issue or unification. This to our mind, because of the reasons I have already indicated, would not be appropriate. All this would appear to point out to the desirability of postponing the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons until a later date. We would have preferred this but if it should be decided to hold a plebiscite in November 1959 in deference to the views of the Visiting Mission, which my delegation has accepted, that the two parts of the British Cameroons should be treated separately for the purposes of the plebiscite and those of the representative from the Northern Cameroons and the Administering Authority that the plebiscite should be held before the federal elections of Northern Nigeria in December 1959, we would be agreeable to this Proposal. We feel, however, that formulation of the alternative questions should be as follows for the Northern Cameroons

Question I : Are you in favour of being part of Nigeria when Nigeria becomes independent?

Question 2 : Are you in favour of deciding the future of Northern Cameroons at a later date ?

We believe that a formulation of this nature will be the most suitable in all the circumstances of the case. It does not oblige the people at this stage to pronounce on unification, the precise details of which cannot be foreseen by them, nor integration with Nigeria, the independence of which, though a certainty, does not materialise until late in 1960 and the final stages of which have still to be worked out through further constitutional talks between the United Kingdom and Nigerian Governments. If the Visiting Mission's finding that all sections of public opinion in the Northern Cameroons favour association with Nigeria is correct, it is more than possible that the plebiscite might go in favour of Northern Cameroons becoming a part of Nigeria when the latter became independent, but in the event of the majority favouring the other alternative, that is to say, deciding the future of the Northern Cameroons at a later date, it would be possible for the people of Northern Cameroons to take part in any subsequent plebiscite in which unification of Cameroons would naturally have to be an issue alongside union with Nigeria.

The situation of Northern Cameroons vis-avis Nigeria is very much like that of Togoland under British Administration vis-a-vis the then Gold Coast. In the case of British Togoland, it will be recalled that Resolution 944(X) of the 10th Session, the General Assembly decided on the following formulation :

- "(a) The union of the Territory with an independent Gold Coast ; or
- (b) Separation of Togoland under British administration from the Gold Coast and its continuance under trusteeship pending the ultimate determination of its political future,"

The formulation we have suggested in regard to Northern Cameroons is similar to that decided upon by the General Assembly in the case of British Togoland with this difference that the question of continued trusteeship as in British

64

Togoland is not raised. In the case of the Northern Cameroons the same precise formulation in that respect is not necessary as the Northern Cameroon is part of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons. under United Kingdom administration and in the event of the people deciding against association with Nigeria, it will automatically continue as part of the same Trust until such time as the Trusteeship Agreement for the entire Cameroons under the British administration is modified or terminated after such further processes as the General Assembly may decide upon.

My intervention in the debate at this stage on the subject of the Cameroons under French administration will only be brief. I would like to reply to some points raised in the debate in regard to the statement I made on 3 March.

Both the distinguished representatives of Ghana and of Iraq, whose statements I listened to with great respect, and attention, did me the honour of mentioning me and my delegation. The distinguished representative of Iraq read out a statement in the Fourth Committee during the first part of this session of the General Assembly and implied that we had changed our basic stand on the question of Cameroons in so far as it related to general elections before the attainment of independence. Mr. Pachachi guoted from the summary record of Mr. Rao's statement in the Fourth Committee on 24 November 1958 to show that the Government of the Cameroons under French administration owed to itself and to its electorate to seek a fresh mandate separately because the elections of December 1956 were held at a time when certain political parties were declared illegal and could not participate in the elections. While it is true that the Indian representative, Mr. Rao expressed these views he expressed other views also. I presume that Mr. Pachachi did not have the full statement of Mr. Rao before him. Mr. Rao also stated and I quote from the summary record itself :-

"The Indian delegation would agree to consider any recommendation by the Visiting Mission regarding the holding of new elections in Cameroons under the French administration".

I would like also to draw attention to the following portion of Mr. Rao's statement of 24 November :-

"We have also to bear in mind that at the moment a Visiting Mission of the United Nations charged with the task of reporting on the methods of consultation to be adopted to ascertain the wishes of the people of the two Trust Territories concerning their future, is in the Cameroons. We should naturally like to study its reports and the comments and observations that the Trusteeship Council may wish to make on the report before the General Assembly approves of measures necessary for the two Trust Territories to attain the final objectives of the International Trusteeship System".

Mr. Rao further went on to say and I quote again from the text of his statement :-

"We recognise that till such time as the report of the Visiting Mission becomes available, it would be inadvisable to reach final conclusions on these questions of the elections, or a plebiscite, or a referendum, or on the more vital questions of the reunification of the two Territories, or the merger of apart of the Territory with another State. These are precisely matters in the consideration of which the first-hand knowledge of the Visiting Mission concerning the actual conditions in the Trust Territories, should be of great value and assistance to the General Assembly."

It is thus clear, Mr. Chairman, that our delegation while on principle favouring consultation and new elections, attached the greatest importance to the report of the Visiting Mission which was at that time already in the Territory and the recommendation of the Trusteeship Council in this regard. There is therefore no inconsistency in our position. The signal fact that has intervened between November 1958 and now is the report of the Visiting Mission and the views now expressed by my delegation have naturally taken the views of the Visiting Mission into full account.

The distinguished representative of Iraq also made the point that the recommendation for general elections before independence in the eight-power resolution (Document A/C4/L581) was only an appeal and a recommendation and that general elections were not a condition precedent to independence being achieved on 1 January 1960. If that were so, Mr. Chairman, the difference between the five-power resolution (Document A/C4/L580) and the eight-power resolution would indeed be greatly narrowed down.

But in fact this is not so. In the first place

65

the eight-power resolution, the substance of which has now been incorporated in an amendment, talks of a decision being taken as to the appointment forthwith of a Plebiscite Commissioner to supervise the general elections, who shall be assisted by observers and staff to be appointed by the Secretary-General or in consultation with him. The distinguished representative of Guinea, who is one of the co-sponsors of the eigh-power resolution, has in the concluding portion of his statement which my delegation listened to with the greatest interest and attention, laid down the five propositions which he considers indispensable for the harmonious solution of the questions before the Committee. His first four points are-Amnesty, total and unconditional; abrogation of the Decree which declared illegal certain political parties and organisations in the Territory ; reunification based on a popular consultation under the control of the United Nations; and general elections under the control of the United Nations before I January 1960. Then comes the last stage, namely, proclamation of independence and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement from 1 January 1960. It is thus quite clear that what the sponsors of the eight-power resolution contemplate is the legalisation of the banned political parties and the holding of general elections before 1 January 1960 as an indispensable prior condition to the attainment of independence on that date. For the reasons already given in my earlier statement, which have been supplemented and amplified by several other speakers, we are unable to support this position.

Mr. Chairman, I need not deal in detail with the substantive points in favour of holding general elections before independence. The only substantial ground urged in favour of general elections before independence is the need for reconciliation. We all agree on the need for reconciliation. That is why my delegation has carefully analysed the question of amnesty and the provisions of the amnesty law and sought the clearest assurances of the existence of fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights. We must be reassured about these. But are we sure that general elections before independence, with the legally constituted government of the Territory unwilling to hold them, and some parties who are in opposition still not having renounced violence, are the best means of effecting reconciliation? Are we certain that an atmosphere of harmony will be brought about merely by elections on the eve of independence? Are we sure that the cloud of bitterness and hatred will be suddenly dissipated by the magic of general elections? The distinguished representatives of Burma, Ceylon and Norway have dealt with this question thoroughly in their very able statements and have pointed out the dangers of elections surcharged with passions, at a time when the Government ought to be preparing for independence. In my statement I gave the reasons which influenced us to decide against the advisability or necessity of general elections before independence, contrary to the wishes of the present government and as a condition precedent to independence. We do not wish to elaborate further on these points. I would only say that my delegation is convinced that the best way to reconciliation would be to ensure that the future constitution of the new State of Cameroons and its relations with its neighbours and other countries are determined not by the present Legislative Assembly but by a new Assembly constituted as a result of elections at the earliest possible date after independence under conditions of amnesty and full freedom of speech and political action by everyone concerned, including those now in the opposition who are free to return to the territory. The representative of Ghana has alleged in his statement that the present Assembly was going to be converted into a Constituent Assembly. There seems no warrant for this in the statement of the Prime Minister. We are of the view that not the present Legislative Assembly but a new Assembly formed after independence should have the task and responsibility for taking decisions in these matters. The Prime Minister of the Cameroons has stated his intention to have such elections soon after independence and the amendment which my delegation has co-sponsored with the delegations of Burma, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Guatemala, Japan seeks to consecrate

in the body of the preamble this declaration of the Prime Minister and by expressing our confidence that this will be done seeks to make our intention and that of the Government of the Cameroons clear beyond doubt in this regard.

On March 12 Shri Jha said :

I had not intended to intervene in this debate at this final stage of the examination of the problem of the future of the Cameroons, but certain observations and suggestions made in the statements of delegations who spoke on their attitude towards the draft resolutions make it necessary for my delegation to clarify our own position with regard to the resolutions and the amendments before us.

We have co-sponsored draft resolution A./C. 4/L.580-Rev.1 on the French Cameroons.

66

Obviously that resolution embodies our considered views and we shall vote for it.

Suggestions have been made time and again in the debates that a vote for draft resolution A/C. 4/L. 580 is a vote in favour of colonialism. Mr. Chairman, we consider this a strange interpretation. What we are voting for is not colonialism but the end of colonialism. What we are voting for is independence, total and complete, which is the very anti-thesis of colonialism and the highest aim of the Charter. Our resolution is intended to bring about nothing less than the exit of France and end of French authority in the Cameroons, without any reservations, without any arriere-pensee. This will make the people of the Cameroons the master of their destiny. To call this colonialism is a travesty of facts. It is unthinkable that my delegation should support anything which is even remotely connected with colonialism. The Bandung Declaration which proclaimed itself against colonialism in all its manifestations is our motto and guide.

In the general debate, our point of view regarding the general elections has been made clear. Nothing that we have heard since has caused us to alter our views. We do not consider it justifiable to insist on general elections before independence, the purpose of which is not to ascertain the wishes of the people regarding self-government or independence, which are indeed well-known and need no kind of consultation to determine, but merely to change the composition of a lawfully constituted Legislative Assembly whose representative character is not doubted-not even by many of those who co-sponsored draft resolution A/C. 4/L. 581. To my delegation, the plain meaning of this resolution and the statements made by the sponsors is that the advent of independence is to be preceded by the fulfilment of certain conditions, one of which is the holding of general elections before 1 January 1960. If the Government of the Territory in the exercise of its powers decides on this step, we shall be happy, but in the absence of any such indication, we cannot be a party to put pressure on them to do so.

In the draft resolution 581 there is a recommendation for the legislation of the political parties, namely, the UPC and two other associated groups, which were prohibited in July, 1955. The Trusteeship Council, the 4th Committee and the General Assembly have been seized of this matter since 1955, and in 1957 the General Assembly, in their resolution No. 1211, expressed the hope that "as a result of the application of appropriate measures in particular, the early promulgation of the amnesty law by the Administering Authority and the renunciation of the use of violence by all political parties it will be possible to achieve in the Cameroons under French Administration conditions conducive to the early restoration of a normal situation in the disturbed area and to the furtherance of democratic progress and political activities in the Territory".

This resolution stands. There has been no renunciation of violence by the parties concerned. In the circumstances, we regret it will not be possible for us to support amendment No. 2 of draft 584-Rev. 1.

Having said this, I would like to add that the future of independent Cameroons depends on the extent to which internal harmony and goodwill can be restored. This cannot be done suddenly by the magic of elections, which, as indeed several speakers have very ably pointed out, could conceivably rekindle the strife and disturbance in a violent atmosphere, it is necessary that both the Government and the parties in opposition should work for reconciliation, forgetting the bitterness of the past. The Government has invited all those outside the territory to come back in freedom and without any fear of reprisal. Categorical declarations have been made on behalf of the Government of the Cameroons, guaranteeing all fundamental rights. We think that those of the opposition who are now outside the territory should go back, renounce violence as a creed for attaining political power, and restart their political activities peacefully.

If they have given evidence of all this the Government should have no hesitation in even legalising the abandoned parties. Reconciliation must necessarily be a slow and time-taking process. The next few months will be a testing time for the statesmanship of the Government leaders, and I would, in this connection, particularly appeal to Mr. Ahidjo. He has made an excellent impression on all of us as a moderate statesman. He will be increasing his political stature and show his real statesmanship if he takes note of all that has been said in the Committee and works in all sincerity during the remaining months before independence to ensure that true reconciliation is achieved.

We would also appeal to distinguished leaders like Dr. Bebey-Eyidi-whose moderation and categorical denunciation of violence have greatly impressed us in this Committee, and those like Dr. Moumie, who are outside the territory, to go back to their country. The barren path of violence and obstruction should be abandoned and they should prepare themselves peacefully for

67

the task that may well be theirs in the near future, of running the government of an independent Cameroons.

As to draft resolution 580 Rev. 1 which my delegation has co-sponsored, it has been said by some distinguished representatives that the paragraphs in the preamble and in the operative part referring to elections after independence, amount to interference with the sovereignty of the future independent State of the Cameroons. Mr. Chairman, we do not think there is any real substance in this view. All that the resolution does is to reproduce. In the preamble the statement of the Prime Minister of the French Cameroons, like many of his other statements that are reproduced there. This we submit cannot be called interference. Then at the end the resolution expresses its confidence in the statement of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons. Nothing new is said therein ; this last paragraph merely paraphrases what the Prime Minister of the Cameroons has himself said. There is no recommendation-not even a suggestion. Taken in isolation there could perhaps be some doubt about its validity. But the resolution has to be viewed as a whole. The part of the resolution expressing confidence forms part of the whole composite picture. In the context of the discussions in the Committee, it is our view that it is most appropriate, and it seeks to set at rest the views expressed by some delegations that the Government of the Cameroons intended to transform the present legislative assembly into a constituent assembly after independence. Mr. Chairman, our delegation is of the view that to embody the assurance of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons and to express confidence in his declaration are most appropriate in the context of the discussions that we have had in the Committee, and do not in the slightest degree affect or seek to impinge the sovereignty of the future State of the Cameroons.

Now I would like to say a few words about the resolution about British Cameroons. An amendment has been suggested in document 589 A/C. 4.L.585-"Do you wish to unite with an independent Cameroons", as the second alternative question to integration with Nigeria. My delegation has already explained that unification should be one of the issues in any eventual plebiscite. But for three reasons we are not able to support it in the forthcoming plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons. First, to do so would be to go against the entire current of authentic opinion in the Northern Cameroons. Mr. Mallam Abdullahi, whose representative character to speak for his people cannot be questioned since he is their elected representative, and who is certainly better qualified to speak for his people than some of the petitioners from outside Northern Cameroons who have advocated unification of Northern Cameroons with the rest of the Cameroons, is opposed to such a question being put. The Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons is opposed to a straight question like this being put at this

stage. The Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Endeley, has not concerned himself much with the Northern Cameroons and has not advocated such a question for that territory either. Are we justified then in insisting on imposing a question of unification at this stage ? Secondly, as the Visiting Mission has shown and Mr. Abdullahi has himself said, the Northern Cameroons have had a different historical development from the rest of the Cameroons. There is no ethnic group like 'Cameroon'. In fact I understand that the word Cameroons itself in Portuguese means shrimps and this name was given to a part of Africa occupied by them from the fact that the rivers teemed with shrimps ! There is no question of partition of a homogenous land nor of violence to any sense of nationhood if the Northern Cameroons is treated separately from the rest of the Cameroons. As Prime Minister Foncha has said the unification of Cameroons cannot be put as a question in the Southern Cameroons until the nature and details of possible unification are known with some precision after negotiations with the Government of the French Cameroons. As I said in my statement of 9th March, if the Southern Cameroons are not yet ready for a question to be put about unification, the Northern Cameroons where there is no visible indication yet of any desire for unification, are even less ready for it. To put the question "Do you wish to unite with independent Cameroons" would be to put those who seek unification at an unfair advantage and would be weighing the scales in favour of union with Nigeria.

For these reasons we consider the formulation in the draft resolution, Document A/C.4/L. 582 Rev. 1 most suitable. It leaves the question of unification open for future consideration and gives the voters the chance to say that they would prefer to wait until a later date, which later date should normally be the date of the plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons. The report of the Plebiscite Commissioner will of course have to be taken into account in determining the subsequent date. My delegation, therefore, is unable to support the amendment and will vote against it.

The other amendment is that of the very distinguished representative of Liberia. Here, we are placed in some difficulty. We would have preferred to vote for it, but the practical effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to give the Plebiscite Commissioner a mandate which he cannot carry out. As I explained in an earlier statement, if there is to be a plebiscite in the foreseeable future we have, to accept the existing situation. Much as the United Nations would wish, we are powerless to alter the electoral qualifications and customs and deep-rooted prejudices among the people, which result in the fixation of such qualifications even in countries which are subject to the international trusteeship system. While, therefore, agreeing with the sentiments that have prompted the amendment, for sheer practical reasons we shall have to vote against it.

INDIA CAMEROON USA UNITED KINGDOM NIGER NIGERIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDONESIA TUNISIA GHANA GUINEA MOROCCO SUDAN MALI SOMALIA ALGERIA FRANCE IRAQ BURMA NORWAY GUATEMALA JAPAN LIBERIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in General Assembly on Cameroons

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the General Assembly on March 13, 1959 on the future of the Cameroons. He said :

The thirteenth session of the General Assembly which is now moving to a close has sometimes been described as an African session. It was our privilege in the concluding stage of the first part of this session to welcome Guinea as a Member of this Organization. On this, the last day of the session, which is the last day of the second part of the thirteenth session, we have taken a decision which will result in the birth of another African nation, and its eventual admission as a Member of the United Nations.

Since the resolutions which we have today adopted with respect to the Trust Territories of the Cameroons, both under French and British administrations, have received the fullest consideration in the Fourth Committee of this Assembly, and earlier in the Trusteeship Council, it seems unnecessary for my delegation to restate the questions and to restate our own position in any great detail.

The resolution relating to the Cameroons under French administration, which we had the privilege to co-sponsor in the Fourth Committee, incorporates the assurance that on the attainment of independence on 1 January 1960, elections will be held for the formation of a new Assembly which should take decisions regarding the establishment of the institutions of free and independent Cameroons in their final form.

In this arduous task the delegation of India desires it to be known that the people of the Cameroons have the greatest goodwill of the Government and people of India. We have no doubt that the patriotic efforts of the leaders of the Cameroonian nation will be crowned with success and that another bright page will be added to the annals of African independence.

With respect to the Cameroons under British administration, the resolution we have adopted requires consultation with the people through a plebiscite. My delegation is confident that in the implementation of the procedures outlined in the relevant resolutions, the Governments and parties concerned will bring to bear imagination and the constructive statesmanship.

We are very happy that the Assembly has selected Ambassador Abdoh as Plebiscite Commissioner. His task is very important and it will involve heavy responsibilities. He has the goodwill of the Assembly as indeed its overwhelming confidence. We are sure that no better choice could have been made in the selection of a Plebiscite Commissioner.

For three weeks we have-worked hard to consider the future of the Cameroons. We have learned much about it. We have come to know the leaders of the Cameroons, both members of the Government and those of the opposition. We have come to know their views, their hopes and their aspirations and, if I may say so, we have come to respect them greatly. We are sure that the destiny of the new State of Cameroons is safe in their hands. We are confident that the leaders of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration will prove their wisdom and statesmanship and, in the very near future, decide on their right destiny.

For three weeks we have engaged in the Fourth Committee in serious debate, often somewhat acrimonious. We have often differed from one another. But I believe that the area of agreement was always much, much larger than the area of our differences. We were all of one opinion-that the new State of Cameroons should be born and soon. Its birth should not be delayed beyond 1 January 1960. In the Committee, we all expressed confidence in that Government of the Cameroons under French administration and in its very distinguished and able Prime Minister. We have all been actuated and motivated by the good of the Cameroonian

69

people. We have all had the single desire to advance the freedom of the African peoples and to add one more independent State to that great continent of Africa where the peoples are yearning for freedom and have long been under suppression.

Now that the storm and fury of the debate is over, we can look to the future. Perhaps we can share with the leaders of the Cameroons under French administration and those under United Kingdom administration their hopes and aspirations. My delegation will watch with the greatest interest, fraternal interest if I may say so, the developments in the Cameroons.

In regard to the Cameroons under French administration, the Government will have many things to do. It has an arduous task before independence dawns on 1 January 1960. But in our opinion its greatest and most worthy task will be to secure reconciliation, to bring about goodwill and unity among its own people. That task is well worthwhile. It is our sincere hope that the leaders of the Cameroons will grasp this great opportunity for making a united and great nation.

In the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, we hope that the Plebiscite Commissioner will have all the co-operation necessary for him to carry on his task and that the Administering Authority, the political parties and the Government on their part will bring to his task a great understanding. We hope that the plebiscite, which is due in November 1959, for the Northern Cameroons will be undertaken smoothly and successfully.

Before I conclude I should like to pay the tribute of our delegation to the Government of France. It has good reason to be proud of the fact that the first Trust Territory to attain independence is one which was under its administration. That certainly is in keeping with the finest traditions of France.

I conclude by offering our respects and our salutations to the new nation of Cameroons and by wishing it all success and assuring it of the co-operation of my Government and my people for all time in the future.

INDIA CAMEROON GUINEA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Letters to President of the Security Council

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed two letters to the President of the Security Council during the month of March, 1959. The letter which he wrote on March 4, 1959, refers to Pakistan Representative's letter to the Security Council President dated December 17, 1958.

Following is the text of the letter:

The Government of India deplore the practice adopted by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to avail himself of the forum of the Security Council to make baseless allegations against India. We regret that his letter dated 17 December 1958 (S/4139) is yet another instance in point.

I do not wish to deal with extraneous and unrelated matters in the letter of my colleague, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan. My predecessor's letter dated 24 October 1958 (S/4107) states the true position. Pakistan has no locus standi in Jammu and Kashmir which is Indian territory. This has been made indisputably clear not only in the three resolutions mentioned in my predecessor's letter but also in the various assurances which the United Nations Commission gave to the Prime Minister of India. These assurances are recorded in Annex V on pages 57-63 of Security Council Official Records for the Twelfth Year, Supplement for January, February and March, 1957.

The right to maintain an army for the security of the territory is an essential attribute of sovereignty. Has Pakistan been authorized to maintain any armed force in Kashmir under the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948 or the U. N. C. I. P. resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949? On the other hand, have these resolutions and the United Nations Commission not recognized India's right to maintain its army in Kashmir for its security and the maintenance of law and order ? These are among the tests of sovereignty and the members of the Security Council are well aware of the replies to these questions given by them in the past. In paragraph 228 of its third interim report (S/1430), the United Nations Commission places the matter beyond doubt :

"Four principles were agreed to by the Governments of India and Pakistan in connection with the withdrawal of forces from the State: by Pakistan, that (a) its troops are to withdraw from the State; and that (b) it will use its best endeavours to secure the withdrawal of tribesmen and Pakistan nationals not normally resident in the State who entered for the purpose of fighting; by India, that (a) it will begin to withdraw the bulk of its forces in stages to be agreed upon with the Commission once the Commission has notified it that the tribesmen and Pakistan nationals have withdrawn; and that (b) the Government of India will maintain within the lines existing at the moment of the cease fire such forces as are considered necessary to assist local authorities in the observance of law and order."

The members of the Council are aware that the issue of Kashmir is not a territorial dispute between India and Pakistan. It is a "situation" which has arisen out of Pakistan's aggression against which India complained to the Security Council under Chapter VI of the Charter. The Council described it as such in its resolution of 17 January 1948. The preamble of this resolution states

"The Security Council having heard statements on the situation in Kashmir from representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan;-

(underlined by us)

The United Nations Commission adopted the same description in its resolution of 13 August 1948, the preamble of which states:

"The United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan having given careful consideration to the points of view expressed by the representatives of India and Pakistan regarding the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir

(underlined by us)

There is nothing in the quotations given in the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter to show that Sir Owen Dixon ever revised his opinion about Pakistan's breach of international law when it committed aggression against the Indian territory in Kashmir. The arguments which he has put forward in paragraphs 6 and 7 of his letter require no further comment. As for the view of the representative of Argentina at the 245th meeting of the Security Council, which he has quoted, it is at variance with the views expressed by some other members of the Security Council from time to time, for example:

The representative of Netherlands at the 611th meeting:

"We know of course that in 1947 the then ruler of the State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India by an instrument which was accepted by the then Governor-General of India, Lord Mountbatten. We also heard what the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had to say on that subject. "We know that this act of accession has bad an influence on the position which the Government of India has so far taken on the problem of demilitarization and on India's responsibilities as regards the security of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

"The final disposition of the armed forces remaining in the State of Jammu and Kashmir after the implementation of the truce agreement was to be left to the impartial Plebiscite Administrator, in consultation with the Indian Government on the one side of the cease-fire line and with the local authorities-not the Pakistan Government-on the other side. In this, India's special position in view of the historical development of the case found a certain degree of recognition."

The representative of Colombia at the 768th meeting:

"Secondly the Commission never recognized the legality of the presence of Pakistani troops in Kashmir".

I request that this letter be circulated to the members of the Security Council as a Security Council document.

On March 31, 1959 Shri Jha wrote another letter to the President of the Security Council in reply to Pakistan Representative's letter dated December 30, 1958. The letter says : The Permanent Representative of Pakistan in his letter dated 30 December 1958 (S/4143) has made allegations which are baseless. These constitute a further attempt to use the forum of the United Nations for tendentious propaganda. In the present instance Pakistan also seeks once again to interfere in the internal affairs of Jammu and Kashmir. However, in deference to the United Nations, I have the honour to set forth the following facts :

The Government of Jammu and Kashmir have, in the discharge of their normal responsibility for law and order, dealt with these matters

71

which are the subject of these baseless allegations and there has been a judicial inquiry. The following findings of the judicial inquiry regarding the death of Mr. Ghulam Mohammed Sheikh were published by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir on 3 January 1959 :

"The death was due to heart failure. The deceased did not show any signs of ailment on any previous occasion. Only a few days earlier he had been examined by a Medical Board in connection with the disposal of certain bail applications and he was found to be enjoying sound health".

I request that this letter be circulated to the members of the Security Council as a Security Council document.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ARGENTINA COLOMBIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

LAOS

President's Speech at State Banquet

The President, Dr. Rajendra. Prasad made the following speech at a State Banquet given in his honour on March 25, 1959 by the Crown Prince of Laos, Mr. Savana Vattang, during his visit to Laos:

Your Royal Highness, Excellencies and Friends,

I thank Your Highness for the kind words you have spoken about me and my country and for your lavish hospitality.

Our being here together today is a symbol and an emphasis of the growing closeness between our two countries. The bonds, cultural and spiritual, between our two peoples have in the few years since independence been accentuated by the close similarity in our objectives and our endeavour. We have to accomplish in a breathless burry what has taken better-equipped countries several decades to achieve and we have also to ensure that in this hurried economic effort we do not lose sight of the spiritual and cultural values that distinguish our peoples. Thus, with us peace is not only an ideal but a necessity-peace not merely in the sense of an absence of armed conflicts, but a conscious direction of national and individual energy to what is positively and powerfully good. The power that science has placed in the hands of man has made this direction an urgent necessity.

'Apsara' in Sanskrit means water-nymph, a liquid thing of light and fairy life, and when we set up our Atomic Reactor in Bombay and called it "Apsara", I was touched by the sweetness of the name, and at once could not help thinking that this watermaiden can also be, if used for the wrong ends, a horrible gorgon many-headed, and wearing a skirt of serpents. When atomic fission began first to be studied in a small way in India, we had at once symbolically committed ourselves to be among the modem States, and since names contribute greatly to the picture of the object in the minds of people, 'Apsara' made it delicate and beneficent. And so it is bound to be, for we are a peaceful people and for our neighbours we have only sentiments of affection and regard. We know that it is the same with Laos. We, neither of us, have the power nor desire to dictate to any one. The only power we have or hope we have,

is the power of persuasion and appeal. Hence loving and needing peace as we do, we persist in our appeal that the Great Powers do not arm themselves with weapons of global destruction but turn the power and force of the atom into account in the only war worth fighting-the war against want, poverty and disease. This is the war, exciting and full of rewards which countries like ours are engaged in fighting and Laos is fortunate to be so ably led in this endeavour.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you the toast of His Majesty the King.

LAOS USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

LAOS

President's Speech at Farewell Banquet

At the conclusion of his State visit to Laos President Rajendra Prasad gave a farewell banquet on March 26, 1959 in honour of H.M. the King and H.R.H. the Crown Prince of Laos.

Speaking on the occasion Dr. Prasad said :

I am grateful to Your Royal Highness for the honour you have done me by accepting my invitation. I have said on a previous occasion how happy and grateful I am for the kind reception given to me by Your Royal Highness, the Government and the people of Laos. My visit to

72

these countries was intended-and I venture to think it has been successful-for making me acquainted with the people and Government and for ensuring the strengthening of the good relations which subsist between my country and Laos as well as other countries of Indo-China. I venture to think that the larger the extent of contact between nation and nation, the greater the chances of harmonious existence, and it is in that hope that we in India have been trying not only to establish such contacts, but also to give such support as we can to everything that is calculated to help the cause of peace.

One of the disturbing factors has been the low level of living standards and under-development of many countries, in particular those which have been under foreign domination. We ourselves are faced with such problems. We are trying in our own way to build up our economy in the best way we can principally within our own resources, but also gratefully accepting such aids as come to us from countries which are generous enough to give them. We have successfully implemented the First 5-Year Plan and are in the middle of the Second 5-Year Plan which we trust, God willing, we shall implement equally successfully. Some difficulty which we have been experiencing has been removed for the time being by the liberal help of other countries. We are already engaged in drawing up the outlines of the Third Plan after the implementation of which alone, we may, with some confidence, look forward to a steady and growing economy. We feel that peace is essential for the implementation of our Plans and we believe that it is equally essential for similar plans and programmes of other countries similarly situated.

When therefore we talk of peace and wish to make our contribution to its maintenance it is not merely a sentimental cry, but is based on solid material requirements of the present day. At the same time this attitude comes to us easily and naturally because we have had along tradition which goes back to many centuries. We have always admitted the absolute right not only of every nation but every individual, to have its or his own view of life and live according to it. The only limitation of this principle, which is really not a limitation but a logical extension of it is that no one should think of forcing his views or beliefs or policies and programmes on anyone else, be it a nation or an individual.

It is this feeling of tolerance for the views of others which flowered in our country into the various systems of thought and philosophy which were not always in conformity with one another, but logically and directly opposed to one another in many respects. Not only did we recognize the founders of these various schools, as rishis, but sometimes we apotheosized them. The people of Laos can easily understand the illustration of Buddhism and its relation to the then prevalent Hinduism. It was undoubtedly a very strong protest against the then existing belief and practice. The Buddha, after his attainment of enlightenment, continued preaching his own doctrine for more than forty years without any hindrance or obstruction from the leaders of the then prevalent belief who were ruling potentates. He was welcomed in every household, down from that of a poor prostitute right up to royal palaces even when his teachings were not accepted by the host and later on, after he had attained Parinirvan, Hindus have actually accepted him as an incarnation of Vishnu, and the present age is known as the age of Buddha's incarnation. It is a practice for religious ceremonies, in many parts of the country at least, to describe the date, the month, etc. when the ceremony is held, and in so doing, it is always mentioned that this is the age of Buddha's incarnation.

We have therefore a marvellous example of a synthesis when Buddhism as a church is not to be found in modem India, but the Lord's teaching has become a part and parcel of the life and make-up of every Hindu. Our present-day political Panch Sheel is a natural growth from this historic and cultural background and with us, it is not a mere formula but an item of active faith as also an essential of our present-day interest, which all combine to dictate to us the doctrine of coexistence.

It is therefore understandable that a visit to these countries, with which our old cultural links from the Great Buddha still subsist and are active, has given me genuine pleasure and satisfaction. With the greatest pleasure and most genuine desire for the strengthening of our relations, I propose the toast of His Majesty the King and His Royal Highness the Crown Prince, and the people of Laos.

73

LAOS USA CHINA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's statement in Lok Sabha on U.S.-Pak Bilateral Pact

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on March 6, 1959 on the bilateral defence agreement between Pakistan and the U.S.A. signed at Ankara on March 5, 1959

I can well understand the concern of Members about this news about the culmination of these long series of talks in the signing of a new military pact between the United States of America and the Pakistan Governments. This matter has been before us in various forms in the last few weeks or more. In fact, it was as a result of the revolution in Iraq in July last that this question arose before the countries of the Baghdad Pact. They saw that the Baghdad Pact had been dealt a mortal blow by Baghdad going out of it and hence they had meetings, I believe, in London. Then, soon after, certain provisional or other decisions were taken to have bilateral pacts to replace in effect the Baghdad Pact which though continuing in form, had lost substance. We were concerned naturally and we followed these proceedings in so far as we could. We were not in, of course. On many occasions we have expressed our concern about it to the United States Government because new accounts were appearing in the world's Press about this and on many occasions we were assured that this was

merely some past commitment being carried on and there was no question of any special or additional military aid and certainly it was not aimed against India and it was confined to the previous purpose of the Baghdad Pact. So far as we were concerned, we were not enamoured by Baghdad Pact at any time. In fact we did not like any military pact, more especially, such as concerned us or concerned our safety. We did not like it. But anyhow, we were given this assurance that this was a repetition of some old commitment and nothing new and the nature of it would not change even in the bilateral pact. That has been the position. I have stated thatas the Hon. Lady Member stated just now-about these assurances.

Now, a reference has been made to this pact in this morning's papers. We have not seen the full text of it. It is possible that the text may be made public because I think-it is said-that it would be registered at the United Nations; if it is so, then it would be made public and if it is made public, we shall examine it and if the House so desires, I can place a copy on the Table of the House.

But I should like to add that last evening the Ambassador of the United States visited our Foreign Office-not me but the Foreign Secretary --presumably after the signature of this bilateral treaty at Ankara and he told the Foreign Secretary, be repeated in fact, what he had said previously that this was not anything special or additional, this was an old commitment about military aid, etc. and he specially repeated that this was governed by the Congressional resolution which is often called the Eisenhower Doctrine. That is to say, that it only applied to communist aggression and to none other.

Now, I am, as I said, repeating what they have said. I do not personally think that any kind of aggression is likely to be prevented or any security to be added to by such pacts. That is my personal view. But anyhow, this is the assurance he gave last evening.

This morning's newspapers stated that the Foreign Secretary of the Pakistan Government has put a different interpretation to it. There is apparently a conflict between the interpretation put by the United States Government and the Pakistan Government. We propose to point this out to the United States Government or their representatives and to enquire which is the correct interpretation ; in fact, find out what the facts are as far as we can. That is all we can do, Sir, at this stage. But I thought it would be desirable for me to place these facts before the House.

PAKISTAN USA TURKEY IRAQ UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Address to Parliament on U.S.-Pak Bilateral Pact

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru told both Houses of Parliament on March 13, 1959 that the U.S. Government had "specifically assured" India that the Bilateral Defence Pact with Pakistan "cannot be used against India".

This assurance had been given in response to the Indian request for clarification of the Agreement in view of the interpretion given on behalf of Pakistan and the doubts that had arisen.

Shri Nehru added : "we have also been

74

assured by the U.S. authorities that there are no secret clauses of this Agreement nor is there any separate secret supplementary agreement".

The Prime Minister said that India had now asked the United States of America for further clarification of the Pact.

Shri Nehru read out from a prepared

statement and also laid on the table of the Houses, copies of the U.S. Bilateral Defence Pact with Pakistan, the joint declaration made in London in July, 1958 at the time of the Baghdad Pact meeting, and the U.S. Congressional resolution known as the Eisenhower Doctrine.

The Prime Minister said that a perusal of all the documents would show that under the latest agreement, the U.S. Government had undertaken that it would not only continue to give economic and military assistance to Pakistan but would also, on request, "use the armed forces of the U.S.A., in order to assist the Government of Pakistan, in case of armed aggression against Pakistan from any country controlled by International Communism".

Following is the text of the Prime Minister's statement to the two Houses of Parliament on the U.S. military aid pacts with Pakistan, Iran and Turkey :

This statement relates to the three agreements for military aid signed recently between the U.S.A. and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.

A meeting of the Baghdad Pact Council was held in London on the 29th July, 1958. This meeting was held soon after the revolution in Iraq. At this meeting, a Declaration was issued on behalf of the Prime Ministers of Iran, Pakistan, Turkey and the United Kingdom and Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, U.S.A. A copy of this Declaration is attached to this statement. The concluding paragraph of the Declaration contains an understanding, given on behalf of the U.S.A. This paragraph runs as follows :-

"Article I of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955 provides that the parties will cooperate for their security and defense and that such measures as they agree to take to give effect to this cooperation may form the subject of special agreements. Similarly, the United States, in the interest of world peace, and pursuant to existing Congressional authorisation, agrees to cooperate with the nations making this Declaration for their security and defense, and will promptly enter into agreements designed to give effect to this cooperation." In pursuance of this undertaking given on behalf of the U.S.A., consultations took place at Ankara early in March 1959, and three agreements were signed on March 5, 1959, between the U.S.A. on the one hand and Turkey, Iran and Pakistan on the other. These three agreements signed on March 5, 1959, are identical. A copy of the Agreement between the U.S.A. and Pakistan is attached to this statement.

Article I of this Agreement of March 5, 1959, runs as follows :

"The Government of Pakistan is determined to resist aggression. In case of aggression against Pakistan, the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America will take such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as may be mutually agreed upon and is envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, in order to assist the Government of Pakistan at its request."

It will be seen from this Article I that the United States of America agreed to assist the Government of Pakistan, at their request, in case of aggression aganist Pakistan by such appropriate action, including the use of. armed forces, as would be :

(i) in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America ; and

(ii) as envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East. (This is commonly known as the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East).

Under the Constitution of the United States of America, U.S. armed forces cannot be used to assist any other country without the specific authority of the United States Congress. The Mutual Security Act authorises the U.S. Government to give military and economic aid to foreign countries but does not authorize the use of United States forces in support of any other country. The use of the U.S. armed forces in support of any other country without specific sanction of the United States Congress, is however, possible under the authority given by the

75

Joint Resolution of the Congress of March 9, 1957. (A copy of the Joint Resolution, generally known as the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East, is attached to this statement).

Section 2 of this Joint Resolution reads as follows

"The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programmes with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism : provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States."

A study of the documents attached to the statement and, particularly, the portions to which attention has been drawn above, shows that under the latest Agreement signed between the United States of America and Pakistan, the Government of the United States have undertaken that they will not only continue to give economic and military assistance to Pakistan, but will also, on request, use the armed forces of the United States in order to assist the Government of Pakistan, in case of armed aggression against Pakistan from any country controlled by international communism.

The spokesmen of the Government of Pakistan have, however, given a wider interpretation to the latest Agreement.

In view of this interpretation on the part of Pakistan and the doubts that had arisen because of this Agreement, a request was made to the United States authorities for clarification. We have been assured by the U.S. authorities that their latest bilateral agreement with Pakistan has no effect other than the extension of the Eisenhower Doctrine to cover Pakistan and that the Eisenhower Doctrine restricts the use of United States armed forces to cases of armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism. We have been specifically assured that this Agreement cannot be used against India. We have also been assured by the United States authorities that there are no secret clauses oh this Agreement nor is there any separate secret supplementary agreement.

Spokesmen of the Pakistan Government have on various occasions stated that their objective in entering into a defence aid agreement with the U.S.A. and in joining military pacts and alliances is to strengthen Pakistan against India. We have repeatedly pointed this out and emphasised that the United States defence aid to Pakistan encourages the Pakistan authorities in their aggressiveness and increases tension and conflict between India and Pakistan. We have known for some time that in cases of attempted sabotage in Jammu & Kashmir, Pakistanis have used some military equipment of United States origin. It is not possible to say whether this equipment is part of the United States defence aid equipment to Pakistan or whether it has been purchased through normal commercial channels. The wider interpretation given by the Pakistan authorities to the latest Agreement is, therefore, a matter of grave concern to us, particularly in the context of our past experience of repeated and increasing aggressive action on the part of Pakistan.

We welcome the assurance given to us by the United States authorities, but aggression is difficult to define, and Pakistan authorities have in the past committed aggression and denied it. In the context of this past experience, the continuing threats held out by Pakistan, and Pakistan's interpretation of the latest Agreement with the U.S.A., it is difficult for us to ignore the possibility of Pakistan utilising the aid received by it from other countries against India, even though those other countries have given us clear assurance to the contrary. We have, therefore, requested the United States authorities to clarify this position still further.

We have repeatedly stated and it is our firm policy that we will not take any military action against Pakistan or any other country except in self-defence. We are sure that the Government and the people of the United States have nothing but goodwill for us and that they will not be parties to any arrangement, formal or informal, open or secret, which may threaten the security of India.

Following is the text of the U.S.-Pakistan bilateral agreement :

Agreement of cooperation between the

76

Government of the United States of America and the Government of Pakistan.

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Pakistan ;

Desiring to implement the declaration in which they associated themselves at London on July 28, 1958 ;

Considering that under Article I of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955, the parties signatory thereto. agree to cooperate for their security and defence, and that similarly, as stated in the above-mentioned declaration, the Government of the United States of America, in the interest of world peace, agreed to cooperate with the governments making that declaration for their security and defense;

Recalling that, in the above-mentioned declaration, the members of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation making that declaration affirmed their determination to maintain their collective security and to resist aggression, direct or indirect;

Considering further that the Government of the United States of America is associated with the work of the major committees of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955 Desiring to strengthen peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

Affirming their right to cooperate for their security and defense in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations ;

Considering that the Government of the United States of America regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of Pakistan ;

Recognizing the authorization to furnish appropriate assistance granted to the President of the United States of America by the Congress of the United States of America in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East ; and

Considering that similar agreements are being entered into by the Government of the United States of America and the Governments of Iran and Turkey, respectively

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

The Government of Pakistan is determined to resist aggression. In case of aggression against Pakistan, the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, will take such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as may be mutually agreed upon and is envisaged in the Joint Resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, in order to assist the Government of Pakistan at its request.

Article II

The Government of the United States of America, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended and related laws of the United States of America, and with applicable agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Pakistan, reaffirms that it will continue to furnish the Government of Pakistan such military and economic assistance as may be mutually agreed upon between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Pakistan in order to assist the Government of Pakistan in the preservation of its national independence and integrity and to the effective promotion of its economic development.

Article III

The Government of Pakistan undertakes to utilize such military and economic assistance as may be provided by the Government of the United States of America in a manner consonant with the aims and purposes set forth by the government associated in the declaration signed at London on July 28, 1958; and for the purpose of effectively promoting the economic development of Pakistan and of preserving its national independence and integrity.

Article IV

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Pakistan will cooperate with the other governments associated in the declaration signed at London on July 28, 1958 in order to prepare and participate in such defensive arrangements as may be mutually agreed to be desirable, subject to the other applicable provisions of this agreement.

77

Article V

The provisions of the present agreement do not affect the cooperation between the two governments as envisaged in other international agreements or arrangements.

Article VI

This agreement shall enter into force upon the date of its signature and shall continue in force until one year after the receipt by either government of written notice of the intention of the other government to terminate the agreement."

Done in duplicate at Ankara, this fifth day

of March, 1959.

| For the Government | For the Government |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| of the United States | of Pakistan; |
| of America; | |

Fletcher Warren. Sayid M. Hassan.

Text of U. S. Congress Joint Resolution to Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East :

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programmes with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by International Communism; Provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this Joint resolution not to exceed \$ 200,000,000 from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such Act : Provided, that, whenever the President determines it to be important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority of Section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (except that the provisions of section 105 (a) thereof shall not be waived), and without regard to the provisions of Section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957 : Provided further, that obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of Section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until fifteen days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended from which the funds are proposed to be derived : Provided, that funds available under this section during the balance of fiscal year 1957 shall, in the case of any such report submitted during the last fifteen days of the fiscal year, remain available for use under this section for the purposes stated in such report for a period of twenty days, following the date of submission of such report. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The President should continue to furnish facilities and military assistance, within the provisions of applicable law and established policies, to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, with a view to maintaining the truce in that region.

SEC. 5. The President shall within the

78

months of January and July of each year report

to the Congress his actions hereunder.

SEC. 6. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Text of a Declaration issued by the nations attending the ministerial meeting of the Baghdad Pact at London, July 28, 1958 :

The members of the Baghdad Pact attending the ministerial meeting in London have reexamined their position in the light of recent events and conclude that the need which called. the Pact into being is greater than ever. These members declare their determination to maintain their collective security and to resist aggression, direct or indirect.

Under the Pact collective security arrangements have been instituted. Joint military planning has been advanced and area economic projects have been promoted. Relationships are being established with other free world nations associated for collective security.

The question of whether substantive alterations should be made in the Pact and its organization or whether the Pact will be continued in its present form is under consideration by the Governments concerned. However, the nations represented at the meeting in London reaffirmed their determination to strengthen further their united defence posture in the area.

Article I of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955 provides that the parties will cooperate for their security and defense and that such measures as they agree to take to give effect to this cooperation may form the subject of special agreements. Similarly, the United States, in the interest of world peace, and pursuant to existing Congressional authorization, agrees to cooperate with the nations making this Declaration for their security and defense, and will promptly enter into agreements designed to give effect to this cooperation. Manouchehr Eghbal Prime Minister of Iran

Malik Firoz Khan Noon Prime Minister of Pakistan

Adnan Menderes Prime Minister of Turkey

Harold Macmillan Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

John Foster Duties Secretary of State, United States of America.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM IRAQ PERU IRAN TURKEY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Border Firing

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in Lok Sabha on March 12, 1959 when replying to a discussion on an adjournment motion moved by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhury on the reported heavy firing resorted to by armed Pakistani troops across the West Bengal-East Pakistan border against three villages in Murshidabad District on March 11, 1959. He said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you were pleased to admit this motion on a specific issue, but it has tended to be discussed on much broader lines. Even in regard to the border issues reference has been made to a large number of past issues on the Assam border etc. and some other border considerations have been brought in also.

It is true of course, that every issue involves

a background, involves considerations that bring it about. Obviously, a border issue between India and Pakistan involves the fact that Pakistan was partitioned from India and certain consequences followed, consequences which, in spite of every effort, seem to pursue us still and create not only insecurity on the border regions but a great deal of ill-will and bitterness.

You know, Sir, and the House knows, that we have tried our utmost, keeping in view the security of India, to deal with these matters so as to put an end to these troubles, to solve these problems as they arise, and not to do anything which was likely to create bitterness. I have often spoken about this in this House. And yet, has been our misfortune to see these big and small issues going on day today and year after year. I must confess to a feeling, a sense, of great disappointment. I do not mean the big issues now, for the big issues could hardly be dealt with when the two Prime Ministers met, and they are in a different category. But

79

we thought, and I thought that the smaller border issues at any rate could be tackled and if all of them cannot be settled immediately we can at least settle them one by one or in certain groups. But I confess to a feeling of grievous disappointment that it has not led to that peace in the border which I hoped for.

I can very well understand the concern and the anxiety of all the Members in this House about this continuous situation. This is not a matter which can be considered from a party point of view because we are all concerned with the safety of our border and the security of our fellow-citizens in that border.

Now, I can, in so far as this narrow issue is concerned, read out a statement of the facts which have been supplied to me by the authorities in West Bengal, in fact by the District Magistrate of Murshidabad who was concerned with this and who was enquiring into it. I shall do so if the House so wishes. I gave some broad idea about it this morning.

There are two other matters to which I would like to refer ; although perhaps they are slightly

outside the scope of the motion before the House there has been some indirect reference to them. There are many Members in this House or some of them who connect these borders issues or border troubles, firing, etc., in some way or other, with the recent military aid pact between the United States and Pakistan and some other countries. Now, on the last occasion when I spoke about this matter, I said that we would enquire further into this. We have had some further enquiries made. In fact, we are still continuing it. By enquiries I mean explanations. I hope tomorrow morning to place a paper before this House on this subject, giving the text of the assurances and the other matters connected with that. Perhaps even that may have to be followed up, because we are pursuing this line of action. So, I shall not say anything more about that except to say that that paper will be placed before the House, which will contain, if I may say so, nothing very new but it will, in a connected form, give the text of these pacts as well as the other papers which may help Hon. Members to see the whole thing in the right perspective.

I can only say this now in regard to it that on further enquiry from the United States Government we have been given categorical assurances that the aid pact has absolutely nothing to do with any idea of Pakistan attacking India. In fact, the assurances in that respect are as categorical as they can be. Of course, as an Hon. Member pointed out, the assurances, though satisfactory to the extent as they may be, cannot be wholly satisfactory, because the other party concerned, instead of giving any assurances, makes statements to the contrary-statements made by Pakistan repeatedly. However, I shall not deal with the matter any more.

Secondly, reference has been made once by me in a general way and subsequently by some other Members, about the military equipment from the United States which is said to have been used by Pakistani forces.

I think that I should place the exact facts as we know them, before the House, so as to prevent misapprehensions from arising. I have nothing to say about the item of news appearing in the Statesman newspaper, which was quoted this morning. I have no particular information. But when I previously said about this equipment I was referring to certain types of equipment which came into our possession on the Cease-Fire line in Jammu and Kashmir State and which undoubtedly were of American manufacture. In fact, they could not have come from anywhere else. Again, I cannot say of course, that they formed part of the Aid Programme or were bought in the open market. We have no evidence of American arms being used in border incidents in the East. But some equipment of American manufacture has been found in cases of attempted sabotage across the Cease Fire line in Jammu and Kashmir. The details are :

Radiosonde transmitters have been recovered. On the 6th of October, 1958, one apparatus marked "U. S. Army Signal Corps, Radiosonde Modulator", number so-and-so, Johnson servicefull particulars.

On the 9th October, another apparatus marked "U. S. Army Singal Corps, Radiosonde transmitter and Radiosonde modulator".-I might add, Sir, that I do not know what these things are. That is to say, I do not know exactly what they are, in detail; I know broadly what they are.

Then, two plastic explosive charges with American fuse, recovered from the premises of the Panchayatgarh in village Banwat, P. S. Poonch on 21st December, 1958.

Then again, one U. S. A. made wireless set recovered from a place about 9 1/2 miles south-west of Rajouri and about 5 miles on our side on the Cease-Fire line on the 16th February 1959.

80

Now, this American equipment cannot necessarily be related to the Defence Aid programme, as they could have been easily bought by the Pakistanis. A large number of such recoveries, if made, of course, would put a somewhat different complexion. On many earlier occasions this matter had been taken up with the United States Ambassador as to the question of the plastic bombs used by the Pakistani saboteurs in Kashmir. The Ambassador had categorically denied that they were of USA manufacture and had suggested that the Pakistanis must have bought them from the United Kingdom. This was on the 7th June,

1958.

That is, Sir, in so far as U. S. equipment is concerned.

Then there is one small matter. An Hon. Member referred to our Area Commander in that region being a foreign national, a UK national. I am sorry he made that reference, because he is a gallant and loyal officer. He is an Englishman, but he is not a UK national. He became an Indian national a long time ago and as such has been serving our Army for a long time. He served in Delhi and various places. As a matter of fact, quite apart from all these recent happenings, in the normal course, he is being transferred to another area.

An Hon. Member: I think, Sir, about a couple of months ago, when he was given four years' extension, the question whether he was an Indian national or not yet an Indian national was talked about here, and I think he has not yet opted for Indian nationality.

The Prime Minister : Sir, the Defence Minister tells me that he is an Indian national.

An Hon. Member : He is an Anglo-Indian gentleman who holds office in the Indian Army, but he has not opted for Indian nationality. About that I am definite. If the Government has any papers, then, of course, I shall stand corrected.

The Prime Minister : That is a matter where if I am incorrect I shall be glad to correct myself But normally speaking, every Anglo-Indian is considered automatically an Indian national unless he does something to opt out. His home is India; he has no other home, hut.

Another matter. The overall ultimate responsibility for international border protection lies with the army. But, it depends how a particular border is dealt with. If a border situation is supposed to be potentially a war situation, then, it is dealt with more from the military point of view. Otherwise, it is dealt with from the police point of view, the military, of course, being in the background which could be summoned by the civil authorities whenever needed. On a great many occasions, mention has been made in this House of border troubles between East Pakistan and India. The House will remember that a great majority of these incidents took place on the Assam border. Generally speaking, West Bengal-Pakistan border was quieter. I say generally speaking, not wholly. The incidents there consisted chiefly of cattle lifting and a little trouble in charlands occasionally. Lately there has been a change and there has been much greater activity on the West Bengal side. Because of the recurrence of many of these instances on the Assam-East Pakistan border, it was arranged to put the army more definitely in charge of that area. That was not so in the West Bengal-Pakistan border although the army was, as I said, in overall responsibility and could be summoned when necessary. But, actually, in the normal way it was the armed police that dealt with it. That has been the position. But, certainly in view of these developments this matter has to be reviewed and we are going to discuss this matter with the West Bengal Government as to how to take more effective measures to give security to our people there.

The difficulty has been that, normally, the army is not brought in in petty cases of assault however bad they may be. It may be distressing. But, if there is a case of theft or dacoity or kidnapping, it is bad, we should protect him, of course, but the whole army movement is normally not indulged in on such occasions. However, this matter is recurring and the incidents do require a reconsideration of the manner in which we should give such more effective protection in future.

In regard to this particular incident about which this motion was originally moved, on the 6th March, at about 11.00 hours, one Rati Kanta Mondal along with four of his employees (all Chaimandals) of Char Rajanagar and adjoining areas under Raninagar p.s. J.L. No. 91, while harvesting linseeds from their field at Char Rajanagar bordering Pakistan were challenged by the E.P.R. men of Diar Khidirpur Pak B.O.P who fired two rounds from their rifles from a distance of about 200 yards. None was injured. Three Pak nationals armed with lathis followed by 4 Pak E.P.R. armed personnel came there and claimed the plot of land in question to be in Pakistan. The Pak nationals caught hold of one Makhan Mondal of Char Rajanagar passing by that way on a charge of harvesting linseed from the Pak territory "and took him away to Pak B.O.P. at Diar Khidirpur and severely assaulted him on the way. Rati Kanta Mondal was also assaulted by the E.P.R. personnel who trespassed into the Indian territory. He sustained swelling injury on his arm.

Necessary steps were taken to guard the border and the police force in the area was reinforced.

On 9th March, our District Magistrate at Murshidabad lodged a protest with the Pakistan District Magistrate of Rajshahi against this trespass and firing into Indian territory. He suggested a joint enquiry on the spot by the two District Magistrates and also asked for stem action against the Pakistan border police and Pakistan nationals responsible for this incident and for immediate return of Shri Makhan Mondal, who had been kidnapped and for compensation for assaulting Indian nationals.

On 10th March, heavy and incessant firing by Pakistani border forces continued and our border police returned the fire in self-defence. Two Indian nationals of Char Rajapur were injured by the Pakistan firing.

Our District Magistrate of Murshidabad got into contact with the Pakistan District Magistrate of Rajshahi on the telephone and the latter agreed to stop firing and to a meeting of the two District Magistrates.

Our District Magistrate of Murshidabad went to the place fixed on the border at 4 p.m. to meet the Pakistani District Magistrate, Rajshahi. The Rajshahi District Magistrate, however, did not turn up at the appointed place and the Pakistanis continued to fire and even fired at the messenger sent across to tell the Pakistan District Magistrate of Rajshahi that the District Magistrate of Murshidabad was waiting for him.

On 11th March, Pakistanis stopped firing at 06.00 hours but resumed heavy and intermittent firing on Char Rajanagar later in the day. Adequate measures have been taken to deal with the situation.

I have nothing further to say on this matter, except that we are very much concerned about these developments, not only the incidents in themselves, but the whole background behind them, and we certainly hope to take effective measures.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM BANGLADESH

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Secretary-level Conference

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on March 3, 1959 on the outcome of the Secretary-level talks held in Karachi from February 23 to 25, 1959 between India and Pakistan on the outstanding border disputes between the two countries.

Following is the text of the statement

A meeting at the level of Secretaries was held in Karachi from the 23rd to the 25th February, 1959. This meeting was held as a consequence of the meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan in Delhi in September 1958. At this Prime Ministers' meeting, a reference to the unsettled disputes and their further consideration was made in the following terms :-

"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."

Our Commonwealth Secretary had visited the Hussainiwala and Suleimanke areas in November 1958 and had then discussed technical and other details with the engineers and the local officers on the spot. The Karachi meeting in February 1959 discussed these two disputes relating to Hussainiwala and Suleimanke areas. The Indian Delegation consisted of engineers and other experts and was headed by our Commonwealth Secretary.

The discussions at Karachi disclosed a divergence of views between the two Delegations.

82

Both sides stated the position of their Governments regarding these disputes, and no agreed proposals for settlement emerged as a result of these discussions.

During his talks with the Pakistan Foreign Minister in Karachi, the Commonwealth Secretary referred to the serious increase in the number of incidents on the eastern border which have been caused by irresponsible and aggressive firing by Pakistan authorities. Representations in this connection have been made repeatedly to the Government of Pakistan at various levels and through our High Commissioner in Karachi.

It is our policy to endeavour to settle border disputes peacefully and to restore normal conditions in border areas. At the same time, any aggressive action or pressure on the part of Pakistan authorities and any violation of our territory has to be resisted. Measures necessary for the protection of the life and property of our citizens living in the border areas have been taken.

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Border Trade

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on March 23, 1959 in reply to a "calling attention" notice regarding refusal by Pakistan to hold a meeting for revival or border trade with India.

Following is the text of the statement:

Border trade between West Bengal, Assam and Tripura on the one hand and East Pakistan on the other is governed by Article VIII of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement (1957-60).

Pakistan had put various obstacles by restricting visas etc. and by harassment of those engaged in border trade. This was pointed out to the Pakistan Delegation at the 1957 Trade Agreement Review Conference held at Karachi in December. Since then, however, this border trade has come to a complete standstill as, a result of "Operation Close Door" started by the Government of East Pakistan since the beginning of 1958.

The High Commissioner for Pakistan in India during his visit to Assam in November, 1958, told Rev. Nichols Roy, M.L.A. and an ex-Minister, that the Government of Pakistan were anxious to improve trade, particularly border trade, with India and suggested that the Chief Secretaries of Assam and East Pakistan meet to discuss border trade without waiting for the Indo-Pakistan Trade Review Conference between the Governments of India and Pakistan. The State Government not sure whether the High Commissioner meant business particularly in view of the exactly opposite policy followed by his Government, referred the High Commissioner's suggestion to us. After consulting the Ministry of Commerce & Industry, we request the Government of Assam to accept the High Commissioner's suggestion for a Chief Secretaries Conference on border trade provided the Chief Secretaries of West Bengal and Tripura also participated in the proposed conference. After the Governments of West Bengal and Tripura had agreed to our suggestion, the Chief Secretary, Government of Assam, wrote to the Government of East Pakistan on 5th December, 1958, welcoming the High Commissioner's suggestion in a formal manner and leaving it to the Government of East Pakistan to suggest the date and venue for the meeting. No reply from the Government of East Pakistan was received to this letter for over two months although there were periodical reports in the Pakistani Press that Pakistan was anxious to improve trade relations with India. On 9th February, 1959, the Chief Secretary, Government of East Pakistan, however, informed the Government of Assam that a meeting of Chief Secretaries to discuss the question of border trade was not necessary and that border trade was a part of the general trade agreement between Pakistan and India.

Apart from the above, there were news items in the East Pakistani Press during December, 1958, and January, 1959, that Pakistan intended to send a delegation consisting of three representatives of the Local Chamber of Commerce in East Pakistan to neighbouring States in India. On attempts by the First Secretary (Commercial) at Karachi to verify the truth of these newspapers' stories, it was invariably discovered that the Government of Pakistan had no such proposals before them.

According to Article IX of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement (1957-60), there has to be a six monthly review of the working of the Trade Agreement. The last review took place in a Conference at Karachi in December 1957. Since then, several approaches have been made to the Government of Pakistan for a Trade Agreement Review Conference at Delhi but no such Conference has yet been held. Our Ministry of Commerce and Industry have been anxious to hold the Review Conference which has been overdue since July, 1958.

The Government of East Pakistan who showed great keenness to have a Chief Secretaries' meeting to discuss border trade arrangements have obviously not been able to convince the Pakistan Government at Karachi about the urgency of this problem and the latter do not seem to be keen to have an early conference to review the Trade Agreement of which the border trade arrangements are a part.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

| Volume No | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 1995 | | |
| PAKISTAN | | |
| U. S. Military Bases | | |

In reply to a question whether the recent publication of a map in the Sunday Times, a leading London Newspaper, showing the existence of U.S. Military bases in West Pakistan, have been brought to the notice of Government, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in Lok Sabha on March 16, 1959 : "Yes, Sir. The map shows three U.S. air bases in West Pakistan-one near Karachi, another in the North-West Frontier Province and a third possibly somewhere in the Punjab (Pakistan)".

Replying to another question Shrimati Menon said : The U.S. Ambassador has sent a communication to the Ministry of External Affairs which states :

"Despite public clarification by my

Government, there seems still to be a misapprehension current regarding the nature of an American communications facility in Pakistan. I wish, therefore, to recall to you, as of possible interest to your Government, that the United States Government has publicly stated that this facility is part of a world-wide communications system. It is not a missile base and I am authorised to deny categorically that the United States Government has any missile base or bases in Pakistan".

PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Violation of Cease-Fire Line

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on March 3, 1959 that the Government of India had received a reply from the United Nation's Chief Military Observer at the cease-fire line on the Jammu and Kashmir border to their complaints about the flights of Pakistan aircraft over Indian Territory on November 21, 1958.

Shrimati Menon, who was replying to a question by an Hon. Member of the Lok Sabha, said

"The U.N. Chief Military Observer has given his findings in respect of five flights between 12.45 and 14.05 hours on November 21, 1958 against which we had lodged complaints with him." She added : "The Chief Military Observer has held that aircraft did fly over our area on all the occasions mentioned in our complaints, adding, however, that it had not been possible to fix the identity of the aircraft".

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIETNAM

President's Speech at Dinner

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a speech at the dinner given in his honour by President Ngo-dinh-Diem during his State visit to South Vietnam. The dinner was held at the Independence Palace on March 19, 1959.

Following is the text of President Prasad's speech :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies and Friends,

I am deeply honoured by your invitation to me to visit you in your home country and by the gracious words of welcome that you, Mr. President, have just spoken. Coming here and enjoying your handsome hospitality, I was marvelling at the speed with which I came to your country--a country which like our own, has had an ancient

84

and leisurely civilization and which has since the earliest times been imbued with the spirit and teachings of the Buddha.

In those far off times there was leisure enough to stop and ponder, and pondering, sometimes, glimpse the truth that lies just beneath the surface flux and chaos of events. It is harder now to perceive and keep in view the true values and ignore the irrelevances and distractions, for at this stage in the history of our countries, mere survival and justification lies in our ability to achieve within the space of one generation what others have achieved perhaps in ten.

We are, therefore, going all out for reconstructing and rehabilitating our economy, for raising the standards of living of our people and making their lives a little more cheerful and happier so far as more material prosperity ran make a man happy. In this high endeavour we have no ill-will or jealousy and we are inspired by the noble desire to raise our own people not at the expense of, or by exploitation of others, but by making them stand on their own legs, at the same time realising that in doing so, they add to the sum total of the good of all and not merely rob Peter to pay Paul. We need in this enterprise the sympathy and cooperation of all and offer our own unstinted service for what it is worth to the service of humanity. This attitude of mind arises out of recognition of our duty to serve all, including ourselves, which in its ultimate analysis is nothing but recognition of the freedom of every individual and every group or nation to develop to its maximum capacity without let or hindrance from others and without offering similar hindrance in the way of others. In other words, it is the fundamental fact of the recognition of human dignity and man's destiny. Let us hope that your country and mine will each contribute what it can to this great human endeavour.

The great speed and tempo which is necessary for success in it is bound to strain the texture of our national life to its utmost, and in the hurry and bustle of rehabilitating millions of our peoples, there is always a danger that this heritage of quiet and inwardness, this frequent contemplation of truth may be lost in the roar and clatter of modern machines. To us as well as to you, such a loss would be a grave one, for violence would have been done to some of the vital elements of our heritage and temper. Today more than ever, therefore, with the power for almost cosmic good and evil that science has placed in human hands, it is necessary for us to remember that we must remain firmly rooted in our tradition and anchored in our deep moral and spiritual values.

On your kindly land warmed by your welcome and hospitality, I am filled with a sense of gratification that my visit has re-emphasized the friendship between our two countries.

Friends, I give you the toast of His Excellency, the President, who in his life exemplifies the energy and the bubbling enthusiasm of the people to be free and to grow and prosper according to their own genius.

VIETNAM USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIETNAM

President Diem's Speech

Speeking on the occasion President Ngo-Dinh-Diem said;

Mr. President,

It is a singularly precious opportunity for Free Vietnam to welcome in you the venerated Chief of India and one of the most representative figures of modern Asia.

You are not only the symbol of Indian unity and independence; you also belong to that race of men of thought and action who leave an imprint on history by making your personality felt in our time.

You have not only struggled and suffered in order to win the battle of Indian independence, you also laboured hard to modernise your country through scientific and industrial development in harmony with the culture of India. You are building a modern economic and social system based on the moral consciousness of Indian tradition, which is one of non-violence, self-denial, search for turth and justice. In the confused and brutal world of today, the method of development put forward by India is a message of a high human significance, especially when the messenger is a man of such moral stature as Your Excellency. Indeed what for others is only a matter of pragmatic values, is for you a principle of truth, which is vital for India, as well as for the continuous existence of mankind. For this reason, Mr. President, we highly value your visit.

Vietnam, which is fundamentally pacific and

85

reveres the sanctity of the human spirit, feels a great admiration for the intellectual and moral endeavours of the great Indian nation. Moreover, Vietnam is firmly convinced that the success of the gigantic efforts of India is our own success.

It is in this conviction that I invite you,

Excellencies ;

Gentlemen,

to raise your glasses to the health of His Excellency President Rajendra Prasad, and to the prosperity of the Indian people.

VIETNAM USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIETNAM

President's Speech at Farewell Dinner

On the conclusion of his visit to South Vietnam, the President Dr. Rajendra Prasad gave a dinner in honour of President Ngo-Dinh-Diem on March 21, 1959. Proposing toast to President Diem, Dr. Prasad said :

Mr. President,

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I appreciate your gracious presence here tonight and the opportunity it gives me to thank you again for the great kindness you have shown me and to my party ever since we arrived in Saigon.

It is a matter of gratification to us in India that the old bonds of geography and of culture between us are being augmented by increasing present contacts.

We had the pleasure of receiving your President in our country some years ago and I have the privilege of visiting you now.

Trade and commerce between our two countries are on the increase, and so is technical co-operation. A Delegation from your country visited India to see the "INDIA 1958" Exhibition. A few weeks ago a gift of cattle arrived in Saigon from India under the Colombo Plan (Technical Co-operation). The Cow, as the symbol of agricultural prosperity, has been the object of reverence in India through the ages, and in the early years wealth was reckoned in terms of cattle. It is therefore a happy augury that our major gift to South Vietnam was in cattle.

It is our attempt at development and adaptation that is chronicled in India's Five Year Plans. The experience of setting up a target of achievement was new to the nation and it was an exciting experience to put it all down in so many words and transmit its message to the farthermost comers of the land and watch through the years some vital parts of it being achieved and slowly coming to fruition. India is avast land, there are many kinds of needs in it and its problems are many. To think of the times with a sense of crisis and urgency and to make four hundred million people think in these terms unremittingly for many years is no easy task. And when our steel plants are coming up and fertiliser plants beginning to gladden

the fields and the great irrigation and power projects are holding out some hope of a gradual rebirth, it all seems worthwhile. We have not much yet to boast of. Our achievements weighed against our minimal requirements have still a long way to go. But it is good to feel that we are moving and the men and women too in the country have begun to feel in the same way. To give these many millions reasonable safety, internally in a planned and ordered existence, externally in an effort to ensure that the nations of the world may continue in peace and friendship are the tasks before us.

The years of our struggle for freedom were heroic years and living as we did under the great and inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, all of life seemed charged with a strange power and an inexhaustible source of energy and vigour seemed to be ours. Perhaps many imagined in those days that once the foreigners left our soil, there would be an instantaneous millennium of prosperity and contentment. But when we became free and were left with our destinies in our own hands, there came with it problems, diverse and multiform from every side. We have had to face these problems frontally and with judicious care and circumspaction. We have now gone some way in solving some of these problems, just as you no doubt have done in solving yours and if in the world at large, all would strive for peace and for the compassion and wisdom to use science and technology for the common good, we can continue the work and hope for the promised land.

Much useful experience gained by different countries in solving their respective problems can be pooled to the advantage of all, and there

86

vast room for co-operation and mutual help between our two countries, of which we should be wise to take advantage. South Vietnam is fortunate in her leadership who realise the importance of development and reconstruction at home and friendly co-operation with neighbouring countries.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you the toast of my friend, President Ngo-Dinh-Diem.

VIETNAM USA INDIA SRI LANKA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIETNAM

President Diem's Reply

Replying to President Rajendra Prasad, President Diem said :

Mr. President,

I thank you for having spoken so kindly of me. I consider it a personal honour. You have also recalled the bonds which have united our two peoples and which have left a strong imprint on the soul and the soil of Vietnam, and which still happily unite our two countries at present. I can only evoke in return the cordial and fraternal welcome extended to me by Your Excellency, by the Indian Government and your people during my last visit to India. The visit was a wonderful pilgrimage through ancient and modem India.

In fact, what we feel so endearing about modern India is that it is not built on abstractions but on the realities which are always rooted in the past. From this prodigious past India draws the principles of its present development. Indeed, it is no easy task to maintain traditions which have partly become incompatible with the modem currents and to adapt science and technology to the solution of pressing problems, for technological progress in its narrowest sense can affect adversely the human being and the traditional values.

Yet it is this difficult path that India and Vietnam have chosen to tread.

The intellectual and moral support indispen-

sable to the pursuit of such a path must be found in the humanism of Mahatma Gandhi, a humanism based on the teachings of Gandhi, which causes man to sacrifice himself, in love and in joy, in the interest of the common good.

I think that it is in the spirit of such humanism that we can find both the courage to persist in our efforts and the sacrifices required by the creation of our present industrial structure. Perhaps we shall also find the intellectual stimulus to break the present technological rigidity in order to make it more flexible and adapt it to the needs of man instead of adapting man to technology.

If in the world of to-day there is an imperative appeal to social justice and equality, there exists also among the people, bewildered and uprooted by the rapid pace of technological developments, a keen desire for spiritual interchange. The intellectual and moral endeavours of India, like its present experiment, which Your Excellency has just given us an outline, is, to a great extent, an answer to that desire.

It is in this conviction that I invite you,

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

to join me in a toast to the health of my noble friend, President Rajendra Prasad, and to the success of his high mission.

VIETNAM INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statements in Lok Sabha on Tibet

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made two statements in the Lok Sabha on Tibet.

Following is the text of the statement he made on March 23, 1959 :

Recent reports about happenings in the Tibet region of China have naturally aroused a great deal of interest in the country. The sequence of events is not quite clear to us. But I should like to make a brief statement on the principal facts in so far as we know them. Last week, on the 17th March, in the course of the discussion on the Demands for the Ministry of External Affairs, I referred briefly to the tense situation there. I mentioned that there had been a clash of wills although no major violence had occurred recently.

87

We have since received fuller information from our Consul General in Lhasa. It appears that various rumours in regard to the Dalai Lama caused excitement in Lhasa. About two weeks ago, a large crowd of Tibetans entered the premises of the Indian Consulate General. They spoke to our Consul General about the rumours and their apprehensions. Three days later, a large number of Tibetan women came to our Consulate General and requested our Consul General to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Bureau and be a witness to their presenting certain demands. The Consul General told them that this was not proper and he could not accompany them or associate himself with any demonstration. The Consul General brought these incidents to the notice of the Chinese Foreign Bureau at Lhasa. He had rightly decided not to interfere in those internal affairs.

On the 20th March, fighting suddenly broke out between the Chinese troops and Tibetan elements. There was firing in the vicinity of our Consulate General and some stray bullets hit our building. For some time it was not possible for the Consul General to go out of the premises. All our staff and their families are safe and no significant damage to property has been reported. Apparently, the situation in Lhasa has somewhat quietened down.

There are about thirty members of our staff in the Consulate General at Lhasa. Together with their families, the number is about 100. There are also sixteen other Indian nationals in the Lhasa region about whom we have no full information at present.

As soon as the fighting broke out in Lhasa, we requested the Chinese Government, through our Ambassador in Peking and the Chinese Ambassador here, to ensure the fullest protection to our personnel and properties in Lhasa and they promised to do so. On the 21st March, a representative of the Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa called on our Consul General and suggested to him that for the better protection of himself and his staff, they should move into the Foreign Bureau. We have instructed our Consul General to inform the Foreign Bureau that it will not be right or proper for our Consul General to leave the premises. A large number of Indian nationals are involved, including the families of our personnel, and there are valuable preperties and records within our premises. In accordance with international law and usage, our Consul General and his staff and our records and properties are entitled to the fullest protection and we have no doubt that the Chinese Government will see the reasonableness of our request.

This outbreak of violence in Lhasa itself is a new development. Previously there had been conflicts in various parts of Southern Tibet between the Khampas and the Chinese forces. But the Lhasa region had remained quiet.

The House will appreciate that this is a difficult and delicate situation and we should avoid doing anything which will worsen it. We have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of China with whom we have friendly relations. In 1954 the Sino-Indian Agreement was concluded. It was in this that, for the first time, the principle of Panch Sheel was stated.

There is a long tradition of cultural and religious ties between India and the Tibet region of China. In this region lie many places of pilgrimage which are considered holy by both Hindus and Buddhists and large numbers of our people visit them every year. The Dalai Lama, whom we had the honour and pleasure of receiving in our country in 1956-57, is held in high veneration by our people and we hope he is safe. We earnestly trust that the present troubles will be resolved peacefully. Our Consul General at Lhasa and his staff are in difficult situation for reasons beyond their control. I have no doubt that the House will wish me to send our best wishes on this occasion to him and to our other representatives in this Tibet region.

Following is the text of the statement the Prime Minister made in Lok Sabha on March 30, 1959 :

The Speaker : It is clear that there is no question of censure involved in this. All Hon. Members are anxious to know as to what exactly is the matter.

The Prime Minister : These adjournment motions as adjournment motions, if I may say so, can hardly arise. But so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to take shelter under any technical plea of not giving any information that I think ought to be given. Indeed subject to certain very broad considerations to which Shri Tyagi referred I wish to place all the information that we get before the House as it comes in and I propose to do so in the future too. It is not necessary for Hon. Members to demand a statement from me but I shall do so whenever any important piece of information comes. I shall place it before the House.

88

At the present moment we have a mass of statements in the Press, rumours, allegations, statements of the Chinese Government from which it is a little difficult to sort out exactly the truth of what is happening. We have one thing on which you can certainly say that there it is. There are Press communiques issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China. I do not understand why Hon. Members bring in the news agency in this matter. It is a Government communique and the news agency did a completely right thing in placing the official communique before us and before the public. You may not like the wording of the communique or the content of it. That is a different matter. But it is the duty of a news agency to deal with such an important matter and not to suppress it but to place it before the public.

May I also refer to what for instance, an Hon. Member has talked about the massing of troops. Now, I am completely unaware of this. In fact, I have not heard a rumour to that effect, leave out the facts. And he wants an adjournment motion because there is massing of troops on the Indian border.

The Prime Minister said : All kind of things are appearing in the Press which again are based sometimes presumably on reports not from within Tibet but from outside Tibet, whether it is Hong Kong or whether it is any other place. I do not say that any such rumour must necessarily be wrong. How can I say that ? But, normally speaking, they are not correct. Any how, my information is that there is no massing of troops on the Indian border, so far as I know. How can I discuss it when I do not accept that fact ?

But, the major things that we have to consider are, as I said on the last occasion, the contacts of India with Tibet are very old, geographical, of course, trade, but much more so, cultural and religious. Vast numbers of pilgrims go from here and some come from Tibet to India. So that, this contact, this relationship is something deeper than the changing political scene. Naturally we are affected by it. Apart from that, as I said on the last occasion, large numbers of people in India venerate the Dalai Lama, respect him very greatly and he was our honoured guest some time ago. Because of these contacts our reaction to anything that happens in Tibet is bound to be very deep, as we see it. It is not for me to object to those reactions. But, we have to bear them in mind.

May I say that all these questions that have been recently put about giving political asylum are, probably, of no service at all to the people who might seek political asylum in India ? It is no good. One has to see the difficult situation as it is and not merely create conditions which make it more difficult to deal with the situation or deal with the persons seeking political asylum. There it is. Whatever I say in regard to that will make it more difficult for these people, I say. So that, on the one side there is this feeling of a certain kinship, if I may use that word, cultural kinship between the people of India and the people of Tibet. That, of course, does not mean that we interfere in Tibet, in any way. We did interfere, not we, I mean, but the previous Government of India took an expedition to Lhasa under Col. Younghusband, 55 years ago. It very much interfered, imperialist intervention. They sat down there and imposed the British Government's will, acting through the then Government of India on Tibet and imposed our troops there in Tibet, in Yatung, Gyantse. All kinds of extra-territorial privileges were imposed on Tibet because Tibet was weak and there was the British Empire. With some variations, we inherited these special extra-territorial privileges when India became independent.

Regardless of what happened in Tibet or China or anywhere, we could not, according to our own policy, maintain our forces in a foreign country, even if there had been no change in Tibet. That was a relic of British Imperialism which we did not wish to continue. We had to withdraw them back. It so happened that soon after this change in the Government in Chinaabout that time, soon after-their armies marched into Tibet. What I am venturing to say is that the policy we adopted towards Tibet would have been adopted regardless of what China did and we would have withdrawn our forces, etc. That was the main thing we did.

The Prime Minister said : Apparently people seem to imagine that we surrendered some privileges in Tibet. The privileges which we surrendered in Tibet were privileges which we do not seek to have in any other country in the world, Tibet or any other. it was patent from the strictly practical point of view, even apart from sentiment, that we could not do anything in Tibet either in law, constitutionally or practically.

Our attitude and historically, previously-I am not going to the past history of 500 yearsthe position of all previous Governments in India and elsewhere has been the recognition of some kind of suzerainty or sovereignty of China over

89

Tibet and Tibetan autonomy. That was normally the basis of approach. The measure of the autonomy has varied, because the strength of China, or the weakness of China, the strength of Tibet, and the weakness of Tibet has varied in the course of the last hundreds of years. But, that is the position. Every Government in China has claimed that. Many Governments in Tibet have repudiated that. So, there it is. Anyhow, we could not become judges or interfere or intervene either in law, or in fact, or in the circumstances, we could do nothing. That is just past history.

May I say one thing to the House ? When the Premier of the Chinese Government came here 3 or 4 years ago or 2 1/2 years ago, be discussed this question of situation in Tibet with me at his own instance. I did not raise it so far as I remember. He told me then that Tibet had always been, according to him and according to the Chinese position, a part of the Chinese State; that is, they have always claimed it and they have had it, according to him ; but yet, Tibet was not China. Tibet is not China ; Tibet is not a province of China. Tibet is an autonomous region which has been a part of the Chinese State. That was, as I remember, his words. Therefore, we want to treat it as an autonomous region and give it full autonomy. That is how he explained the Chinese Government's attitude to Tibet. All I can say was that we had to recognise Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. But, I was glad to hear Mr. Chou En-lai laying such stress on Tibetan autonomy. I said, if this was fully acted upon and was well known to Tibetans, possibly the difficulties would be much less, because, I remember, difficulties had arisen already, three vears ago.

For nearly three years, there has been what is called the Khampa revolt in China. Khampa region, although it consists of people of Tibetan origin, is not technically Tibet now. About 50 or 60 years ago, the Khampa region in Eastern Tibet was incorporated in China. It was never really adequately controlled or ruled by any authority, Tibetan or Chinese, because Khampas are mountain people, rather tough people, not liking anybody ruling them.

When the new Chinese Government came in, quite apart from Tibet proper, the Khampa region was in China proper. They started introducing their new reforms or changes, whatever they did in land or otherwise in the Khampa region. That brought them into trouble with the Khampas in Tibet-not actually in Tibet, but the Tibetans in China, you may say. That trouble started 2 or 3 years ago or more than that-about three years ago, locally confined there. Then it spread and it spread to the south and south-east chiefly. Naturally one does not have details. But, it was a kind of guerilla activities which went on causing much trouble to both the parties and damage and all that. That has been continuing. When the Premier Chou En-lai talked to me, this Khampa trouble had started. It is not a kind of trouble which is of great military importance to every Government: not that; it is a nuisance and it prevents things from settling down.

That has been continuing. Nothing new has happened except that in some border some convoy has been attacked or taken away or something has been happening. The new thing, what has happened in Lhasa, may I say, has not flown from that; it is really a completely new development. The very matter was mentioned by me in this House and to the Press here the moment we heard of fighting there. Previous to that, only a few days previously, I had spoken in this House and talked about the conflict of wills there. I thought that expression was a good expression to describe what was happening there because there was no violence at that stage. Nobody had hit anybody. But, this conflict had come out in the open in the sense of people talking in the open. It lasted 3, 4 or 5 days when actual firing began. I cannot say who began it, but it began. Normally, one would say that where it is a question of military might, the Chinese Government is much stronger than some kind of local recruits of the Tibetan Army. It is obvious. So, that has been the background of it.

Now, it is unfortunate that all this damage is done. I do not know what damage has been done, but some considerable damage has been done to some of the old monasteries in Lhasa, and may be, some valued manuscripts have suffered thereby ; and all that has happened, and our sympathies go out very much to the Tibetans.

The Prime Minister ;...... quite apart from the actual incidents, what happened, who was to blame and who was not to blame.

In the press today, the Chinese News Agency has published some letters, which, it is said, have been written by the Dalai Lama to the Chinese Governor, the military Governor of Lhasa, just in this month. I would not like to say anything about those letters. I should like to have a little greater confirmation about them, about what they are, in what circumstances they were written, whether they were written at all. It is very difficult; because all these things are being said by various parties, it is exceedingly difficult to sift the

90

truth out of this lot of chaff. And whatever I may say, whatever my Government may do, may have far-reaching consequences.

We talk about Tibet, and we want to have friendly relations with the people of Tibet, and we want them to progress in freedom and all that. At the same time, it is important for us to have friendly relations with this great country of China. That does not mean that I or this Government or this Parliament or anyone else should submit to any kind of dictation from any country, however great or big it may be.

The Prime Minister said: That is not the point. But it also does mean that in a difficult situation, we should exercise a certain measure of restraint and wisdom in dealing with her, and not in an excited moment do something which may lead our country into difficulties. (Interruptions).

Today is the 30th of this month. It was on the 20th, the early morning of the 20th, that firing began-it is now ten days-in a country from which no news comes, except rumour. The only news that has come to us or to the wide world-I am leaving out China ; they might have some special-ways of getting news-the only news that came was from our Consul-General's telegrams to us. We got them pretty rapidly.

But what can the Consul-General report ? Remember that too. The Consul-General reports by and large what he sees from the window of his consulate. Obviously, he cannot tell us what is happening all over Tibet. He does not know. He is in touch with Lhasa, and more or less Lhasa is what he can see from his consulate, just round about what buildings firing took place, and he can report it. He cannot even tell us what is happening in Lhasa itself. He cannot tell us precisely and definitely what has happened to our nationals who are spread out. He can tell us definitely that our staff in our consulate is safe. He can tell us also that so far as he knows our other Indian nationals are safe, but he is not certain, because he just cannot reach them, so that all news has been cut off, and it comes to us in extremely small driblets, news that we can rely upon. And it becomes difficult for me to make statements or to say that we shall take some action, because of vague rumours which are obviously not always reliable.

Now, may I just say one word-I think I have answered it-about the people from Ladakh? It has been the old custom of people from Ladakh to go to Lhasa, and they do not take any travel papers or anything. They go for courses of instruction. Lhasa is in a sense their spiritual centre, their educational centre, from the Buddhist point of view. So, plenty of people go there. At the present moment, I have been informed that four head abbots from Leh are there, as well as-I forgot the number,-about 30, or 40 or 50-or it may be somewhere about a hundred-monks and others who have gone there. We have not got them on our register there, because they simply come and go, and do not report to us. But as soon as I heard about this two days ago, we are making inquiries about them.

Now, I come to the statements issued presumably by the Chinese Government. Now, those statements give a narrative of facts according to them, and I have nothing to say to that. I can neither confirm it nor deny it, because it is not in my, knowledge to make a firm statement ; if it was, I would make it.

As I said, so far as the letters which are said to have been written by the Dalai Lama are concerned, they are rather surprising letters. But more I cannot say; I should like to know more about them before I say.

There are two things mentioned in this statement of the Chinese authorities. One is about Kalimpong. About that, as soon as that appeared, the External Affairs Ministry, through a spokesman, contradicted that statement or corrected it. I suppose Hon. Members have seen it, but I shall read it out or part of it, if they have not, "Asked for his comments on the description of Kalimpong as 'the commanding centre of the rebellion' in the news communique released ... an official spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs emphatically repudiated the suggestion. He said that a number of people from Tibet have been residing in Kalimpong for many years..."

-many years meaning twenty, thirty, forty, fifty and more-

"...and among them are some who arrived during the last three or four years."

It is not many, it may be in dozens, perhaps.

"The Government of India have repeatedly made it clear to them that they should not indulge in any propaganda activities against a friendly Government on Indian soil. The last warning was

91

given about six months ago and since then these persons have remained quiet. There have been no unlawful activities in Kalimpong or elsewhere either by these people or others. It is, therefore, entirely incorrect to say that Kalimpong is the centre of any rebellious activities. The check-posts on the India-Tibet border are adequately manned and the strictest watch is always maintained on movements between India and Tibet."

Now, an Hon. Member wanted precise information as to whether the Chinese Government had complained to us about Kalimpong. I shall tell him, so far as I can remember, in the last few months, maybe, a year, there has been no complaint ; but there were on two occasions perhaps, two or may be three in the last three or four years, references to Kalimpong, to some people in Kalimpong carrying on propaganda and like activities. Our position has always been, and we have made it quite clear to people who came from Tibet, important people, that 'You are welcome to come here, but we cannot allow Indian soil to be used for subversive activities or even aggressively propagandist activities against friendly Governments'. That general policy of

ours applies to every Embassy that is here ; may be sometimes, they overstep the mark or we do not object when we might have objected. That applies to every Embassy here or every foreigner here. So that was the rule that we followed. And on two or three occasions, some leaflet came out in Kalimpong, which we thought was undesirable, and we drew the attention of the people who had brought it out, saying 'You should not do this, this kind of thing from Indian soil'. And our instructions and warnings bad effect, so far as we know we are not aware, in fact, in the last many months, of any activity in Kalimpong ; it may be in people's minds there ; naturally, they may have feelings; they may have sentiments. But I am merely saying that it is wrong to say that Kalimpong was a kind of centre from which activities were organised.

An Hon. Member: Has the Prime Minister read Elizabeth Partridge's article which has come in one of the papers where she says that she has contacted the rebels ? It has come out in the papers.

The Prime Minister : I have not read that particular article. I do not know to which article the Hon. Lady Member is referring. In one or two cases, foreign correspondents have gone and talked to people there in Kalimpong or wherever it is ; I do not know where, it may be Kalimpong or it may be elsewhere, but they have not mentioned names or the place or the individuals contacted. And they have given an account from the point of view, more or less, of those people in Tibet, who were on the site of the revolt. That I cannot catch, I cannot get it, but broadly speaking, it is wrong to say that Kalimpong has been the centre. Certainly, we have very good control of our check-posts, of people coming and going from Tibet to India, and nobody in Kalimpong can easily come or go, and you cannot control something where the movement is not easy.

I am told that when we enquired about Elizabeth Partridge's article, we found she had not gone anywhere near the border; she bad written it from far away.

The second point to which reference has been made by Hon. Members is to what is said in those press statements about our discussions here. It is not necessary for me to say that it is open to this House, this Parliament, and it is completely free to say or do what it chooses, to discuss any matter it chooses, subject always to the necessities of good sense and wisdom of which you, Sir, are the best judge. Nobody else outside this House is going to judge.

Unfortunately, the methods of government and the way legislatures and organisations function in China are different from ours. Perhaps it is not quite realised there, the background or the way of our functioning. Quite apart from what we do, or whether what any Hon. Member says is right or wrong, he has the right to say it; he has the right to say the wrong thing, as many Hon. Members on the opposite side know very well.

The Prime Minister said : It is, I suppose, a little difficult for people trained in a different tradition for a long time to understand the normal ways in which a parliamentary system of Government functions, and we should not be over-eager to find fault with somebody who does not agree with us, who describes our system in a different way, but certainly it should be made perfectly clear to all concerned that this Parliament is not going to be limited in the exercise of its right of discussion, saying or action or anything, by any external or internal authority, whoever it may be. Having said that, obviously that right has to be exercised always with wisdom and always thinking of the consequences, and how that right should be exercised.

92

CHINA USA INDIA HONG KONG CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Communique

A five-man official delegation of the Soviet Union led by Mr. A.A. Andreyev, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, U.S.S.R., paid, a visit to India from February 24 to March 19, 1959.

The delegation held a series of talks in New Delhi with Prime Minister Nehru and other Indian leaders.

At the conclusion of the delegation's visit to this country a Joint communique was issued in New Delhi on March 19,1959.

The following is the text of the communique:

On the invitation of the Government of India, a Government Delegation of the Soviet Union consisting of Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, U.S.S.R., Mr. A.A. Andreyev (Leader of the Delegation), Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Supreme Soviet, U.S.S.R., Mr. N.A. Mukhitdinov, as also First Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian S.S.R. and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. M.I. Kuchava, Member of the State Committee of the Council of Ministers, U.S.S.R., for Foreign Economic Relations, Mr. A.G. Sheremetiev, and the Chief of the South-East Asia Department of the Ministry of External Affairs, U.S.S.R., Mr. V.I. Likhachev, made an official State visit to India from the 24th of February to the 19th of March, 1959.

During their travel in India, the Delegation were accompanied by the Ambassador of U.S.S.R. in India, Mr. P.K. Ponomarenko, and the Ambassador of India in U.S.S.R., Mr. K.P.S. Menon.

The Delegation visited different parts of the country and had talks with leaders in Delhi as well as in other parts of India. The Delegation had the opportunity to visit different enterprises and new constructions such as the multipurpose project at Bhakra Nangal, the Chittaranjan Locomotive Factory, the Cable Factory at Chittaranjan, the Chemical Factory in Sindri, the wagon Building Factory in Perambur and other enterprises. The Delegation visited the steel mill which is being put up in Bhilai with the assistance of the Soviet Union and also was present at the opening of the Indian Technological Institute in Bombay in the setting up of which considerable help has been extended by the Soviet Union directly as also through the United Nations. The Delegation saw a number of agricultural farms, visited many villages, Scientific Research Institute schools and hospitals. They also saw several historical monuments.

On arrival in India, the Delegation handed over to the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, a letter from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. U.S.S.R., Mr. N.S. Khrushchev. This letter underlines the international significance of the Seven-Year Plan of the economic development of the U.S.S.R. and expresses the conviction that at present there are considerable possibilities for further development of all-round co-operation between India and the Soviet Union for the benefit of the peoples of both the countries and in the interest of permanent peace in the whole world. The letter also conveyed the agreement of the Soviet Union to extend to India assistance in the construction of the Oil Refinery Factory in Barauni and cooperation in the development of the Pharmaceutical Industry of India.

The Delegation had a number of talks with the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, and with other leading personalities. During these talks a number of important international problems such as disarmament, the question of a peace treaty with Germany, the Berlin problem, the creation of areas of peace free from atomic weapons in South-East Asia and in the Pacific ocean area, the cessation of the tests of nuclear weapons, the recently concluded bilateral military agreements between the U.S.A. and Pakistan, Turkey and Iran were discussed. In the course of these talks, both sides agreed to continue their efforts for the reduction of international tension and to assist the cause of peace and also expressed themselves in favour of the speedy conclusion of an agreement between the great powers possessing atomic weapons for the immediate suspension of the tests of such weapons. Both sides noted with great satisfaction that the visit of the Soviet Government Delegation to India made a valuable contribution to the further strengthening of friendly relations between both countries.

Wherever the Delegation went, they were

given a cordial welcome. From their side, the Delegation were happy to have the opportunity to convey to the Government and the people of India the feelings of sincere friendship which the Government and the people of the Soviet

93

Union have towards them. The Delegation expressed deep thanks for the warm and cordial welcome extended to them.

The Government of India were happy to receive the Soviet Government Delegation and to have the opportunity to exchange with them views on a number of important problems. The Government of India and the Soviet Government Delegation trust that the exchange of views will be continued and contribute towards the further development of Soviet-Indian cooperation in the economic, cultural and scientific fields as also in the task of ensuring peace in the world.

USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM GEORGIA GERMANY IRAN PAKISTAN TURKEY **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreements Signed

Agreements covering more than Rs. 100 crores lying in the account of the Government of U.S.A., on account of the sale of agricultural commodities imported under U.S. Public Laws 480 and 665 were signed in New Delhi on March 18, 1959.

The major portion of these funds arose out of the PL-480 agreement signed on August 29, 1956 for the sale of U.S. surplus wheat, rice, cotton, dairy products and tobacco to India against rupee payments. The amounts are being made available to India for meeting the rupee expenditure for the balance of the Second Five Year Plan period on 14 public sector river valley development projects.

The agreements were signed by Shri N.C. Sen Gupta, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, for the Government of India and by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, for the United States Government.

The agreements signed today are on a 40-year repayment basis. Of the Rs. 1,00,90,00,000 involved in today's agreements, the loan portion is Rs. 94,96,00,000; the balance is a grant.

These U.S. Technical Co-operation Mission (TCM)-aided projects are in the States of Bombay, Rajasthan, Mysore, Madras, Andhra, Orissa, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal. Some of the projects which benefit by these agreements are : Chambal, Damodar Valley Corporation, Kosi, Rihand, Nagarjunasagar and Sharavati.

The aim of these projects is to boost India's food output through irrigation and raise the power potential by harnessing the rivers for hydro-electric power generators. Flood control and soil conservation are other important benefits.

The Rihand project on completion in 1961 will not only step up electricity for eastern Uttar Pradesh but also bring under irrigation 14,00,000 acres of agricultural land by energising 4,000 tubewells in U.P. and Bihar, thus raising food output by about 3,25,000 tons. Nagarjunasagar when completed will irrigate some 20,00,000 acres of land.

Previous TCM assistance to River Valley projects in India, largely in heavy construction equipment and technical assistance, amounts to Rs. 14 crores, which consisted of both dollar and rupee funds.

USA INDIA LATVIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Avoidance of Double Taxation of Incomes

Following negotiations first in Washington and later in New Delhi, agreement has been reached between the Tax Delegations of the Governments of the United States and India at technical level on the draft of a Convention for the avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between the two countries. The Convention now-requires to be approved by the respective Governments and ratified.

The United States Delegation was led by Prof. Dan Throp Smith, Special Adviser to the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury and included Mr. Nathan G. Gordon, Mr. Eldon P. King and Mr. Thomas R. Favell of the U.S. Government and the Indian Delegation by Shri V.V. Chari, Member, Central Board of Revenue and included Shri N.H. Naqvi and Shri N.S. Sivaramakrishnan of the Central Board of Revenue.

94

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on April 2, 1959:

Mr. speaker, Sir, I must express my deep regret for my absence yesterday from the House as I had gone out of Delhi. Since My return this morning, I have tried to get myself acquainted with what happened in the House by reading the official reports. I have not read any newspaper yet. I do not know what the newspapers say. I think the official reports would naturally be more reliable. I must say, reading them, although I got a gist of what happened, I sensed that much of what happened yesterday was-shall I say-I wish to say nothing disrespectful but there was an exhibition of a certain lack of restraint, if I may say so, and certain strong feelings which came in the way of the consideration of the matter that was placed before you and before the House.

Now, the matter is important and I can very well understand the strong feelings and the matter is important not because of the one or two or more adjournment motions that were moved here but because of what lies behind those motions. It is that which has led to strong feelings in the House and in the country. The actual motions were perhaps not very important but the other thing is important. Because the other thing is important, it is all the more necessary that we should not be led away by relatively extraneous or minor matters into doing or saying things which affect the other major things at issue. They are big things at issue and in that matter I cannot say that every Member of this House is of identical opinion. But I do think that nearly all the Members of this House will broadly agree. I imagine so and anyhow whether large or not, we have to realise the importance of what is happening and the consequences of what is happening. We have to shape our policy keeping full regard naturally, the first thing for the honour and dignity and the interests of India; secondly, the honour and dignity of the causes for which we stand. Also, we must remember that when conflicts arise which lead to this certain degree of passion on various sides one has to be particularly careful, especially this Honourable House whose word go out to the ends of the earth. We have to be particularly careful at a moment of difficulty such as this, that we function and we say whatever we have to say with dignity and, as I ventured to say last time, wisdom, That does not mean moderating any policy. We follow the policy which the House will ultimately agree to.

Now, Sir, the two matters, as far as I can

gather, that were raised yesterday in two adjournment motions were a statement issued by the Communist Party of India and the circulation of an article in the People's Daily of Peking, circulation presumably by an agency attached to the Chinese Embassy here. These were the two matters, if I am not mistaken.

Before I deal with them, may I, Sir, mention one thing. Perhaps you have another adjournment motion today. I have received notice of it and I do not know whether you have been pleased to consider it, but I might also deal with that adjournment motion. There is an adjournment motion-there am two in fact-asking me, first of all, as to whether them is any truth that the Chinese authorities have expressed a wish to search the premises of Indian Missions in Tibet or asked us to vacate those premises. Now, here is an instance of every rumour, which is appearing in newspapers in great abundance, affecting the people being brought into the House by way of an adjournment motion or some other motion. There is no truth in this at all. Nobody has asked us to vacate our premises. Nobody has asked us to search our Missions abroad. But everything comes in in the shape of an adjournment motion or asking me to make a statement. It is very difficult to keep pace with the amount of statements which are appearing in the Press now, coming chiefly from Kalimpong or Hongkong-those appear to be the two sources of information. Anyhow, there is no truth in that

Then, again, there was another adjournment motion asking me whether it is true that the Chinese Embassy sent for a top leader of the Communist Party of India to discuss various matters with them. Now, how am I to know, Sir? I do not. I have no information on the subject. I can say nothing.

Another matter-it is not the subject of an adjournment motion, I think I was asked to make a statement on it-is the visit, as it is said, of a group of Tibetans to me a day or two ago. Now, day before yesterday a large number, about 125 people came to visit me. Normally speaking, Sir, every morning in my house a few hundred people come. It is an open door more or less. Large numbers of peasants, students and others come because, unfortunately, I am supposed to be one of the sights of Delhi. Anyhow, about these 125 people, they said

95

they had come to Delhi and wanted to pay their respects to me. I said, certainly come. The great majority of them were Indian nationals, chiefly from Darjeeling, Kalimpong and those northern areas. Some were from Calcutta, that is to say, Indian nationals of Tibetan origin representing some association in Calcutta, Banaras, Kalimpong and others. There were a few, I forget how many people from Tibet proper who had gathered here some days ago. They came. We had no discussion. They did give me a paper, a kind of a memorandum which I took, and then I bid good-bye to them. That is all that happened.

Coming to the two matters which were referred to yesterday, one was the statement of the Communist Party of India. Now, I have, naturally, endeavoured to get a copy of that statement and read it carefully. I presume that it is a correct copy that I have. I have no reason to doubt its correctness, but I cannot guarantee that.

I have read it carefully and, if I may express my own opinion about it, the whole background of the statement is not one with which I would agree. I do not agree with it. There are certain slants with which I do not agree. But the question before us, I take it, is not whether we agree with the statement or not slant given in that statement or not, but, rather, if any great impropriety has been committed by the issue of that statement. I am not myself quite clear how, normally speaking, if a statement is issued by a political party outside that statement becomes the subject matter of an adjournment motion in this House. It is not clear to me. Of course, each case depends upon the content but, broadly speaking,-whether one agrees with the statement or disagrees is a completely different matterpolitical parties sometimes attack each other, criticise each other, or say something which another party may consider very objectionable. But, nevertheless, it is not clear to me how this matter can be raised by way of an adjournment motion

Now, it has been stated that it was raised because this statement challenged the bona fides of what I had said two days before about Kalimpong. I have read the statement carefully. What I would say is this, that it does not precisely and explicitly do that. But it does certainly throw a hint that what I might have said whether through mis-information or otherwise, might not be correct, so that I do not quite know what to do about it.

I shall repeat and, perhaps, a little more fully what I did previously, what I said about Kalimpong. You will remember, Sir, that in certain statements issued by the Chinese Government Kalimpong was referred to as the Commanding Centre of the Tibetan rebellion, and I said this is not true at all, and the External Affairs Ministry had also denied this. At the same time, I had said that I have often said that Kalimpong has been a centre of trouble.

Kalimpong, Sir, has been often described as a nest of spies, spies of innumerable nationalities, not one, spies from Asia, spies from Europe, spies from America, spies of Communists, spies of anti-Communists, red spies, white spies, blue spies, pink spies and so on. Once a knowledgeable person who knew something about this matter and was in Kalimpong actually said to me, though no doubt it was a figure of speech, that there were probably more spies in Kalimpong than the rest of the inhabitants put together. That is an exaggeration. But it has become in the last few years, especially in the last seven or eight years. As Kalimpong is more or less perched near the borders of India, and since the developments in Tibet some years ago since a change took place there, it became of a great interest to all kinds of people outside India, and many people have come there in various guises, sometimes a technical people, sometimes as bird watchers, sometimes as geologists, sometimes as journalists and sometimes with some other purpose, just to admire the natural scenery, and so they all seem to find an interest; the main object of their interest, whether it is bird watching or something else, was round about Kalimpong.

Naturally we have taken interest in this. We have to. While we cannot say that we know exactly everything that took place there, broadly we do know and we have repeatedly taken objection to those persons concerned or to their embassies. We have pointed this out and we have in the past even hinted that some people better remove themselves from there, and they have removed themselves. This has been going on for the last few years. So there is no doubt that so far as Kalimpong is concerned there has been a deal of espionage and counterespionage and a complicated game of chess by various members of spies and counter-spies there. No doubt a person with the ability to write fiction of this kind will find Kalimpong an interesting place for some novel of that type.

An Hon. Member: What is the Home Ministry doing about it? It seems to be absolutely ineffective.

The Prime Minister : The Home Ministry or

96

the External Affairs Ministry are not at all worried about the situation.

An Hon. Member : They allow the spies to espionage ?

The Prime Minister: Absolutely yes, first of all, because when we suspect a person of espionage we keep a watch over him. If he does something patently wrong we take action, but there are certain limitations in the law, as the House very well knows and we cannot function merely because we suspect somebody, and we have taken action in the past in regard to some people.

Now, about this particular matter, the statement by the Chinese Government, please remember the statement, "this was the commanding centre of Tibetan rebellion". I cannot say--how can I--that nobody in Kalimpong has indulged in espionage against the Chinese Government or against any other Government. I cannot say. Somebody whispers something to somebody else's car. But I did repudiate and I repudiate today that to say Kalimpong has been the commanding centre has given it a place in this matter which is, I think, completely untrue.

Now, in the past several years-and I said so on the last occasion-the Chinese Government has drawn our attention to what they said were activities in the Kalimpong area, that is, activities aimed against them. And repeatedly we have made enquiries; apart from our normal enquiries we have made special enquiries. I say this because I find that in the Communist party's statement we are asked to have an investigation. In so far as espionage activities are concerned we have investigated them several times. One cannot investigate those activities in any other way except through intelligence methods. That is being done. We have fairly full reports about it. I have got-I need not go into it-a fairly full note as to when the protest came from the Chinese Government. Three or four years ago it was mentioned to me and it was mentioned to our Ambassador some years ago, and we enquired and we took action. Sometimes we found that their protests or the facts that they stated did not have any particular basis. They would say, for instance, that an Organisation in Kalimpong was doing something or other. We found there was no such Organisation in Kalimpong at all. There were organisations there ; they were of course people in Kalimpong. Everybody knows that. There are some emigrants from Tibet. There are old Tibetans, that is to say, who have been there for a generation or more, but whose feelings may be against the Chinese Government. That is so ; there is no doubt about it, and we cannot do anything about it but we did make it perfectly clear to them in accordance with our normal Policy that they must not indulge in any propagandist activities and much less, of course, in any subversive activities.

In the nature of things they could not do much even if they wanted to intimate except perhaps-I cannot guarantee that-occasionally send it message or receive a message. It is very difficult to stop that but that is on a very small scale. They could not do very much in India except again to whisper something in somebody's cars. That I cannot stop. They may have whispered something here and there. But it is obvious to me that they could not do much and they did not. Once or twice a certain leaflet or certain document was issued ; somebody issued it. The moment it was issued we took action. We tried to trace it and we told them that they must not have been done. This has happened in three or four occasions. Again I repeat,--we were charged with-it was said that Kalimpong was a commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion. I denied that statement and I further said that apart from the last few years when there has occasionally been a paper or a leaflet or occasionally somebody in Kalimpong has perhaps met somebody else, privately and not publicly-that can always take placeand more particularly in the last five or six months more particularly I might say since we received the last protest from the Chinese Government-I think the last was early in August last yearwe took particular care to enquire again and we had no complaints since then. So, even if some activities took place there by some people there previously they were of a relatively small nature except of course contacts, and what can we say about contacts, in a place which, as I said, is so full of spies-there may be contacts, somebody meeting somebody. But in the last six months, we have taken particular care, and we have had no cause to think that any such action or activities had taken place there. I cannot conceive that Kalimpong could be--it has been described by the Chinese Government as the commanding centre--a commanding centre with the Indian Government not knowing about it. It is quite inconceivable to me. Some odd message can go or come and that is possible, but it cannot be, and to imagine that the Tibetan rebellion was organised from Kalimpong does seem to me a statement which cannot be justified.

An Hon'ble Member : Did the Chinese Government in August complain that somebody was

97

organising a rebellion from there?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir. Not that. They did not talk about rebellion. But so far as our records go, the first mention of it was made informally to us in 1956-57, when Premier Chou En-lai came here and it was mentioned tome and I replied that our policy was that we did not wish our soil-Indian soil-to be used for any subversive activities against a friendly country. But I also pointed out that there were obvious limitations under our law to take action on the basis of suspicion, and I requested his Government to supply me with special cases and that we would immediately enquire and take action, if necessary. Then a year and a half later, the same matter was mentioned to our Ambassador in Peking. At that time a photostat copy of a pamphlet which has been circulated in Kalimpong was sent to us. This was about

15 or 16 months ago, i.e. in January, 1958 ; There is no doubt about it that that pamphlet was anti-Chinese. But on enquiry and examination, we found that there was no such association as had been described in that pamphlet and the pamphlet itself, as a matter of fact, was two years old and had been issued in autumn of 1956-some of ancient pamphlet which they have got. That pamphlet was a bad one from our point of view, too, but some bogus name was given and somebody had issued it there.

There were, in fact, two associations in Kalimpong-one Tibetan Association, which has been in existence for 255 years and odd and the other, the Indo-Tibetan Association brought into being in 1954. The office-bearers of either of these associations were prominent emigrants, but neither of these associations was supposed to be engaged in political activities. In July, 1958, the Foreign Office in Peking presented a memorandum protesting against the use of Kalimpong area as a base for subversive and disruptive activities and five points were mentioned. Some names of persons were given. We immediately enquired into the activities of all these persons and we made detailed reports. We found that no doubt these persons held views which might be said to be anti-Chinese, but we could not get any information of any activity, propagandist or subversive.

The charge was made that they were in collusion with the United States and with the Kuomintang authorities of Formosa or their representatives. Some of the prominent emigrants in Kalimpong had previously been in the United States and lived there for some time. And, no doubt they had their contacts there. We had no doubt about their views about it. But we have made it clear to them, even when they settled down in India, that we do not want Indian soil to be used for any subversive activities. Once when some letter or something was sent, we particularly looked into it and all those six persons who had been named in the Chinese Government's note were given specific warnings on the 14th of August through the Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling and to our knowledge, since that date, they have not done so. But as I said, I cannot guarantee any secret thing.

There are three organisations mentioned in

the Chinese note, viz., the Tibetan Freedom League, the Kalimpong-Tibetan Welfare Conference and the Buddhist Association which were alleged to be engaged in collecting intelligence from Tibet. We could not trace any of these three organisations and so far as we know, they are not in existence. Two other ones which I have mentioned previously were in existence and so far as we know, engaged in non-political activities.

The third objection in the Chinese note was to the reactionary views of a monthly called the Tibetan Mirror, which is edited by an Indian national of Ladakhi origin. As a matter of fact, we issued a warning to the editor, but we pointed out to the Chinese that many newspapers in India were far more anti-Government, i.e. anti-Government of India, and we could not and did not take any legal action against them.

Shri Nehru said : A statement was further made in the Chinese note that agents and saboteurs were sent into Tibet and arms were smuggled and despatched to the rebels. But no evidence was given and we are not aware of a single case. It is not an easy matter to cross the border between India and Tibet. No body can guarantee an individual perhaps going across, but to take arms, etc., was exceedingly difficult, practically impossible, without our knowledge.

Then the Chinese Government protested against agents of the Kuomintang operating in Kalimpong, particularly one gentleman whose name was given. We enquired into this matter.

In reply to a question whether all these details are necessary, the Prime Minister said : I thought they were not necessary; I agree with the Hon. Member. But this matter has been discussed at such considerable length and warmth. We found that this gentleman who had been named had been in Calcutta two years earlier and

98

had presumably returned, because we could not trace him.

Another note was presented to us by the Chinese Ambassador on the 4th August-that

was in July, the previous month-drawing our attention to the setting up of a committee in Kalimpong for giving support to resistance against violence by the Tibetan reactionaries and that this committee was forcing people into support of the signature campaign, and also drawing attention to the alleged meeting of 15 aristocrats wanting to make an appeal for support for Tibet We enquired into this matter and we gave him our reply that so far as the leaders were concerned, we had already warned them.

The House will see that all this took place in August and there has been to our knowledge nothing which we could have called objectionable, except private expression of opinion-that we cannot guarantee-during this period. Therefore, I venture to say that, in spite of the presence of people in Kalimpong to whom the Chinese Government might object because they were opposed to Chinese-Government's policy and all kinds could be made into the basis of a statement that Kalimpong was the commanding centre of the Tibetan rebellion.

An Hon. Member : I would like to know one thing. We have heard so many notes that we have received regarding Kalimpong from Chinese Government. As he mentioned, in 1956, when Chou-En-lai was here and when, fortunately or unfortunately, Dalai Lama was here, he was reluctant to leave this country and asked for a sanctuary. Through the intervention of our Prime Minister an assurance was given that no repressive measures would be taken by the local Chinese Command and on that specific assurance, he returned. The Prime Minister promised that he would pay a visit soon to see that that assurance was carried out.

The Prime Minister : What the Hon. Member has said is not at all correct, not at all, There is no question of my getting an assurance from Premier Chou-En-lai or his giving it or my asking for it. No such question arose at all. There was a question whether Dalai Lama should visit Kalimpong or not. It was in that connection that that was said. Naturally, we were anxious about Dalai Lama's security when he went to Kalimpong or anywhere. We discussed this with Premier Chou-En-lai and ultimately Dalai Lama decided to go there. We had informed the people-the Tibetans and people of Tibetan origin in Kalimpong that they will have to behave when the Dalai Lama went there.

They did it when he went there. So, there is no question of assurance and all that.

About the article in the Peoples' Daily of Peking, first of all, it is not for us to object to any article that appears in a newspaper in Peking. Obviously, if we started objecting we may disagree with them; there are many articles in the world press with which we are not in agreement; some are even very consorious of India or Indian policy-we can answer them. The only point is whether the circulation of that article here was proper or improper. That is it. Now I should like to point out that article appeared in Peking well before they could have had any report of my statement here. I took two days to come across here. But when it appeared in Peking it had no relation to my statement. It appeared, I cannot say the exact time but probably sometime or a few hours before. They could not have bad it. But even if they had it, they have every right to do what they like.

Now about the Embassy circulating papers, a question was raised here of, shall I say, breach of diplomatic privilege. There is no such thing. It depends, of course, on how it is done. But reproducing a newspaper article in their own country can certainly not bethought of in that light. It may be an impropriety, it may not be the right thing to do. It is very difficult to draw the line. We have throughout been trying to impress on the various Embassies here that we do not approve of the cold war being brought into India. That is, articles being circulated here, attacking apart from India other countries, in that sense. And, on the whole, I would say we have succeeded, not completely; but I must say the foreign Embassies here have been good enough to avoid doing many things which I find they are doing in other countries in regard to the cold war attitude. Now, I do not wish to mention countries, but I may mention one country. If the articles that have often appeared in the Pakistan newspapers were circulated here frequently, well, we would not approve of it, and in fact we have not in the past approved it, because sometimes we consider these articles very objectionable. We cannot stop them. But surely they should not be circulated by an Embassy here. I have given one instance. I can give many other instances. This is an instance of the very regrettable cold war between Pakistan and India. But in the bigger sphere of the cold war in the world many articles appear which. use the strongest language in attacking the other country. We try not to have them

99

circulated here. Well, the foreign Embassies have been good enough to co-operate with us in this matter. In this particular matter, as I said, it is anybody's opinion whether this was a very proper thing to do or an improper thing to do, although I would like to draw attention to the actual phrase of it to which objection has perhaps been taken. It is slightly different from the phraseology in the Chinese Government's reference to Kalimpong. Here it says the reactionaries in Tibet etc. "utilising Kalimpong, which is in a foreign land, as a centre for collusion with imperialism", slightly different from saying that Kalimpong is the commanding centre of a collusion. May be, that may be explained by saying that somebody met somebody and whispered and, as such, that is collusion certainly.

I am merely putting various aspects of this matter. It is an unsavoury matter altogether. But I want the House to deal with this matter with dignity and restraint, because behind all these minor matters lie much bigger matters which we have to face today, tomorrow and the day after, and we should not allow ourselves to be diverted from that major and difficult issue by relatively minor issues.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the general debate in the Committee on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, on April 27,1959.

Following is the full text of his statement.

Mr. Chairman,

In its report to the Tenth Session of the General Assembly, this Committee had summed up one of the directive principles of policy to be adopted in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the following words :

"To bring to every community a vision of a better way of life which, by their own efforts, they could build for themselves."

The Committee had defined this principle in relation to the policies and programmes of Administering Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the field of their social advancement. Education being the most important and effective means of the advancement of a society, this aim is equally applicable to educational policies.

The objectives of educational activities in Non-Self-Governing Territories as summed up in Resolution 743 (VIII) of the General Assembly are closely related to this directive principle of policy enunciated by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. It is in the light of these objectives that their advancement in the educational field must necessarily be determined. Furthermore, the evaluation of advancement in the educational field of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories must be made in the light of the goals defined by Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations.

After a study of the many volumes of summaries and analyses of information and the great variety of documentation prepared for the Committee by the Secretariat, by the UNESCO and other Specialised Agencies of the United Nations Organisation, we have formed the view that while progress in the dissemination of education in NonSelf-Governing Territories over the last three years has continued, the pace and the scope of such progress have been limited in relation to the needs of those territories. If the orderly development of these territories towards independence and selfgovernment is to continue unhindered, educational activities in these territories will need to be considerably expanded and intensified almost immediately. We are not unaware of the difficulties, both financial and administrative, faced by those who are responsible for the formulation and implementation of educational policies in Non-Self-Governing Territories. We have been, and are now, face to face with these difficulties in our own country. We appreciate the efforts that the Administering Powers are making to achieve the objectives of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories enunciated by the General Assembly in its Resolution to which I have already referred. Nevertheless, despite notable progress in some individual territories, the progress on the whole in the sphere of education has fallen far short of the needs of the people, of their passionate desire for education and of the pace with which Non-Self-Governing Territories are moving towards the realisation of

100

the goal of self-government under the impact or modern world conditions.

In some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly those under the administration of the United States of America, educational progress has been truly spectacular. A few decades ago there was nothing in these territories to distinguish them from the rest of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the matter of educational advancement. Today in these territories primary education is free and compulsory; secondary education, technical and vocational education are available to the inhabitants free of cost and in adequate measures; and higher education not only in the academic field but also in the professional fields, such as medicine, technology and engineering, has made rapid strides.

Impressive progress has been achieved, especially in the field of primary education, in the Australian Territory of Papua, where local environment and the backwardness of the inhabitants constitute special difficulties compared to other territories. Papua is, perhaps, the only territory where not only education imparted by the State but also by Missionary organisations. Is completely free. This is an example which deserves special mention and emulation.

In terms of numbers, comparatively speaking, the task was easier in the territories under New Zealand administration, but we are impressed by the zeal and success with which the Administering Authority has tackled this task, and we are happy to note that educational policies and programmes of the Administering Authority in the Cook Islands, in the Nieu Islands and the Tokelau Islands have evoked the enthusiasm and the support of the people for whose benefit they were intended.

Since this Committee examined educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories in detail in 1956, some considerable progress in the spread of primary and secondary education, and in the "vertical" expansion of educational facilities in French West Africa, has been achieved. For these achievements the Administering Authorities deserve our warm praise and commendation.

My delegation is not unconscious of the genuine, sustained and well-intentioned efforts which the United Kingdom is making for the expansion and development of educational facilities, especially primary education, in territories under its administration and control. These efforts are bearing fruit in Nigeria, where the formulation and implementation of educational policies are now largely in the hands of indigenous authorities. But on the whole, governmental programmes and plans for the dissemination of education are only now beginning to assume tangible proportions, and it is rather early to evaluate and assess their magnitude and their impact on the needs of the peoples concerned. In these territories and in the Congo under Belgian administration there are both bright and dark facets to the educational policies under implementation. Of these, I shall speak later.

My delegation deeply regrets that this committee is deprived of the presence of a Belgian Representative in our midst. While the Government of Belgium submits information to the Secretary-General, they seem to maintain that this information is merely intended for the benefit of the Secretary-General and that the United Nations or this Committee have no business to analyse and study and pass judgement on it. We entirely disagree with this view. Ten years have passed since the stand of the Belgian Government was first taken. Much has happened during these years. If there is one thing which characterises the last decade, it is that colonial regimes are disappearing sometimes in an orderly manner through, wise and peaceful transfer of power and sometimes as a result of unfortunate violent upheavals. And the valuable harmonising role of the United Nations in this process through the exercise of its functions through this Committee under Article XI of the Charter and otherwise cannot now be denied or questioned., We hope that the Government of Belgium will reconsider their attitude and, like many other Administering Authorities whose representatives are with us to-day, decide to participate in the deliberations of this Committee. I need hardly add that the active co-operation of Belgium in the work of this Committee will be in full accord both with the letter and spirit of the principles and purposes of Chapter XI of the Charter and, while benefiting this Committee, will also prove of some benefit to them.

Mr. Chairman, it is one of the greatest tragedies of our time that two of the largest African territories, namely, Angola and Mozambique, and a few smaller territories, which are Non-Self-Governing Territories in every sense of the phrase, are not so regarded by the colonial power that administers them and by a few likeminded friends of that power. They are regarded as part of Portugal itself. In spite of all the legalism and tenacity with which this view is maintained, our Delegation consider that the myth of such territories forming part of the metropolitan country cannot obscure the real fact

101

of their being no different from a colony. In the absence of the information which ought to be submitted to the United Nations under Article 73 of the Charter by a colonial power which is a member of the United Nations, we can only extend our sympathies to the peoples of these territories who in this latter half of the Twentieth Century continue to bear the yoke of colonialism and to suffer exploitation in speechless sorrow. My Delegation endorses the view expressed by the delegation of Ghana that the General Assembly should take urgent measures to ensure the implementation of Article 73 in respect of territories under Portuguese administration.

Article 73 recognises the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories are paramount and that it is the sacred duty of the administering powers to promote. to the utmost, these interests. This Article proceeds to define these interests as advancement in political, economic, social and educational fields. Appropriately, the pride of place is given by the Charter to the political interests of the inhabitants. namely, their development towards self-government in accordance with their political aspirations and according to their particular circumstances. The promotion of economic, social and educational interests of these inhabitants is regarded, as if it were, not an end in itself, but as a means to a much larger end, namely, the political emancipation of these peoples. The relationship between education and self-government, as was so aptly and so forcefully pointed out by the representative of Ghana the other day, is real and decisive. There cannot be any real promotion of the economic and social interests of a people, self-governing or non-self-governing, without the spread of education. Moreover, as I stated the other day during my intervention in the debate on sub-item (a) of item 4, an), Non-Self-Governing Territory in which education has advanced to any tangible degree, the goal of independence cannot be far. In the reverse it is also true that when self-government approaches and the inhabitants of a territory are in a position to lead active and extensive participation in the formulation and implementation of educational policies, the spread of education assumes new and unforeseen proportions. It was therefore, that in my second intervention in the deliberations of this Committee I emphasised the necessity of increasing, in all Non-Self-Governing Territories and by all means possible, the active participation of inhabitants themselves in the preparation and implementation of plans for educational development. In the territories where such participation has been real and effective, educational progress has been remarkable: and where such participation has been permitted grudgingly or has not been granted at an education is in a sad state. We sincerely hope that in such territories as Kenya, Uganda, Bechualand and others renewed and

more vigorous efforts win be made in the immediate future to transfer the control and implementation of educational policies to the peoples concerned, and that participation shall not be limited to merely an advisory role either through parent-teacher associations or through village, district or tribal councils.

Mr. Chairman, if, as I pointed out the other day, the ends of education are to enable a man or woman to cam his or her living, to equip him to play his part as a useful citizen of a free and democratic society and to enable him to develop all the latent powers and faculties of his nature and so enjoy a good life, the education of adults is as important as the education of children of schoolgoing age. We recognise that in a territory like Papua under Australian administration the best means to the eradication of illiteracy might be the extensive promotion of primary education so that the literate and educated children of to-day will become the adults of tomorrow. But in most other territories, where the goal of self-government or independence is near, the mass of adult population cannot be allowed to live in ignorance. We are glad to note that adult literacy programmes are under way in a large number of territories, and that these programmes, as the report of the UNESCO points out, are attempting to attack conditions of illiteracy on a broad front and simultaneously. The best form of adult education is functional education which relates to the day-today life of an adult whom it is intended to educate. There has been some considerable discussion of the methods, including audio-visual methods for the spread of such education. Interesting experiments concerning the use of mass media such as radio are being successfully made in Papua and several territories under the United Kingdom administration. These methods have to be constantly examined and improved, changed or modified as may be necessary. Naturally, Mr. Chairman, in discussing these subjects I have to draw upon our own experiences in India, and if I do so rather freely and frequently in my statement, it is only because we ourselves have passed through the same phase as Non-Self-Governing Territories; and our social conditions and problems being similar, our experience may be of some interest to administering authorities and people of Non--Self-Governing Territories. In addition to what I have said earlier on this subject, I would like to say that we have found in South India that where an illiterate

community has to be instructed in certain aspects of life, drama based on simple themes related to

102

those aspects of life staged by members of the community, sometimes illiterate members has proved of tremendous value. It occurs to me that this method of audiovisual education, not dissimilar to the showing of films which are so frequently and successfully undertaken, might prove of special value in African territories. Africans have displayed tremendous dramatic talent; they are comparatively km inhibited, and we should be interested to see the organisation of some dramatic clubs engaged in experimentation with this method of adult-education.

The other day, I touched upon the problem relating to the Preparation of literature of a suitable quality for adult literates. This is a problem which haunts all those who are engaged in the promotion of adult-literacy in all parts of the world. It seems to us that the theme of the life and work of the United Nations could form a useful subject in the preparation of such literature. From time to time the General Assembly has adopted resolutions concerning the dissemination about the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories and in Trust Territories. Literature of this kind in our view will evoke interest among the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. It will certainly help spread greater understanding of the principles and purposes of the United Nations, and perhaps also of the role of the administering authorities themselves in this Organisation.

Another experiment in the field of adult education we are beginning to make in India might he of interest to some Non-Self-Governing Territories. Workers education, as distinct from other types of adult-education, in order to help him solve his problems not as an individual but as a member of his class, is of the highest importance to any country in which workers form, as they do in many African and Asian territories, an organised component of the population.

Opportunities for workers to be educated in order to enable them to participate more effectively in various workers' movements and to fulfil more adequately their trade-union and related functions. The workers' education in this sense benefits the society as a whole, not only by helping the worker to equip himself for his job and for dealing with common social problems, but also by creating a potential channel for better labour management relations.

Recently, in co-operation with the Ford Foundation, the Government of India appointed a team of experts, which his recommended that the education of union representatives in the techniques of trade-union organisation, management and financing and the education of unionmembers for intelligent participation in union affairs, should be undertaken. A machinery comprising a Central Board with semi-autonomous authority and Regional Education Boards of local workers is now being developed. A scheme of training teachers for workers' education is being implemented. The whole programme is to be financed through Central and State Government grants, trade union contributions, employers' contributions, contributions in kind in the shape of classrooms, libraries and teachers etc., from educational institutions and grants from funds consisting of unpaid wager, fines and canteen profits etc.

Turning now to free and compulsory education we note, with appreciation, the substantial progress that has been achieved in a large number of Non-Self-Governing Territories during the period under review. In Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights it is stated that "everyone has the right to education; that education should be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages; and that elementary education shall be compulsory". It is in but few territories that primary education is either free or compulsory. In most of the territories under the United Kingdom administration, education is neither free nor compulsory. In some territories primary education is, in fact, exorbitantly expensive as in the territory of Fiji. Situated in the Pacific area, which the UNESCO describes as "in general a free tuition area", Fiji constitutes a special, and if I may say so an anomalous case. The report of the Department of Education of this territory for the year 1957 states that "Tuition fees in Government schools are designed to recover 25 per cent of tuition costs, and during the period under review have been levied at the following rates

Fijian and Indian primary schools 2-5-Od per annum, and Fijian intermediate schools which we presume are in nature of higher primary schools 6-15-Od per annum". A comparatively small measure of primary education is administered by Government schools; and the World Survey of Education 1956 tells us that "fees in private schools vary, but are usually higher than in corresponding Government schools". We agree with the UNESCO that "if the levy of fees is intended to be permanent, it will mean that fees will continue to rise as tuition costs will almost certainly do so". We hope with the UNESCO that this statemerit of policy with regard to the percentage recovery only describes an interim policy. We would welcome to have a reassurance to this effect

103

from the representative of the United Kingdom as this policy runs counter to that of most other Non-Self-Governing Territories which are heading, however slowly, in the direction of total abolition of tuition fees in respect of primary education.

A heartening factor in the field of primary education is the percentage of girl students. In a number of territories this percentage exceeds 50, and with the exception of Uganda, Cambia, French West America, French Equatorial Africa, Aden and Somaliland where it is rather too low, it varies from 30 to 50. High as these percentages are, in total numbers they are less significant as total enrolment of pupils in relation to the total number of boys and girls of school-going age is rather low. Mr. Chairman India is one of those countries which has from time immemorial believed in the essential equality of women with men, and has regarded the basic education of women in religious and domestic matters as of the highest importance. In the context of to-day's conditions, paradoxical though it may seem, we have perhaps the longest record of famous women in mythology and history. We have had great women thinkers, religious teachers, mathematicians and rulers. Even to-day women are playing a leading role in our public life in several capacities. Unfortunately, however, the education of women, for certain historical reasons, has suffered serious neglect in the last few centuries. In 1931 the percentage of female literacy was 2.4, and in 1947, when we took over the administration of our country, it was no more than about 3%. In 1951, at the

beginning of the First Five-Year Plan period, this percentage was 4, and it rose to 11.4 at the end of this first development plan in 1956. Progress has continued since then, and it is a professed aim of our policy to ensure that in the not too distant future every woman of India like every young male will be liter-ate and educated.

We are aware of the difficulties in the spread of literacy and education among women. Certain deep-rooted prejudices have to be fought against and there are the usual problems of finance and the non-availability of trained teachers. But it is our considered view that no country can continue its forward march if its women are not educated. We can hardly over-emphasise the need for paying greater attention in Non-Self-Governing Territories especially those of Africa to the promotion of education of women. In a growing literate society the literate mother performs a most important function. If parents are interested in education and know the value of it, they are then more willing to send their children to school. Without going into great detail at this stage, I would merely draw this Committee's attention to the measures recommended in its 1953 report for the rapid development of educational facilities for women. The Committee will do well to reiterate those recommendations at this Session.

A discouraging feature of primary education is the average number of pupils per teacher. Our own experience shows that 30 pupils per teacher is on the average not an unsatisfactory number. But an examination of the tables prepared by the UNESCO shows that in Basutoland, Tokelau, Bahamas, Jamaica, Dominica, Comoros, a teacher is required to teach more than 50 pupils on the average. Only in about 20 territories is the average number of pupils per teacher near or below 30. This is unsatisfactory, and we hope that as teacher-training programmes materialise and expand in these territories, a more satisfactory average will be obtained.

The last report of this Committee on Education in Non-Self-Governing Territories summed up the position concerning Secondary Education as follows :

"The number of schools providing advanced and wider instructions after the primary stages is increasing. Even so, in most of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, there is not enough secondary education."

Although during these last three years the number of institutions of secondary education has been steadily increasing, the acceleration of general political and social consciousness has, happily, continued to stimulate the demand for education of the secondary type. Generally speaking, therefore, the conclusion reached by this Committee concerning the provision of secondary education in 1956 remains true in the context of the conditions prevailing today. In 1956 this committee had expressed the view that the concept of secondary education as an intermediate stage between primary and higher education has often led to formalism and rigidity. Secondary education has to provide a broad education and training of sufficient content in itself without necessarily leading to higher education.

The need for the expansion and the demand of the people for such expansion, so well recognised in policy-statements and development plans of Administering Authorities, has not often been matched by practical measures. There are, no doubt, practical difficulties, such as difficulties of staffing, the paucity of financial resources and the poverty of the pupils or their parents who are unable to provide the cost of tuition.

104

A perusal of the information tabulated by the Secretariat, the UNESCO and the World Health Organisation reveals that the familiar complaint that adequate number of pupils for institutions of secondary education is not forth-coming is not true of the territories in which secondary education is provided free of cost. We have already pointed out that popular participation resulting often in the provision of free education tends to contribute significantly to the more rapid expansion and popularisation of education. Another means of popularisation of secondary education, which has been successfully used in some of the territories, is that of relating it to the functional fields of life. In our view, priority should be given to the integration of secondary education with systems of vocational and technical education. Schemes of secondary education should be planned in relation to the overall prospects and to the actual and potential requirements for skilled and professional positions available to the peoples of the territory.

In some of the territories diversification of education at the secondary stage is being carried out with success. Nigeria is one such example. The Committee on Secondary Education appointed by the Government of India in 1952 recommended that secondary schools should be of the multipurpose type. They should seek to provide varied types of courses for students with diverse aims, interests and abilities, so as to use and develop their natural aptitudes and inclinations in the special courses of studies chosen by them. The intention should be to cater to the requirements of boys and girls in the age group of 14-17 in such a way that they will be trained in their respective fields of work, so that when they leave school they will be prepared either to join professional colleges or universities, or to get settled in practical professions after a further short period of intensive training, instead of swelling the ranks of educated unemployed.

The preparation of syllabuses for multi-purpose schools should, if I may venture an opinion based on our own experience, have, besides the diversified courses, a certain number of core-subjects common to all students, such as languages, general science, social studies and crafts.

In India in schools of this kind in the coresubjects group we are teaching as many as three languages, namely English. Hindi and the Regional Language of the pupil. The secondary education in a large number of Non-Self-Governing Territories is mostly in the metropolitan languages. This, in our view, is not the correct policy. While we commend the teaching of the metropolitan language, which is likely to broaden the horizon of learning and culture the teaching in that language alone can only result in the gradual elimination of the trainee's closeness to the environment in which he subsequently will have to work.

The conversion of purely academic secondary education into diversified education can be attempted in two ways : Firstly, by creating new facilities for diversified education; and secondly, by systematic and planned conversion of at least some of the existing high and higher secondary schools into multipurpose schools. The second method is comparatively less expensive and will result in the full utilisation of existing facilities which may not be sufficiently attractive to the pupils of secondary school age being far removed from the functional aspects of their lives. This, in our view, is the surest way of avoiding wastage in the existing facilities.

To emphasise the importance of higher education in various fields, Mr. Chairman, I cannot do better than quote paragraph 67 of the Secretariat paper on higher education in Non-Self-Governing Territories (Doc. L. 302), which reads :

"Education as the key to progress finds its ultimate consumption in the product of the university and technical institutions. That product depends, in quality and quantity, on the whole process of education from the primary level upwards ; and, in reverse, the process of education as a whole depends, for its teachers and administrators. on the product of higher education."

As we have found from our experience in India, the universities should aim at doing two things :

- 1. To provide the country the personnel it needs to man its civil services, its schools and colleges ; and
- 2. To turn out the requisite number of technicians, doctors, engineers and specialists of all kinds.

The aim of university education should be to produce, more or less, the exactly adequate number of educated persons for each profession, and not to produce any particular type of graduate in excess of the number required in the country. The latter leads to unemployment and the frustration of the unemployed, which marks the development of university education in many countries, including my own.

105

Fortunately, the Non-Self-Governing Territories in Africa and Asia, particularly of the former continent, are not in any danger of having graduates or undergraduates of any description in excess of their requirements for some years to come. On the contrary, these territories fall far short of their requirements in the provision of university education, academic and technical, and it is necessary to accelerate the pace of development of higher education, especially in African territories.

It does no credit to the United Kingdom that today when its territories in Africa cannot conceivably be far from the day beyond which their independence cannot be delayed, they cannot boast of even one university providing education in all the various professional fields. There are a few colleges of various kinds in these territories and some of them like the Makarere College are excellent institutions, but their syllabuses and examinations are controlled by Metropolitan institutions, or the Metropolitan governments themselves. These features divorce university education and the graduates it produces from their countries and the needs of those countries. The aim in these territories, at least in some of them, should be to establish national universities, the educational policies and products of which will be linked closely with the culture and the requirements of the nation concerned. The institutes of higher learning that exist are performing a useful role but their remoulding in the years to come will be necessary to attune them to perform higher roles in the new age of freedom that is dawning for-Non-Self-Governing Territories, and their expansion will also be necessary.

The observations which I have just made, Mr. Chairman, also apply to the Non-Self-Governing Territories under the administration of France, where the determination of standards, syllabuses and educational policies in the matter of higher education, including university, still rest with the Metropolitan Government.

We here constantly of the shortage of indigenous administrators in many of these Non-Self-Governing Territories; we are told that metropolitan personnel is there because indigenous personnel is not available. This itself, in our view, is eloquent proof of the need for the expansion of facilities for higher education in these territories. When we come to think of the requirements of these territories in terms of number of doctors, engineers and technicians of various kinds, the situation is much worse. For example, there is a total of 12 institutes of higher learning in African Territories out of which only four teach medicine up to some standard, with a capacity to turn out about 200 graduates per year for a population of over a hundred million in an area which suffers from all kinds of diseases and epidemics.

While we appreciate that a number of African students are persuing higher studies abroad on scholarships and otherwise, we do not think that the right kind of policy is the one which depends for higher education primarily on the facilities available to Metropolitan universities and institutions of higher learning. This Committee has noted in the past that students going abroad for higher studies do not always become available to the country of origin. In Nigeria for example, in 1955, 60 medical students were studying abroad on government scholarship. 20 of them received qualifying degrees or diplomas in the United Kingdom, but only seven returned to Nigeria for active work in the service of their country.

The general aim of policy with respect to university education should, therefore, be to develop the requisite facilities in at least some of the larger territories of Africa and other areas. Overseas education should be restricted only to fields where specialisation and final practical experience is required. Expenditure on such education should be met, as far as possible through the scholarship schemes and other schemes of international assistance and co-operation which are now available to the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The funds available from the Metropolitan and indigenous authorities should be devoted entirly to the development of higher education in the Territories.

In Resolution 743 (VIII) in which the General Assembly enumerated the objectives of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories, it also reaffirmed that "in accordance with these objectives the processes of education should be designed to familiarise the inhabitants with and train them in the use of the tools of economic, social and political progress, with a view to the attainment of a full measure of self-government". The ILO, the FAO and the WHO have prepared most useful reports on the subject of vocational and technical education for the use of this Committee. These studies highlight the fact that the greatest impediment to the development of technical and vocational education in the territories is the lack of adequately trained teachers. During the Seventh Session of this Committee my delegation had urged that this situation should be rectified by making the teaching profession more lucrative and more attractive. We had also pointed out that teachers as a class are entitled to Government protection as otherwise it would be difficult to attract personnel of

106

good quality against the competition offered by other more lucrative forms of employment. We urged the Administering Authorities to create unified cadres of teachers with adequate prospects of advancement and promotion. We are gratified to note that in one of the documents before this Committee the FAO has brought this last point out clearly. At this stage we wish merely to reiterate the suggestions and recommendations we made in the Seventh Session of this Committee.

It is our experience that vocational training in such fields as health and sanitation, nursing, preliminary agriculture, farming, etc., can be most effectively imparted as part and parcel of an allembracing programme of community development to which I have referred in my other statements before the Committee. According to the information concerning the dissemination of vocational and technical education, there is a lack of enrolment in existing institutions specially in agricultural institutions. This is a somewhat paradoxical position as most of these Non-Self-Governing Territories are predominantly agricultural. We are inclined to agree with the view expressed by the representative of Ghana that the difficulty experienced in persuading the youths to enter institutes of agricultural training may be due to the deficiencies in the school curriculum and to the failure of the educational systems in general to create respect for manual work. Both the ILO and the FAO support this view. The FAO has stated that agriculture often occupies a very low place in the scale of values. Another difficulty in the expansion of technical education is the lack of finance. We are often told of the investments made by colonial powers in projects in colonial territories for the betterment of the people under their protection. A cardinal fact to be remembered is that the basic resources of most of these territories have been and continue to be exploited by colonial powers. Therefore till such time as the subject peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories come to manage their own financial and other resources, it is the responsibility of the administering powers to find the finances necessary for their educational development, which can no longer be neglected or postponed. The Seventh Session of this Committee recognised, and we hope that the present session will reiterate, that "From the point of principle it is a responsibility of the administering members to assist in the provision of adequate resources for the development of education, which forms an important part of the foundation of the new societies in the Non-Self-Governing Territories."

There may be some initial apathy towards technical and vocational education, but our own experience shows that if a proper climate is created, and the benefits of such education are made known to the populations concerned, people develop a preference for this kind of education over education of the purely academic type. A basic reason for the alleged unpopularity of vocational and technical education in these territories is the fact that general education itself at primary and intermediary level is unduly restricted. The statistical appendices to the various studies available to this Committee confirm this view, which has been endorsed by the ILO.

The organisation of education on racial lines also has tended to develop prejudices against technical and vocational education. When a European community is given education of the academic type aiming at turning out qualified personnel for high administrative jobs, the impression is created that the technical and vocational education offered to an indigenous community for different purposes is intended to exclude that community from professions of greater importance, and is therefore an education of an inferior type. The situation is aggravated when an agricultural institution like the Egerton Agricultural College of Kenya, where a superior type of agricultural education is imparted is reserved exclusively for Europeans. The prejudices are further perpetuated when an indigenous person with qualifications equal to a European counterpart is called by a different name and designation in the same professional field. The FAO has pointed out that while a European officer with certain training is designated an Assistant Agricultural Officer, an African with equal training is referred to as a Field Officer. It is FAO's view that this is a minor

point, but it is our conviction that this is a point of major psychological importance since discrimination between two persons of same qualifications but different races cannot but aggravate prejudice.

Mr. Chairman, it is our considered view that on no ground whatsoever can the principle of racial education be justified. Racial discrimination results from and, in turn, creates political discrimination. It serves to keep the communities and races apart by solidifying the barriers to the understanding which should result from membership of common educational institutions and providing equal opportunities to all. History has proved that no one race is nearer to God than any other and that no race as a whole is superior or inferior to the other. Discrimination on the grounds of race in any matter can only precipitate strife. Racial discrimination in the field of education can only perpetuate racial division, and thereby aggravate such strife. And yet in the Congo, as in the Central African Federation, in Kenya and in

107

Uganda and in numerous other territories, education continues to be organised on raical lines.

As the 1950 report of this Committee concluded: "In the field of education no principle is more important than that of equality of opportunity for all racial, religious and cultural groups of the population." We hope that the present session of the Committee will reiterate the conclusion reached in 1950 which is as valid to-day as it was then. It is our view that any discrimination on grounds of race in the matter of educational promotion is contrary to the Declaration of Human Rights and indeed to the Charter of the United Nations and the very principles and purposes of that organisation which ought to govern the thinking of member States. Resolution 644 of the 7th Session recommended to the administering powers the abolition in Non-Self-Governing Territories of laws and practices contrary to the principle of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We must regret that racial descrimination in education still persists in Non-Self-Governing Territories. We hope that the practice of maintaining at the public expense and of encouraging different schools with different levels of facilities for different racial groups will disappear without further delay.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has time and again in the General Assembly and in this Committee suggested that the Administering Authorities concerned should endeavour to establish comprehensive plans in all fields of education with stages and tentative time-tables for the accomplishment of these stages duly specified. We are glad that the delegation of Ghana has now joined its voice to ours in this connection. While in some territories there are five-year and ten-year education plans or plans of general development in which the implementation of educational measures is taken care of, in most territories measures for the expansion of primary, secondary, technical, vocational and higher education are adopted on an ad hoc basis. Our own experience in India has confirmed the view that we have so often expressed that progress is much more satisfactory and much more easily achieved in any field when it is systematically planned ahead. The aim of educational policies in most territories is the introduction of free and compulsory primary education. While the progress in the various fields of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories is characterised by a remarkable variety, there seems to be general agreement on this point, namely, the introduction of free and compulsory education. We would therefore strongly urge that the Committee's report should recommend the adoption by all Administering Authorities concerned of time-tables for the attainment of each particular stage on the path towards free and compulsory primary education both for men and women in all Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should again stress on behalf of my delegation the important mutual link between education and political responsibility. More education and better education mean better base for political advance and greater acceleration towards self-government. At the same time, the larger the responsibility on the people, the greater the stimulus for education and the more accelerated will the spread of education become. The processes of devolution of political responsibility on the people and the development of education must, therefore, go hand in hand. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that the increased participation of the people leading to an early entrustment of responsibility for education on elected Ministers is a necessary and urgent further step in all Non-Self-Governing Territories. Side by side with this, there should

be no relaxation of efforts - indeed in many territorries the efforts have to be much more serious and intensive than they have been hitherto - in creating a literate and educated society which will understand its responsibilities and prepare itself in a peaceful and orderly way for selfgovernment.

INDIA USA AUSTRALIA NIGER NIGERIA CONGO BELGIUM ANGOLA PORTUGAL GHANA KENYA UGANDA OMAN FIJI MALI MALDIVES BAHAMAS COMOROS DOMINICA JAMAICA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Krishna Menon's Statements in Lok Sabha on Shooting Down of IAFCanberra

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Defence Minister, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on April 11, 1959 on the shooting down of an IAF Canberra near Rawalpindi by the Pakistan Air Force on April 10, 1959 :

Government deeply regret to report to the House the loss of one Indian Air Force Canberra Aircraft on the morning of April 10, 1959.

In view of the circumstances in which this event occurred and in view of the various reports that have appeared in the Press and the concern of the House itself, Government would like to

108

place all the available facts before the House.

In the normal flying programme of the day, one Canberra Aircraft, equipped for survey photography and not for bombing or hostile purposes, took off from an IAF airfield on the morning of April 10 at 6 a.m. It, however, failed to return within the expected time. The mission of this Aircraft was to take aerial photographs, for the Survey of India, of the territory of the Union in the areas of Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir. The lost Aircraft was scheduled to complete its task within a period of four or five hours, and should, therefore, have returned to its base not later than 11 o'clock on the morning of April 10.

The Aircraft. however, failed to return and was awaited until mid-day. Thereafter, the Air Force authorities, in accordance with the usual practice, ordered a search in the area which was to be surveyed by the missing plane.

News reached Air Headquarters, and, I believe, the public generally after mid-day. Pakistan Radio had announced that "an unidentified" Aircraft had been intercepted by Sabre jet fighters of the Pakistan Air Force and had been shot down. Similar reports later in the day stated that the aircrew of the plane that had-been shot down had been picked up and taken to Rawalpindi.

Later, sometime on the evening of April 10, similar reports and the papers printed in the evening mentioned the incident and that an IAF Canberra was the Aircraft shot down. About this time, a Press Trust of India report also stated that two Indian Air Force men who were the crew of the shot-down Aircraft mentioned by them also as an IAF Canberra were taken to Rawalpindi. The House should be informed that no communication had reached either the Government through Diplomatic channels or Air Headquarters through Pakistan Air Force channels at the time of the incident or later in the day at any time.

This morning, Air Headquarters, as is customary in such contexts, communicated with Pakistan Air Headquarters, and were informed that the lost aircraft was a Canberra of the Indian Air Force. They were also informed that the Pilot and the Navigator who were the sole crew of the Aircraft had been injured and were in Rawalpindi. Air Headquarters were also informed by the Pakistan Air authorities that these two men would be returned to India. They are now on their way home in a Pakistan Air Force Freighter Aircraft. Government regret to say that both the airmen had been injured but fortunately not grievously. The House should be informed that this type of Canberra carries no arms or weapons. From the fact that the aeroplane was shot down in Pakistan territory, it is obvious that owing to operational and navigational difficulties the plane must have gone off course into Pakistan air space.

The crew had been briefed to fly at a height of between 47 to 48 thousand feet.

The House will understand that at the speed at which a Canberra operates and the short distance between our Frontier and Rawalpindi, which is about three minutes in flying time, it would be nothing unusual for such an aircraft to go off course into foreign air space. Government have seen reports in the Press that it was said to Pakistan that their Air Force had repeatedly radioed the Canberra and ordered it to land and that such instruction was disobeyed by the crew and in consequence the plane was shot at.

It is most unlikely and Government cannot believe that such a warning, if it had been given, would have been ignored by our airmen. The crew had knowledge that they were unarmed. They also knew full well that the consequences of ignoring any such warning would be grievous.

The cases of violation of our air space across the cease-fire line in Kashmir, over the International Frontier with Pakistan and on the borders of our territory in Bombay near Goa are by no means uncommon. Indeed their frequency can be judged by the fact that, to give one instance, there were 17 violations of our air space across the cease-fire line alone in Jammu and Kashmir in three months, from October 1958 to January 1959. The custom that has been followed in such cases is to record a protest to the United Nations Observer Group, who thereafter make an enquiry. In no case has our Air Force sought to initiate hostile action against Pakistan Aircraft which have periodically and want only violated our air space even after repeated protests. The House may also be informed that even during the hostilities in Jammu and Kashmir, one Pakistan Air Force Aircraft which crossed into our territory and was intercepted by our fighter aircraft was only warned.

It was allowed to proceed to its base.

The shooting of our plane yesterday, as announced by the Pakistan Radio and confirmed 109

to Air Headquarters this morning by the Pakistan Air Force, is unwarranted and contrary to International Law and Custom. The House will note that the Pakistan authorities have repeatedly referred to an "unidentified plane". It is inconceivable that when an attacking plane able to shoot and hit could not and did not see the clear markings on its target or what type of plane it was, this action of Pakistan further more reflects no reciprocity of treatment on the, part of the Pakistan Government.

Government, however, regret that in the course of a routine flight, even though probably due to defective navigational aids, our aircraft strayed into Pakistan air space. Government desire to make it clear to the world that the straying of our plane from our space was not and could not, therefore, be part of any hostile design or policy.

Government are taking all such steps as are appropriate to the circumstances and through normal diplomatic channels.

On April 21, 1959 the Defence Minister made another statement in the Lok Sabha on the shooting down of the Canberra. He said

It may be recalled that on the 11th April last, Government reported to this House, with regret, the loss of one Indian Air Force Canberra aircraft and also the circumstances in which that event occurred so far as the latter were then known to Government. The House was also promised a fuller report on the occurrence when more became known about the circumstances that led to it and are otherwise relevant. In pursuance of that undertaking, and because of the concern in the public mind about this incident and in view of the large number of misstatements of facts, official and otherwise, that continue to emanate from Pakistan. Government is now placing before the House further relevant and known facts.

The Pilot and the Navigator, the sole crew

of the shot-down aircraft, who had become casualties as a result of the incident have now been returned to us. They have been hospitalised. While there is no reason to think that they will not fully recover, their progress is slow and the injuries and shock sustained by them are considerable.

The House may also recall that I had mentioned in my earlier statement that at the very time I was making it these officers were on their way home. Pakistan Authorities had earlier that day promised to return them and they were scheduled to reach India that afternoon. They did not however arrive. Pakistan Authorities informed Air Headquarters later that evening that the Airmen would not be returned as Pakistan Medical Specialists had advised that the men were not fit to travel. Pakistan Authorities, therefore, were not prepared to take the responsibility for moving them. They also informed our Air Headquarters that if we wished to move the Airmen and bring them back we should send our own Doctor, who would have to accept full responsibility for whatever might happen in consequence of their being so moved

The House will no doubt feel concerned as the Government do that these injured men who were according to Pakistan Medical Specialists themselves in such a bad way were being subjected at that very time to interrogation, harassment and threats.

Air Headquarters immediately sent an Air Force Doctor to Lahore. He was taken by the Pakistan Air Force to Rawalpindi where he reached at 1.00 A.M. on the 12th of April. The Doctor decided to bring back the Airmen forthwith and under his own care. Pakistan authorities, however, demanded and obtained from our Doctor an assurance in writing that he was taking the casualties away on his own responsibility and at our risk and also in the face of the contrary advice given by the Pakistan Medical Specialists. Our Doctor and the injured men left Rawalpindi for Lahore in a Pakistan Air Force Plane at about 3.30 A.M. From there they were transhipped into the Indian Air Force Plane which brought them to Delhi at 7.00 A. M. They were immediately hospitalised.

Forty-eight hours had passed since they had been shot down. The two officers were still suffering from severe shock, the Pilot more than the Navigator, and they had to be kept in total quiet and rest. The Hospital authorities reported that the Airmen were found to be suffering from the following injuries and effects of ejection from extreme altitude :

- "(a) Sqn. Ldr. J.C. Sengupta (3657) G.D. (P)
 - (i) Compound fracture with Laceration of the right lower leg (operated on in C.M.H. Rawalpindi).
- (ii) Fracture left ankle (Discovered in M.H. Delhi).
- (iii) Severe sprain left knee.

110

- (iv) Fracture right lower arm.
- (v) Fracture spine (Discovered in M.H. Delhi).
- (vi) Injuries, to pelvis and shoulder.
- (vii) Shock and disorientation.
- (viii) Contusions and Lacerations.
- (b) Flt. Lt. S.N. Rampal (4218) G.D. (N).
- (i) Fracture right lower leg.
- (ii) Multiple contusions and lacerations
- (iii) Shock and disorientation."

The Hospital authorities prohibited visitors and ordered that the patients should not be disturbed. Interrogation of them by Air Headquarters was, therefore, not possible until the 9th of April. Our Air Headquarters, in accordance with usual procedures, have interrogated them for brief periods at a time, as permitted by Doctors, from the 19th April till this morning.

Both the Pilot and the Navigator have been closely examined. They have stated categorically and repeatedly that their flying over Pakistan territory was the result of Navigational error. Owing to the extreme importance of this factor not only with regard to this particular incident but to the Air Force generally in respect of discipline, morale and efficiency, the Air Force authorities have done the interrogation on this matter with particular thoroughness and care. I will read some of the questions and answers :

Q. What was the reason for your going off track ?

A. My Compass must have given wrong readings.

Q. How is it that your ground position indicator confirm your position as over Pathankot ?

A. As it was hazy, I could not pin point myself visually and I had no reason to doubt the accuracy of my instruments.

Q. How then do you explain the error in navigation ?

A. I over-relied on my navigational aid and

could not verify the accuracy of my compass by visual pin pointing and bemuse of haze.

The Pilot has stated that he took off from Agra on the 10th April at 0645 hours and set his course to Pathankot expecting to arrive there at 0740 hours. When he crossed the Sutlej the weather was hazy and he could not see the ground. He continued flying and a little later he read his instruments as indicating that he was over Pathankot. The House should be informed, however, that when he believed himself to be over Pathankot it is now known that he was in fact over Pakistan territory. Believing as he did that he was over Pathankot, he turned his Aircraft slightly to the left towards his task am which was 25 miles north of Jammu. Thereafter, he flew for 10 minutes in that direction. He saw ahead of him two airfields close to each other and a town. Seeing this he began to feel uncertain of his position. He felt he must have drifted off his track and that he was probably over Pakistan territory, as he knew there were not two airfields

close to each other in his task area.

He decided to check his position and therefore tried to establish radio contact with Srinagar. He failed to receive any response. Fearing that he was over Pakistan territory, he at once turned right towards India. It was at this moment when he was turning Indiaward that he felt a 'thud' in his plane. He saw the red warning lights in the plane indicating to him that the under carriage had been hit. His hydraulic pressure gauge had also dropped to zero. Within moments of this, the Canberra received a second and longer burst of fire shaking her up and as a result she went completely out of control. The Aircraft coursed down a steep spiral dive and the Pilot had to order his Navigator to eject and did so himself. Since, however, the plane was hurtling down in a steep dive at the time of ejection the Pilot received severe injuries in his legs and right arm. The injuries to his arm incapacitated him from manipulating his parachute while descending and the injuries to his legs prevented him from landing on the ground in the normal posture. He fell in a gorge and in the fall received further injuries.

The Navigator, however, was more fortunate. His injuries were fewer and less severe, bad as they were. Fortunately he could manipulate his parachute, and he landed near a village. The villagers who had seen also the Pilot descending through the air and falling farther away, later brought him also to the village. These villagers were kind and hospitable. After sometime they put the Navigator on a pony and the Pilot on a

111

charpoy and moved them towards Rawalpindi. This kind of journey did not, however, improve their condition. When they bad travelled about two miles, an ambulance met them and both the Airmen were taken to the Military Hospital, Rawalpindi.

When they reached the Hospital the Pilot had already lost consciousness. The Navigator was in extreme pain and was given pills and injections by Pakistan Hospital authorities. Despite this he had a restless night. The next day starting from midday he was interrogated by Pakistan Officers continuously until late in the evening of the 11th April. The Pilot regained some consciousness by the afternoon of the 11th April, but even then he was only semi-conscious, in fact at no time, till two or three days ago, was he in any reasonable possession of his faculties. During the interrogation of both the Airmen, the Pakistan Officers concerned appear to have subjected them to much pressure and harassment. They appear to have told their victims that they were in Pakistan and not in India, that it was better for their health if they confessed that they had deliberately violated Pakistan territory for aerial reconnaissance and photography.

The Pilot has only hazy recollections of the whole of this period. He remembers people continuously shouting at him. He remembers feeling threatened and harassed. He has no recollection whatsoever of speaking himself or signing any statement at all or as alleged. He vaguely remembers being moved a number of times and of being in Aircraft.

The Navigator has stated that he was separated from the Pilot from the moment they reached the Hospital and that the Pakistan Officers interrogated him separately and not with the Pilot. He was told that it was no use his saying he was off track and was over Pakistan territory owing to faulty navigation since the Prime Minister and the Government of India had already admitted that they had been sent out on a mission to fly over Pakistan and to take photographs. The Navigator was further told that his Pilot had confessed to deliberate violation of Pakistan territory and that he would do no good to his health if he persisted in his story of faulty navigation and the Canberra going off track. His interrogation came to an end near about the midnight of the 11th only when he was totally exhausted. A short time later, however, Pakistan Officers saw the Navigator again and asked him to sign a paper which, those officers asserted, contained no more than what he had said to them. The statement was not read by him; indeed he was in such a condition of physical and mental exhaustion that he could neither read nor appreciate the contents of anything read out to him. The Pakistan Officers repeatedly assured him that the statement was only to the effect that they had come over Pakistan territory as a result of navigational error. He was also told that he had to sign the statement which was a formality which he bad to comply with before he could return. In his completely exhausted physical condition he signed a paper

which he was told said that they had come over Pakistan because of faulty navigation. It is significant that neither the Pakistan authorities nor the Pakistan Press has so far said anything about a statement of the Navigator.

Pakistan has referred to a confession made by the Pilot. Government in their answer to a question on the 14th April expressed doubts about the veracity of the alleged confession because at that time Government were aware that the Pilot had been badly injured. He was unconscious most of the time he was in Pakistan and not in possession of his faculties. He could not, therefore, have signed anything knowing what he was doing.

The Pilot under interrogation has repeatedly affirmed that he has no recollection whatsoever of saying anything or signing anything. If, therefore, his signature, or what purports to be his signature, appears on any paper it cannot be regarded as of any value.

Government regret to say that further examination in the Hospital has revealed that the injuries and shock suffered by those men are more than originally believed. It now transpires that the Navigator has also fractured his spine. The effect of the shock from the fall from that great height has been grievous and to some extent still subsists. Both these Airmen have confirmed that they flew at a height of 47,500 ft. The height of the plane given by Pakistan at first was 50,000 ft. It was later changed to 45,000 ft. This is no doubt intended to cover up the fact that at the height of 50,000 ft. the Canberra could not have been chased by a Sabre Jet but could only have been shot at by the Fighters lying in wait for her quite deliberately. Even at 45,000 ft. this is the only way it could have happened. It is absurd to suggest that the Sabre Jets could have chased the Canberra for over 100 miles and still keep her under their control.

No warning of any kind by radio or by firing tracer bullets as alleged by Pakistan was at all given. Both the Pilot and the Navigator who have been very closely questioned by our Air Authorities on this matter are quite clear on this

112 point. The Pilot was asked :

"Are you positive you did not receive any warning of any kind before being shot down ?". to which he has answered, "Absolutely positive

The shooting of the plane was calculated and wanton.

The first indication to the crew that anything unusual was happening was not any warning by radio or by tracer bullets as claimed by Pakistan but the rude shock of a 'thud' in the plane. They became aware of the attacking planes only after they had been hit, when after having seen two airfields on the ground and realised that they were probably over Pakistan they had already turned towards India. Pakistan authorities have admitted that the Canberra was attacked by more than one Pakistan Fighter plane. It is therefore obvious to the House that the Fighters were armed and the guns loaded contrary to the practice of Air Force planes in Peace-time. The attack on the Canberra was deliberate, planned and prepared and was made not to prevent her from further penetration into Pakistan because she was already turning Indiaward. It is to be noted that even the Pakistan version of the concocted confession of our pilot contains no reference to these alleged warnings.

The House would also be interested to know that it is the practice to give all such warnings on a wave length accepted for this purpose by all nations. All stations, Civil and Military, in every country, are turned to this wave length. Such messages would, therefore, be received not only by the warned Aircraft but also by all air stations. They should certainly have been heard in Jammu and Amritsar. No air station anywhere heard any such message. It must be clear therefore that Pakistan's claim in regard to warnings is untrue.

It will be further noted that neither the Pakistan Air Command, nor the Pakistan Government made any communication to our Government or to our Air Headquarters about this incident. What is more, they referred to an "unidentified" aircraft even though they claim to have been trailing the Canberra for over a hundred miles. It is only after our Air Headquarters got in touch with Pakistan Air Headquarters the next morning to seek information since the news had come to us through press and radio reports from Pakistan sources that they even mentioned the incident.

In addition to various allegations and statemerits, official or otherwise, Pakistan Press has printed a photostat which purports to be the photograph of a map giving the flight of our Canberra as tracked by their radar. This might give the impression to the layman that the photostat is a photograph of the track as it appeared on the radar screen. This is not and what is more, cannot be the case. The photostat is the photograph of merely a map with lines on it which could be drawn at any time without any reference whatever to any radar tracking. According to the photostat which has appeared in the Pakistan Press, our plane entered Pakistan near Lahore and flew for about 160 miles in Pakistan territory. According to the facts which have come to light as a result of interrogation of the Pilot and the Navigator, the Canberra could have been over Pakistan territory only less than half this distance. It is inconceivable that a Canberra on a deliberate mission of reconnaissance and photography as alleged would knowingly expose itself even for 80 miles in Pakistan territory. If taking photographs in that area was the intention, the Canberra could reach the same areas by 3 or 4 minutes flight across the border. I may however add for the information of the House that our Air Force has strict instructions not to engage themselves in any missions or exercises which involve violation of Pakistan or any foreign territory. I have no doubt in my mind that these instructions are strictly observed.

Several short notice questions in regard to this incident have been tabled since the 11th of April. Mr. Speaker, Government submitted to you that the subject-matter of these questions maybe dealt with in the Statement which they had undertaken to make. You were good enough to concur.

Most of the issues raised by such questions have already been covered by what Government have stated hitherto including what has been said so far today.

There is, however, one issue on which Members of the House have sought information. It is also a matter which has been challenged by Pakistan and this is in regard to Government's view of the legality of the conduct of Pakistan in shooting down the Canberra. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, therefore, I shall deal with this matter as fully as I can.

It is true there is no universally recognised and absolute rule of international law which regulates the conduct of a Territorial Sovereign if its air space is violated. This may be well said of most matters relating to international behaviour. They are to be regulated having due

113

regard to the general principles of law recognised by civilised nations. Article 38 (c) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice lays down that that body will apply among others.. "general principles of law recognised by civilised nations". The conduct of a Territorial Sovereign in all circumstances should also be regulated by his own municipal law, the multilateral conventions to which he is a party as well as Reason, Morality and Humanity. These are well understood and accepted by civilised nations today. The practice of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and other countries in recent years in respect of intruding Aircraft may be examined.

The view held in the United States is that all efforts should be made to have the plane land if it shows determination to cross over national territory. Fighter plane would be under orders to withhold firing until it seems certain that the intruding plane was actually attacking. Such evidence might be the opening of bomb bay doors or the plane's taking a flight attitude indicating a bombing run. The U. S. Government also expects the foreign Government to advise them in advance that in case a U.S. plane strayed into their territory because of mechanical trouble, it would be fired at.

The United States holds that the intruding Aircraft should be given warning, and further, requested or directed to land. Secondly it should be led by the interceptor to an appropriate landing field or such a landing field should be pointed. The intruding Aircraft should be given warning of the intention to fire. To fire, even warning shots, at an unarmed Aircraft in time of peace, wherever such Aircraft may be, is regarded as entirely inadmissible and contrary to all standards of civilised behaviour. The flight of such a plane in no way constitutes a threat to sovereignty.

The United Kingdom regards firing as justified only to compel compliances in the case of an Aircraft which has declined to obey signals requiring it to land at the nearest aerodrome and this also only in cases where such Aircraft has been flying over a "Restricted" area so declared and made known by the Territorial Sovereign beforehand. In all other cases the United Kingdom regards the usual method of protests and enquiry alone as applicable. This is the normal practice of nations in peace time.

The Soviet Union regards the resort to firing as appropriate in cases where foreign Aircraft after penetrating into the air space of the territonal sovereign refuses to land.

Intrusions arising from faulty navigation, it is said, "give no cause whatsoever for confusion with international frontier violations", and such aircraft should not be fired upon.

No right of the territorial sovereign to initiate an attack is admitted in cases of deviation by foreign aircraft of the prescribed corridors.

The Swedish regulations expressly provide that foreign aircraft should be sought to be turned away by warnings, that it should not be fired upon if it changes its course and seeks to fly away. They further provide that if the intruding aircraft commits an act of violence against targets within Swedish territory, it shall be met with force of arms.

Yugoslavia lays down that no unarmed aircraft should be fired upon, even if the intrusion is intentional. If there is non-compliance of instructions given by the territorial sovereign to the intruder to land, the proper procedure, according to Yugoslavia, is to inform the foreign Government concerned and to take action through appropriate channels.

It is clear, therefore, that in cases of intrusions as a result of faulty navigation, intruding planes may not be fired upon at all. In other cam it should be communicated in advance to the foreign country concerned that any intrusion would be met by fire. The exemption of application of this rule, however, in regard to planes straying into territories due to faulty navigation is well accepted.

There are no known regulations or any Pakistan Law, either in regard to civil or military planes, which either justifies, much less prescribes, the conduct to which Pakistan has, in fact, resorted to.

There are some provisions in her law in regard to "prohibited" areas. This is also referred to in the United Kingdom Regulations: "Prohibited" areas in Pakistan are set out in paragraph 7 of "General Information in connection with flights to or within Pakistan by foreign aviators (No. 10 of 1949)." No part of the territory over which the Canberra either flew or is even alleged to have flown is either a prohibited area or anywhere near such area.

Over and above all these considerations, Mr. Speaker, Pakistan, as a Member of the United Nations, has obligations to observe the provisions of the Charter. She has an obligation not to use force except in self-defence as provided in

114

Article 51 against an armed attack. Her conduct, therefore, considered from any point of view, is in disregard of the canons, the principles practices of international behaviour as well as the Charter of the United Nations. It also is in total disregard of the principle of reciprocity in relation to India.

There is another aspect in regard to the conduct of Pakistan which is totally against accepted principles of international behaviour. This is in regard to the treatment to which our men were subjected. They were not prisoners of war but citizens of a friendly and neighbouring country. Even assuming, for argument, that they were prisoners of war or could be treated as such, how far does the conduct of Pakistan conform to the law and the practice on the subject. The Geneva Convention of 1949 which deals with the treatment of prisoners of war in Article 17 sets out that "every prisoner of war, when questioned on the subject, is bound to give only his surname, first names and rank, date of birth, and army, regimental, personal or serial number, or falling this, equivalent information." Thus the only additional information that can be obtained from intruding personnel is what

they may volunteer themselves. In the present case not only did our men not volunteer information, but were subjected to pressures and intimidation to extort information which suited the interrogators. Even then, the Navigator who alone remembers what was said is guite clear on the fact that he informed them that the plane had straved over the skies into Pakistan by faulty navigation. What happened thereafter by way of long interrogation under threat and pressure and the misleading statements and other technique used to extort statements is against the Geneva Convention or international practice. Article 17 again lays down that "no physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind".

"Prisoners of war who, owing to their physical or mental condition, are unable to state their identity, shall be handed over to the medical service. The identity of such prisoners shall be established by all possible means, subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph."

The House may be somewhat concerned if there were any element of truth in the allegations made by Pakistan that the Canberra displayed a "defiant and hostile" attitude. The allegation is Dot only fantastic but totally unrelated to fact. It tells a story which cannot be true of any unarmed aircraft. Wherein is the hostile attitude? She carried no arms and no weapons. Is it suggested that a lone Canberra in broad day-light was on a bombing mission ? What is more, the Pakistanis themselves admit that the Canberra was on a steep climb and was shot. No bomber with hostile intentions would be on a steep climb. Not even Pakistan can believe that Indian Aircraft would fly over their skies with such an intention. It is too ridiculous even to contradict. The allegation is as fantastic as untrue.

In their statement of the 11th of April, Government informed the House of the large number of violations across the cease-fire line in Kashmir. Counter allegations have been made by Pakistan that more numerous violations have been made by us. This is not correct. Apart from the incidents over the cease-fire line attributed to Pakistan or to India to which special considerations apply, such as the presence of the U.N. Observer Corps, Government would like the House to be seized of the fact that the violations by Pakistan of our territory are both frequent and numerous. In the seven-month period between July 1958 and January 1959 the Government of India have protested in writing to Pakistan in regard to 27 instances of such violations giving them all the particulars. Each of these protests has been acknowledged but no further response has been made. In the twomonth period between the 26th January 1959 and the 26th March 1959 there have been further 21 violations in respect of which the Government of India have made written protests to Pakistan. As against this Pakistan has complained and protested to us in regard to three violations of their territory this year. We have investigated them. In two cases our aircraft are not concerned at all and the third refers to civil aircraft straying into their Air space.

The House should also be informed that in respect of the above mentioned violations as many as 3, 4 and 6 Pakistan Fighters have been involved at a time. The intrusions have extended from such border areas as Suleimanki and Husseniwala to distances far into the interior near Meerut.

During the current month several violations of an even more sinister character have taken place. On the 9th of April a Pakistan aircraft penetrated 90 miles into Indian territory. On the 14th a Sabre Jet penetrated into a depth of 100 miles into our territory. On the same day

115

another aircraft, also a Fighter, penetrated 30 miles within our border. Yesterday, the 20th April, a Pakistan Aircraft penetrated some 85 miles into our territory in the neighbouring district of Hissar, not far away from Delhi. Indian Aircraft have not resorted to any hostile action in spite of the provocation in respect of the Canberra.

As reported to the House the Government have already made an oral protest to Pakistan about the Canberra incident. With a due sense of responsibility and having regard to the seriousness of the incident Government have deliberately refrained from making any further communication to Pakistan or taking any other action in regard to this incident until the full facts have been investigated and our Airmen interrogated and Parliament fully informed. Government will take all such steps as are legitimate and open to them according to the practice of civilized nations to secure the cessation of these violations of our territory and to obtain redress for the pre-meditated and wanton attack on our aircraft.

PAKISTAN AUSTRALIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI YUGOSLAVIA ITALY SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Statement in Lok Sabha on Canal Waters

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Union Minister for irrigation and Power, said in the Lok Sabha on April 6, 1959 that discussions had just concluded in Washington on proposals for ad hoc transitional arrangements for continuance of supplies from the three eastern rivers, Sutlej, Beas, and Ravi, to Pakistan for period April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960.

This, the Minister added, was in accordance with the Inter-Dominion Agreement of May 4, 1948, and the principles of the World Bank proposals. Although the Pakistan Government did not enter into an agreement for the period after April 1, 1957, India continued to give supplies to Pakistan.

The draft agreement, now under consideration, the Minister continued, followed broadly the lines of the agreement for Kharif 1956, except that India would get for her use a somewhat larger proportion of the waters hitherto supplied to Pakistan. The Minister was making a statement in the Lok Sabha on a motion, calling attention to the reported interim agreement between India and Pakistan about the use of the Indus river and its main tributaries for irrigation purposes.

Following is the text of the statement:

As the House is aware, the Inter-Dominion Agreement of May 4, 1948 between India and Pakistan provided for the progressive diminution of supplies to Pakistan canals from the eastern rivers in order to give time to Pakistan to tap alternative sources. In pursuance of the agreement Pakistan started the construction of a few link canals to transfer supplies from the western rivers to canals fed by the eastern rivers.

In February 1954, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development put forward a proposal according to which the entire flow of the western rivers (Indus, Jhelum and Chenab), except for the insignificant volume of Jhelum flow presently used in Kashmir, has been allocated to Pakistan and that of the eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas and Sutlej) to India, save that for a specified transition period India would continue to supply the historic withdrawals from these rivers in Pakistan. The proposal also envisaged that during the transition period Pakistan would construct certain other link canals for replacing the supplies received from the eastern rivers.

Three link canals, viz., Bambanwala-Ravi-Bedian-Dipalpur Link, Merala-Ravi Link and Balloki-Suleimanke Link, the construction of which was started in Pakistan after the Inter-Dominion Agreement of May 1948, have since been completed. The withdrawal of waters by India is related to the capacity of these link canals to replace supplies hitherto received from the eastern rivers. For various reasons Pakistan has not been running these canals to full capacity. If so run, the link canals are capable of replacing nearly half of the supplies which the canals in Pakistan have been getting from our rivers. India cannot wait indefinitely and will gradually withdraw more and more supplies as and when more replacement works are built by Pakistan.

In the course of the talks under the aegis of the World Bank, which commenced in 1952, the Governments of India and Pakistan entered into ad hoc transitional arrangements for the supply of water on three occasions: for Kharif 1955, Rabi 1955-56 and for the period from April 1, 1956 to March 31, 1957. Copies of these agreements have already been placed in the Parliament Library. Although the Pakistan Government did not enter into an agreement for the period after April 1, 1957, we continued to give supplies to Pakistan in accordance with the agreement of May 4, 1948, and the principles of the Bank

116

proposal. Discussions have just concluded in Washington on proposals for ad hoc transitional arrangements for the period from April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960. The draft agreement now under consideration follows broadly the lines of the agreement for Kharif 1956, except that we stand to get a somewhat larger proportion of the waters hitherto supplied by us to Pakistan. The indications are that the agreement will be signed in Washington shortly. A copy of the agreement, after it is signed, will be placed in the Parliament Library.

PAKISTAN LATVIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Ad Hoc Agreement on Canal Waters

The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, with the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, have entered into another inter-governmental agreement in connection with the Indus Water discussion.

This inter-governmental agreement makes provision for transitional arrangements for the

period April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960, and. after taking into account Pakistan's ability to transfer water in replacement from the western rivers, establishes agreed amounts for additional withdrawals by India from the three eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas and Sutlej) during the period covered by the agreement.

The agreement was signed in Washington on April 17,1959, on behalf of Pakistan by His Excellency Aziz Ahmed, the Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States of America, and on behalf of India by Mr. N. D. Gulhati, Additional Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Irrigation and Power.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

India's Concern at Supply of U.S. Bombers

India's 'Great Concern' at the supply of jet bombers and jet fighters by the United States of America to Pakistan had been brought to the notice of the U.S. Government on several occasions and in various ways, Prime Minister Nehru told the Rajya Sabha on April 29,1959.

Shri Nehru, who was replying to a question said: "The fact of the U.S. Government supplying jet bombers to Pakistan, as is well-known, has led to considerable feeling concern and resentment in India, which have progressively grown as shown in the recent Canberra incident when one of our planes was shot down by the jet planes. This fact of our great concern has been brought to the notice of the U.S. Government on several occasions in various ways".

The Prime Minister said that the U.S. autho-

rities in reply had repeated their earlier statements that this was no new agreement but only a continuation of the old and that "in fact they have avoided expending it and tried to limit".

Earlier Mrs. Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, told an Hon. Member of the Rajya Sabha that the Government of India had brought it to the notice of the U.S. authorities that their supply of military equipment and aircraft to Pakistan had produced strong adverse reactions in India.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA AUSTRALIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Violation of Cease-fire Agreements

In reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha on April 29, 1959, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said that eleven cease-fire agreements were violated by Pakistan during the years 1957-58 and 1958-59, each agreement several times.

PAKISTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

In a written reply to a question the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said in the Rajya Sabha on April 29, 1959 :

"Pakistan aircraft, in formations of three or four, violated Indian air space in Jammu & Kashmir on January 13, 14. 16 and 17, 1959.

The Prime Minister replied in the affirmative when he was asked by an Hon. Member as to whether the matter was reported to the U.N.

117 Observers Team.

Shri Nehru added: The U.N. Chief Military Observer has held that aircraft did fly as alleged by India in all the four cases but that their identification was impossible. He has, therefore, given an award of 'No Violation' against Pakistan in these cases."

PAKISTAN INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Dalai Lama's entry intoIndia

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Lok Sabha about the Dalai Lama on April 3, 1959. He said :

The other day, three days ago, I think, when I was speaking about recent happenings in Tibet, I mentioned that I would keep the House informed of every fresh development. In the last two days, day before yesterday and yesterday, we have been receiving a number of messages. They were often delayed because they had to come through a rather devious route.

Yesterday I was thinking of informing the House of a certain development, but then I hesitated to do so, because I wanted it to be fully confirmed; I was waiting for some details. We received them last evening. We could have issued this news to the Press last evening, but I thought I should inform the House first and then the Press can have it.

The facts are that on the 1st April, i.e. day before yesterday morning, we received a message via Shillong dated 31st March evening that an emissary with a message from the Dalai Lama had arrived at our border check-post at Chutangmu in the North-East Frontier Agency. He had arrived there on the 29th March stating that the Dalai Lama requested us for political asylum and that he expected to reach the border on the 30th March, i.e. soon after he himself had come. We received the message on the 1st. The same evening, i.e. 1st April evening, a message was received by us again via Shillong dated 1st April that the Dalai Lama with his small party of 8 had crossed into our territory on the evening of the 31st March.

Expecting that some such development might occur, we had instructed the various checkposts round about there what to do in case such a development takes place. So, when he crossed over into our territory, he was received by our Assistant Political Officer of the Tawang subdivision, which is a part of the Kameng Frontier Division of the North-East Frontier Agency. A little later, the rest of his party, the entourage, came in. The total number who have come with him or after him is 80. From the second evening i.e. yesterday, we learn that this party in two groups is moving towards Tawang, which is the headquarters of that sub-division and that he is expected to reach Tawang the day after tomorrow, Sunday, 5th evening.

An Hon. Member: There is a news in the Press that the New China News Agency has published the very same news yesterday. How is it that the Government of India here did not get this confirmation even till the last evening? The Prime Minister himself said that he knew the information when he was making a statement here yesterday, but he could get the confirmation only last evening. May I know whether we are going to give political asylum to the Dalai Lama?

Another Hon. Member: I want a clarification. The Dalai Lama is the temporal and spiritual head of Tibet. Does the asylum confer the same right on him and will he be functioning in the same capacity on the Indian soil ? That is a very serious method.

The Prime Minister : So, far as the Hon. Member's question is concerned, about spiritual rights, etc., I cannot answer it. It is a complicated matter which will have to be considered. But there is no doubt that he will receive respectful treatment.

As for the other question, I myself stated that we knew it day before yesterday evening-in fact, if I may say so I was not here then, but we knew about his having crossed the frontier, but we wanted certain confirmation about details, whether the whole party had crossed over, where they were, etc., before I mentioned it to this House. Yesterday morning, I was not in a position to do so, although I knew that he had crossed the border. In the evening I was, but I wanted to wait for the meeting of the Lok Sabha today to say so, instead of giving the news to the Press.

118

INDIA USA CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Tibet

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Lok Sabha on April 27, 1959 on the situation in Tibet.

Following is the text of his statement:

I have made several statements in the House in regard to the developments in Tibet. The last statement was made on April 3, in which I informed the House that the Dalai Lama had entered the territory of the Indian Union with a large entourage. I should like to bring this information up-to-date and to place such additional facts as we have before the House.

A few days ago, the Dalai Lama, and his party reached Mussoorie, where Government had made arrangements for their stay. I have had occasion to visit Mussoorie since then and have had a long talk with the Dalai Lama.

In the course of the last few days, reports have reached us that considerable numbers of Tibetans, numbering some thousands, have recently crossed into the Kameng Frontier Division of the North-East Frontier Agency and some hundreds have also entered the territory of Bhutan. They sought asylum, and we have agreed to this. Such of them as carried arms were disarmed. We do not know the exact number vet. Temporary arrangements are being made in a Camp for their maintenance until they can be dispersed in accordance with their wishes and necessities governing such cases. We could not leave these refugees to their own resources. Apart from the humanitarian considerations involved, there was also the law and order problem to be considered. We are grateful to the Government of Assam for their help and cooperation in this matter.

So far as the Dalai Lama and his party are concerned, we had to take adequate measures on grounds of security and also to protect them from large numbers of newspaper correspondents both Indian and foreign, who, in their anxiety to obtain first-hand information in regard to a matter of world importance, were likely to harass and almost overwhelm the Dalai Lama and his party. While we were anxious to give protection to the Dalai Lama and his party, we were agreeable to giving these newspapermen suitable opportunities to see him. I had received an appeal from nearly 75 representatives of news agencies and newspapers from Tezpur requesting me to give them such opportunities. A senior officer of the External Affairs Ministry was, therefore, deputed to proceed to Tezpur in advance to deal with the press representatives and photographers who had assembled in that small town of Assam. This officer made the necessary administrative arrangements to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of the newspapermen to see the Dalai Lama and to photograph him. Soon after entering India, the Dalai Lama indicated his wish to make a statement. We were later informed that this statement would be released at Tezpur. Our officer made arrangements for the distribution of a translation of the statement to the newspaper correspondents.

In view of certain irresponsible charges made, I should like to make it clear that the Dalai Lama was entirely responsible for this statement as well as a subsequent briefer statement than was made by him from Mussoorie. Our officers had nothing to do with the drafting or preparation of these statements.

I need not tell the House that the Dalai Lama entered India entirely of his own volition. At no time had we suggested that he should come to India. We had naturally given thought to the possibility of his seeking asylum in India and when such a request came, we readily granted it. His entry with a large party in a remote corner of our country created special problems of transport, organization and security. We deputed an officer to meet the Dalai Lama and his party at Bomdila and to escort them to Mussoorie. The particular officer was selected because he had served as Consul-General in Lhasa and therefore was to some extent known to the Dalai Lama and his officials. The selection of Mussoorie for the Dalai Lama's stay was not finalised till his own wishes were ascertained in the matter and he agreed to it. There was no desire on our part to put any undue restrictions on him, but in the special circumstances, certain arrangements had necessarily to be made to prevent any mishap. It should be remembered that the various events in Tibet, culminating in the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa and entry into India had created tremendous interest among

the people of India and in the world press. After arrival in Mussoorie, steps were taken to prevent the Dalai Lama from being harassed by crowds of people trying to see him as well as by newspapermen. Apart from this, no restrictions about movement were placed on him. He has been told that he and his party can move about Mussoorie according to their wishes. It should be remembered that the Dalai Lama has recently not only had a long strenuous journey, but has

119

also had harrowing experiences which must affect the nerves of even a hardened person. He is only just 24 years of age.

These are some bare facts, but behind these facts lie serious developments which may have far-reaching consequences. Tragedy has been and is being enacted in Tibet, passions have been let loose, charges made and language used which cannot but worsen the situation and our relations with our northern neighbour. I am sure that the House will agree with me that in considering matters of such high import, we should exercise restraint and wisdom and use language which is moderate and precise. In these days of cold war, there has been a tendency to use unrestrained language and often to make wild charges without any justification. We have fortunately kept out of the cold war and I hope that on this as on any other occasion, we shall not use the language of cold war. The matter is too serious to be dealt with in a trivial or excited way. I would, therefore, appeal to the press and the public to exercise restraint in language. I regret that occasionally there have been lapses from this on our side. In particular, I regret that grave discourtesy was shown some days ago to a picture of the head of the Chinese State, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. This was done by a small group of irresponsible people in Bombay. In the excitement of the moment, we cannot allow ourselves to be swept away into wrong courses.

It is not for me to make any similar appeal to the leaders, the press and the people of China. All I can say is that I have been greatly distressed at the tone of the comments and the charges made against India by responsible people in China. They have used the language of cold war regardless of truth and propriety. This is peculiarly distressing in a great nation with thousands of years of culture behind it, noted for its restrained and polite behaviour. The charges made against India are so fantastic that I find it difficult to deal with them. There is the charge of our keeping the Dalai Lama under duress. The Chinese authorities should surely know how we function in this country and what our laws and Constitution are. Even if we were so inclined, we could not keep the Dalai Lama under some kind of detention against his will, and there can be no question of our wishing to do so. We can gain nothing by it except the burden of difficult problems. In any event, this matter can be easily cleared. It is open to the Dalai Lama at any time to go back to Tibet or wherever he wants to. As the Panchen Lama has made himself responsible specially for some strange statements. I have stated that we would welcome him to come to India and meet the Dalai Lama himself. Should he choose to do so, every courtesy will be extended to him. I have further said that the Chinese Ambassador or any other emissary of the Chinese Government can come to India for this purpose and meet the Dalai Lama. There is no barrier for anyone to come peacefully to India, and whether we agree with him or not, we shall treat him with courtesy due to a guest.

Another and an even stranger allegation has been made about "Indian expansionists" who, it is alleged, are inheriters of the British tradition of imperialism and expansion. It is perfectly true that British policy was one of expansion into Tibet and that they carried this out by force of arms early in this country. That was, in our opinion, an unjustified and cruel adventure which brought much harm to the Tibetans. As a result of that, the then British Government in India established certain extra territorial rights in Tibet. When India became independent, we inherited some of these rights. Being entirely opposed to any such extra territorial rights in another country, we did not wish to retain them. But in the early days after Independence and partition, our hands were full, as this House well knows, and we had to face very difficult situations in our own country. We ignored, if I may say so, Tibet. Not being able to find a suitable person to act as our representative at Lhasa, we allowed for some time the existing British representative to continue at Lhasa. Later an Indian took his place. Soon after the Chinese armies entered Tibet, the question of these extra territorial rights was raised and we readily agreed to give them up. We would have

given them up anyhow, whatever developments might have taken place in Tibet. We withdrew our army detachments from some places in Tibet and handed over Indian postal and telegraph installations and rest houses. We laid down the Five Principles of the Panchsheel and placed our relationship with the Tibet region on a new footing. What we were anxious about was to preserve the traditional connections between India and Tibet in regard to pilgrim traffic and trade. Our action in this matter and whatever we have done subsequently in regard to Tibet is proof enough of our policy and that India had no political or ulterior ambitions in Tibet. Indeed, even from the narrowest practical point of view, any other policy would have been wrong and futile. Ever since then we have endeavoured not only to act up to the agreement we made, but to cultivate the friendship of the Chinese State and people.

It is therefore a matter of the deepest regret and surprise to us that charges should be made which are both unbecoming and entirely void of substance. We have conveyed this deep feeling

120

of regret to the Chinese Government, more especially at the speeches delivered recently in the current session of the National People's Congress in Peking.

I stated some time ago that our broad policy was governed by three factors; (1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow, because we think that a correct policy not only for the present but even more so for the future. it would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The Five Principles have laid down, inter alia, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used.

I have already made it clear previously that the charge that Kalimpong was a centre of the Tibetan rebellion, is wholly unjustified. We have a large number of people of Tibetan stock living in India as Indian nationals. We have also some Tibetan emigres in India. All of these deeply respect the Dalai Lama. Some of these have been exceedingly unhappy at developments in Tibet ; some no doubt have anti-Chinese sentiments. We have made it clear to them that they will not be permitted to carry on any subversive activities from India and I should like to say that by and large they have acted in accordance with the directions of the Government of India. I cannot obviously say that someone has not done something secretly, but to imagine or say that a small group of persons sitting in Kalimpong organised a major upheaval in Tibet seems to me to make a large draft on imagination and to slur over obvious facts.

The Khampa revolt started in an area of China proper adjoining Tibet, more than three years ago. Is Kalimpong supposed to be responsible for that ? This revolt gradually spread and no doubt created a powerful impression on the minds of large numbers of Tibetans, who had kept away from the revolt. Fears and apprehensions about their future gripped their minds and the nationalist upsurge swayed their feelings. Their fears may have been unjustified, but surely they cannot be denied. Such feelings can only be dealt with adequately by gentler methods than warfare.

When Premier Chou En-lai came here two or three years ago, he was good enough to discuss Tibet with me at considerable length. We had a frank and full talk. He told me that while Tibet had long been a part of the Chinese State, they did not consider Tibet as a province of China. The people were different from the people of China proper, just as in other autonomous regions of the Chinese State the people were different, even though they formed part of that State. Therefore, they considered Tibet an autonomous region which would enjoy autonomy. He told me further that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force Communism on Tibet. Communism could not be enforced in this way on a very backward country and they had no wish to do so even though they would like reforms to come in progressively. Even these reforms they

proposed to postpone for a considerable time.

About that time, the Dalai Lama was also here and I had long talks with him then. I told him of Premier Chou En-lai's friendly approach and of his assurance that he would respect the autonomy of Tibet. I suggested to him that be should accept these assurances in good faith and co-operate in maintaining that autonomy and bringing about certain reforms in Tibet. The Dalai lama agreed that his country, though, according to him, advanced spiritually, was very backward socially and economically and reforms were needed.

It is not for us to say how far these friendly intentions and approaches materialised. The circumstances were undoubtedly difficult. On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society ; on the other, a static, unchanging society fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reforms. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile changes in some forms inevitable came to Tibet. Communications developed rapidly and the long isolation of Tibet was partly broken through. Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased. Apparently, the attempt to cross these mental and emotional barriers was either not made or did not succeed.

To say that a number of "upper strata reactionaries" in Tibet were solely responsible for this appears to be an extraordinary simplification of a complicated situation. Even according to the accounts received through Chinese sources, the revolt in Tibet was of considerable magnitude and the basis of it must have been a strong feeling of

121

nationalism which affects not only Upper class people but others also. No doubt, vested interests joined it and sought to profit by it. The attempt to explain a situation by the use of rather wornout words, phrases and slogans, is seldom helpful.

When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction, nor was this reaction essentially political. It as largely one of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons. Also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long-established religious and cultural contacts. It was an instinctive reaction. It is true that some people in India sought to profit by it by turning it in an undesirable direction. But the fact of that reaction of the Indian people was there. If that was the reaction here, one may well imagine the reaction among the Tibetans themselves. Probably this reaction is shared in the other Buddhist countries of Asia. When there are such strong feelings, which are essentially not political, they cannot be dealt with by political methods alone, much less by military methods. We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet ; we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China ; but at the same time we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their helpless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly co-operation in accordance with the assurance they have themselves given about the autonomy of the Tibet region. Above all, we hope that the present fighting and killing will cease.

As I have said above, I had a long talk with the Dalai Lama three days ago at Mussoorie. He told me of the difficulties he had to face, of the growing resentment of his people at the conditions existing there and how he sought to restrain them, of his feelings that the religion of the Buddha, which was more to him than life itself, was being endangered. He said that up to the last moment he did not wish to leave Lhasa. It was only on the afternoon of the 17th March, when, according to him, some shells were fired at his palace and fell in a pond nearby, that the sudden decision was taken to leave Lhasa. Within a few hours the same day he and his party left Lhasa and took the perilous journey to the Indian frontier. The departure was so hurried that even an adequate supply of clothes etc. could not be brought. When I met the Dalai Lama, no member of his entourage was present. Even the interpreter was our own. The Dalai Lama told me that the two statements which had been issued were entirely his own and there was no question of anybody coercing him to make them. Even though he is young, I could not easily imagine that he could be coerced into doing something he did not wish. All my sympathy goes out to this young man who at an early age has had to shoulder heavy burdens and to face tremendous responsibilities. During the last few weeks he has suffered great physical and mental strain. I advised him to rest for a while and not to take any hurried decisions. He felt very unhappy at conditions in Tibet and was especially anxious that fighting should stop.

122

USA INDIA BHUTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Governing Council of U.N. Special Fund

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund on May 27, 1959

Mr. Chairman :

We now come to what might be regarded as the most important subject before us, namely the consideration of the projects recommended by the Managing Director, the documentation in respect of which is contained in L/12 and several addenda. These in themselves are an eloquent testimony to the sincerity of purpose, vigour, initiative and dynamism which the Managing Director, assist. ed by his able lieutenants, has brought to bear within a brief period of four months. We have before us a large number of projects covering different geographical areas on which we have to take decision. This is a proof of the happy cooperation and rapport which have been established between the Managing Director and his staff and the Secretariat of the UN, Specialised Agencies, and the Governments concerned. This indeed augurs very well for the future of the Fund. My delegation wishes too pay a tribute to the

Managing Director, Mr. Lewis, and his other assistants for the excellent start they have given the Fund.

That the Managing Director within a space of a few months has received 75 requests covering a total expenditure of over 80 million dollarsand I believe further additional requests have been received since-is a sign of the tremendous interest and expectation created among nations by the Special Fund. Indeed, this is a vindication of the establishment of the Fund and justification for the prolonged discussions preceding it. The persistence of many delegations, including our own, which at times may have jarred on certain ears, was, it seems to me, amply justified and wellrewarded.

It is reasonable to hope and expect that this interest should be matched by the volume of contributions. However, this is not the case at present. The total pledges, as the Managing Director told us, made by various countries amount to a little over fourteen million dollarsand the actual payments received so far have not exceeded two and a half million. It can, therefore, be said that this is far short of the expected 100 million entertained at the time of the adoption of the resolution by the General Assembly. Even that amount would have been a trickle compared to the vast and urgent needs of the under-developed areas laid down by the General Assembly resolution as appropriate for the activities of the Fund. It is obvious that the countries which are in the fortunate position of being "haves" need to be more generous in their contributions. We hope that these will be forthcoming in increasing amounts.

There is, however, it seems to me, a concurrent responsibility on the Special Fund to stimulate such response by the wisdom and objectivity of its decisions, by laying down sound principles governing the relationship, the nature, extent and scope of the executing agencies, the proper selection of projects and allocation of funds, therefore, as between the Special Fund and Governments, etc. We believe that the Special Fund should not be a mere repetition or a projection or an extension of the Technical Assistance Board. What we should aim at and this is something which my delegation has repeated in the past, and would like to say again, should be the establishment of a comprehensive and large capital fund through the UN, and we regard the Special Fund as an interim and successful attempt in that direction. We would like the Special Fund to prove itself as an appropriate and successful stage in the journey towards the establishment of a capital fund dispensed by the UN. That is why this first substantial meeting of the Council has a special importance. We have really to lay sound foundations for the future. We have to prove by our decisions, by our actions, by the results shown in different countries that the Fund deserves substantial support, much more substantial than hitherto, from governments and also from private contributors, if they should be forthcoming.

Having said this, perhaps you will permit me to make some general comments-and I would like to make it clear that we do so not with an intention to criticise but with the object of hoping in the realisation of the objectives of the Fund. Because of the slenderness of our resources, the expenditure should be incurred on projects which produce the maximum results, are fairly evenly geographically distributed and conform to what General Assembly itself has stated, which is that the urgency of the requirements should be an important consideration. These principles have to be borne in mind. The Managing Director has himself in his very

123

able statement at the last session given the types of projects on which expenditure should be incurred, and here I would like to read out the relevant portion :

"We do not believe that the Fund should be called upon to defray expenditures which are a normal part of a Government's budget. In order to prevent this diversion of our resources we might in the formative period of our work be guided by the following general rules :

(a) We would prefer to limit the Fund to financing projects for which there is a definite terminal point to the Fund's commitments, an agreed point at which either Governments or other agencies would take over. In other words, the fund would not embark on projects. which would commit its resources for an indefinite period;

(b) We would make subventions to operating expenditures only in respect of new or experimental programmes. Any project which merely extends a programme which already exists in one part of a country to other parts, should be met from the Government's budget ;

(c) Our annual subventions to operating expenditures would, therefore, not be large and should not normally be carried beyond a maximum period of, say, five years."

These are very sound principles, and it will be recalled that at the last session we gave our general approval to the statement of the Managing Director. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should bear in mind these principles. We should aim at incurring expenditure from the Fund which should be self-generating in its nature, scope and development, that is to say, the slender resources that we have should be spent over projects in the different fields which have been laid down by us and which may be decided later and which will really bring about a snowball effect by stimulating further development in different fields. The Fund should be careful not to adopt any particular project or types of projects in specific countries and extend its sources on recurring assistance or subventions of a nature which should be the day to day operation expenditure by governments concerned and which should be their responsibility. Where an education or technical or vocational institution has been helped or is proposed to be helped by the Fund-and it would be quite justified to set it on its foot-the Fund should ensure that particular training institutions or types of institutions in a particular country are not too frequently assisted because that would be rather contrary to the purpose of the Fund, and to what I have just emphasised, the selfgenerating power of the assistance that we render in the various fields.

I should also like to point out that in many under-developed countries which are in a somewhat higher stage of development than others, research institutions are equally, if not more, important, than training institutions. Successful research in the context of local conditions might open up possibilities of development and investment from outside. I mention this with reference to my own country which is advancing fairly rapidly on the road from an underdeveloped to a developed or semideveloped country. Indeed, that is the reason why in the projects submitted by my Government the Managing Director has not been able to accept them, because of the slenderness of the resources and other reasons-there are certain projects of a very important nature, the establishment of certain research institutions, which will no doubt receive due consideration by him.

I would like to confess in connection with these projects to our feeling that perhaps the expenditure on what we might call the nonsubstantive aspects of the projects is rather high. For example, in Doc. SF/L/12 add. 16, the executing agency costs range from 12.7% to a figure as low as 0-we might omit that and take the minimum at 2.5%-the average being 8.6%. Add to this 15% which has been asked by the Managing Director on contingencies, which in the course of the discussion, subject to certain comments that have been made, we have agreed to; and there are other additions which have also been requested by some Specialized Agencies and agreed to by the Managing Director. I refer in this connection to para 2 of SF/L/16. Apart from this we also find in para 19 of L/12-

"Also to be allocated to each project are the identifiable costs of the Managing Director's office, of which the most important are the cost of sending consultants to evaluate a project request, before deciding whether to recommend the project to the Council, and the cost of sending Special Fund staff to inspect the project during its operation."

I refer to these because it gives us the feeling that the non-substantive aspects of the costs involved in these projects are high. If I understand

124

para 19 of Doc. L/12 correctly, there may be further additions to the estimates regarding the agency. This is a matter which I do not want to emphasise too much. I am sure the Managing Director has already in mind these aspects. What we would like, however, is an accurate estimate of the costs of the different projects. We feel also that the executive agency costs plus contingencies which might form about 22 to 23 per cent of the total costs is rather high. We hope that these amounts will be substantially reduced, especially, as I am going to suggest a little later, if we are to change our conception slightly as to the manner of execution of these projects.

In all these projects, there has been a mention of the executive agency. In the draft agreement with governments, there is a paragraph which says-

1. The Parties hereby agree that each project shall be executed by an Executing Agency to which the sums referred to in Article I above shall be disbursed by agreement between the Special Fund and such Executing Agency.

2. The government agrees that an Executing Agency, in carrying out a project, shall have the status, vis-a-vis the Special Fund, of an independent contractor. Accordingly, the Special Fund shall not be liable for the acts or omissions of the Executing Agency or of persons performing services on its behalf. The Executing Agency shall not be liable for the acts or omissions of the Special Fund on of persons performing services on behalf of the Special Fund.

3. Any agreement between the Government and an Executing Agency concerning the execution of a Special Fund project shall be subject to the provisions of this Agreement and shall require the prior concurrence of the Managing Director.

4. Any equipment, materials, supplies and other property belonging to the Special Fund or an Executing Agency which may be utilised or provided by either or both in the execution of a project shall remain their property unless and until such time as title thereto may be transferred to the Government on terms and conditions mutually agreed upon between the Government and the Special Fund or the Executing Agency concerned.

Also for each project an executing agency has been designated. Now, while we are in accord with the views that many of these projects have to be executed by outside agencies, specialized agencies of UN, etc., and other agencies it seems to us that there is a slight over-emphasis on the execution of these projects by other than governments. We have to be careful not to give the impression. that the Special Fund is just a kind of managing agency which sends out a private firm or another agency to do a certain work there, calls upon the government to give subsidiary aid. That would be an unfortunate impression to create. We should like projects to be aimed at stimulating public enthusiasm and also provide a kind of training to governments in the execution of such projects. So far as our own country is concerned which is regarded as an under-developed country, we have statutory executive agencies-the Central Water & Power Commission for power projects, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research for Technical research, etc. Normally these should be the executing agencies. Likewise in other countries there may be similar national agencies which are used to executing certain types of work. Of course the participation of outside agencies is not barred, but that should be by agreement with the governments concerned.

There is another point about the executing agency ; if we employ a government agency, the cost is likely to be less. In this way we might make the slender resources of the Fund go much farther. In this connection I would like to refer to para 39/40 of General Assembly Resolution 1240 where the words used are "whenever possible".

"39. Projects shall be executed, whenever possible, by the United Nations, by the specialized agencies concerned, or by the International Atomic Energy Agency it being understood that the Managing Director shall also be authorized to contract for the services of other agencies, private firms or individual experts in the cases mentioned in paragraph 34 above."

Now, there is no obligation on the Fund that all projects should be executed through the various bodies which have been mentioned in Article 39. The emphasis should be that the Agencies should be utilised to the maximum extent. It is for the Managing Director to decide on all these matters which can be discussed and decided in consultation and negotiation with governments. We feel that where the project is of a type for which there already exists an adequate or near adequate machinery for execution in the country, the government concerned should be the executing agency with the assistance of the Special Fund and specialized agencies, provision of experts, etc.

125

Before I conclude my remarks I should like to make some observations on the draft agreement between the Special Fund and governments. There are many features of the draft agreement which are not agreeable to us. In the first place, I would say that the provision which strikes one as rather odd is the proposal for extension of diplomatic and other privileges of the same nature, to the personnel of private firms working in connection with the projects. Most governments I am sure will hesitate to go as far as that. As regards the Government of India their view is that, that would be a provision which it would be difficult to accept. These privileges can be extended only to the personnel of the United Nations and specialized agencies and not to others.

The agreement in its present form, we apprehend, would cause a lot of difficulties, and our suggestion would be that we should not be in a hurry to frame any kind of a model agreement. We should leave over this matter to be discussed at a further session of the Council after we have had more experience, after governments have thought over it, and after the Managing Director, in consultation with various governments will enter into negotiation and submit a report to us on the broad aspects which are not at present agreeable to us-and many other governmentsthis matter can be decided. It will be enough for our purpose to authorise the Managing Director to enter into agreements with governments in respect of whose projects are approved, bearing in mind the comments that are made by the members of the Council and keeping in view the agreements entered into by the United Nations Technical Assistance Board with governments. Naturally, the agreements will not be in the same form with each government.

These are the observations I wish to make now and if there be occasion in the future, I hope you will grant me indulgence to speak again.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIETNAM

Interim Report

The Ministry of External Affiairs, Government of India, issued on May 13, 1959 the following summary of the 9th Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam :

The report is a brief survey of the activities of the Commission from May 1958 to January 31, 1959 and a review of the progress made by the parties concerned in the implementation of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam.

During the 8-month period under review, the Commission had 39 meetings and sent out 6 mobile teams for investigation, reconnaissance and control. The Commission's headquarters were transferred from Hanoi to Saigon in April 1, 1958.

The Commission received from the Cambodian Commission the report of the ad hoc investigation team on the Stung Treng border violation and certain fresh complaints of border trouble notified by the Government of Cambodia. The report and the further complaints were forwarded to the Government of Vietnam with the suggestion that border problems may be settled by negotiations between the two Governments.

The Commission has, under consideration, the request of the Cambodian Government to take charge of 90 escapees into Cambodia from South Vietnam who wish to go to North Vietnam.

The position regarding the administration of

the Demilitarized Zone between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of Vietnam has shown no improvement. The Commission's team reported several instances of persons entering the Southern part of the Zone with the permits issued by the Chief of the Ouang Tri Province. In many of these cases the Commission has declared that there was a violation by the Republic of Vietnam of article 7 of the Geneva Agreement. The Commission received 49 complaints from the PAVN High Command and 14 complaints from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, each party charging the other with violation of the Demilitarized Zone and acts of provocation. Some of these cases are still under inquiry while others have been closed after explanations were received from the parties concerned.

On April 15, 1958 the French Mission was withdrawn from the Joint Commission established under article 30 of the Geneva Agreement for purposes of joint action by the two parties. The Government or the Republic of Vietnam informed

126

the Commission that, not being a signatory to the Geneva Agreement it could not take part in the activities of the Joint Commission. The Commission drew the attention of both the parties to this situation and emphasised that prompt action by the parties through the Joint Commission to settle complaints of alleged violation of articles 7, 8 and 9 is of great importance for the preservation of a Demilitarized Zone created to act as a buffer and to prevent any incidents which might lead to resumption of hostilities. The Commission also stated that it would report to the Co-Chairmen the situation arising from the attitude of the Republic of Vietnam for such action as may be considered necessary. A special mobile team maintained by the Commission continued to perform, as far as possible, the duties of supervision and control in the Zone. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has in spite of the request from the Commission failed to provide telephone communications between this mobile team and Hien Nuong Bridge. The Commission has informed them that this failure constituted lack of co-operation under article 23 of the Agreement.

The question of solving the problem of border raids with the assistance of Red Cross Societies of the two sides is being pursued by the Secretary General. Some fresh complaints were received on this subject from the PAVN High Command particularly in respect of the proposal by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to transfer to another location the cemetery at Qui Nhon. The reply of the Government of Republic of Vietnam to these complaints is under consideration.

The Government of the Republic of Vietnam persisted in its uncooperative attitude in regard to supervision by the Commission of the implementation of article 14 (c) under which the parties had undertaken to refrain from any reprisals against persons or organisations on account of their activities during the hostilities. They have neither replied to the complaints forwarded to them nor permitted the Commission's mobile teams to investigate these complaints. The Commission stated that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam had not observed article 25 of the Geneva Agreement.

64 fresh complaints under article 14 (c) received from the PAVN High Command between October 1957 and August 1958 were forwarded to the Republic of Vietnam for comments. The Commission decided to review the situation after four months. Two complaints were subsequently received, one alleging food poisoning and shouting of persons in Phu Loi Concentration Camp and the other alleging arrest and torture of Miss Tran Ly. communications were received from the South Vietnam Government denying these allegations. These communications are under consideration.

During the period under review the Commission received 41 complaints from the PAVN High Command against the Republic of Vietnam but none from the Republic of Vietnam against the PAVN under article 14(c).

No progress was made during the period under review regarding the settlement of cases under article 14(c) and article 14(d) reported in the 8th and 7th Interim Reports.

The Commission scrutinized several cases of violation under article 21 dealing with prisoners of war and civilian internees.

The Secretary-General continued to explore the possibility of having requests for search for

missing prisoners of war and civilian internees dealt with by the Red Cross Societies of the two Zones without prejudice to the duties of the Commission in this regard. Information continued to he exchanged by the parties through the Commission.

The PAVN High Command did not agree to the continuous control at the Phuc Hoa but a mobile element of the Dong Dang fixed team visited Phuc Hoa frequently. In August 1958, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam agreed to daily control of the Nha Be harbour.

South Vietnam authorities reported the construction of a new airfield to replace the former airfield at Ban Me Thuot. The Commission has decided to carry out the necessary reconnaissance of the new airfield.

On receipt of the complaint from the PAVN High Command that the Quang Ngai airfield in South Vietnam was being repaired and enlarged, the Commission has requested the Republic of Vietnam to arrange for a team of Air Advisers to reconnoitre this airfield.

The Commission is also awaiting a reply of the South Vietnam Government on the suggestion that Air Advisers should reconnoitre seven other airfields in South Vietnam. Concurrence of the PAVN High Command has been received for the reconnaissance by the Commission of the Lai Chau Nam Coum Road. Concurrence is awaited for the reconnaissance of the off-shore islands. The Commission has also told the PAVN High Command that it wished to send a team of Air Advisers to reconnoitre the Bach Mai airfield.

127

The PAVN High Command has stated that at present the airfield is being used as barracks but they would advise the Commission if it is reconverted into an airfield. The Air Advisers' team visited South Vietnam's Bien Hoa airfield and the Vietnam Government has been asked to furnish all the documents required by the team.

The Commission was unable to exercise control and supervision in terms of article 36(d) at several places through mobile teams as the Government of the Republic of Vietnam placed various restrictions on them. The Commission has informed the Republic of Vietnam that it would report the matter to the members of the Geneva Conference (as required by article 43).

Regarding the complaint of the PAVN concerning the presence as observers of representatives of the Republic of Vietnam at the SEATO Conference at Manila in March 1958, the Republic of Vietnam affirmed that they did not send any representative to this Conference. Four other complaints have been received by the Commission from the PAVN alleging the presence of representatives of South Vietnam at a conference and at the military and naval manoeuvres of the SEATO during 1957-58.

The Commission has informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that the TERM (Temporary Equipment Recovery Mission) should be able to complete its work by June, 1959 and should leave South Vietnam thereafter.

The Commission recorded procedural contravention by the Republic of Vietnam in several cases under article 16 (f) and article 17 (e) requiring that prior intimation should be given by the Commission in respect of the arrivals or departures of military personnel or war material. These cases related to an earlier period. During the period under review further notifications under these articles were received from the PAVN High Command. The PAVN High Command has also alleged increase in the strength of American military personnel in South Vietnam. The Commission examined the team reports for the period from 7th June 1956 to 28th December 1957. On the basis of available information, it was seen that 2002 American military personnel arrived in South Vietnam and 1243 left the country. Thus arrivals exceeded departures by 759. The Republic of South Vietnam has agreed to look into these figures. As explained in the 8th Interim Report, the Commission has been receiving claims from the Republic of Vietnam for credit for the replacement of war material under article 17 (b) and also of the war material exported by the French High Command from the cease-fire upto June 20, 1956. The Commission has worked out and accepted the principles and procedures under which such claims are to be granted, (the Polish Commission dissenting). The PAVN High Command has stated that this decision of the Commission was contrary to the spirit and letter of the Geneva Agreement. The Democratic Republic

of Vietnam also represented their view to the Co-Chairmen. No reply has been received from the Co-Chairmen to these communications. The Commission has pointed out to the DRVN that there was no provision in the Agreement for appeal against any decision of the Commission.

Some of the Commission's teams in North Vietnam could not go out on their mandatory control duties on Sundays and holidays as the PAVN did not make the necessary arrangements. The Commission expressed its concern over these difficulties. Similar difficulties were experienced by some of the teams of the Commission in South Vietnam also.

There has been no major incident in the Demilitarized Zone and no outbreak of hostilities from either side. The Commission has, however, invited attention to the fact that the preservation of the demilitarized character of the buffer zone may well be jeopardized in the absence of the Joint Commission or any other machinery for joint supervision of the Zone by the two parties. The Commission has preserved in its efforts to maintain peace in Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva Agreement.

There have been no consultations between the two parties with a view to holding free nationwide elections for the re-unification of Vietnam as envisaged in the Agreement. This has maintained the prospect of indefinite continuance of the Commission and its activities. The Commission has expressed the hope that this problem is engaging the attention of the Co-Chairmen and of the Geneva Powers.

The parties have persisted in giving their own interpretations which sometimes differ from those of the Commission on some of the provisions of the Agreement. In spite of such difficulties (which the Commission has requested the Co-Chairmen to resolve) the Commission has continued to exercise some measure of supervision and control of the execution by the parties of the Geneva Agreement.

128

VIETNAM INDIA SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PHILIPPINES **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

IRAQ

Trade Agreement Ratified

Letters were exchanged between the Governments of India and Iraq in Baghdad on May 18, 1959 ratifying the trade agreement between the two Governments signed on December 29, 1958. The agreement will be valid for a period of one year.

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 manufactures, light engineering products, plastic goods, pharmaceuticals and chemicals.

IRAQ INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Shri Morarji Desai's Statement on Pakistan's Partition Debt to India

The Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on May 7,1959 in response to notice by several Members of the House calling attention to the reported claim by a spokesman of the Pakistan Finance Ministry that India owes Pakistan Rs. 180 crores on account of partition debt.

Following is the text of his statement

With your permission, Sit, I propose to make a. short statement on the partition debt of Pakistan to India, about which I answered a question in this House on the 21st of last month and in the Rajya Sabha on the 28th, with reference to certain comments which have appeared in the Press as from a spokesman of the Pakistan Government and which give a misleading impression.

The House will remember that on the 5th September, 1957, Shri T.T. Krishnamachari made a statement on behalf of Government on the financial issues between the two countries and dealt at some length with the various outstanding items. Nothing has since happened necessitating a change in any of the facts or figures given by him.

In regard to the partition debt, it has been suggested that there is no basis for the figure of Rs. 300 crores mentioned by us and that the question of payment arose only after the debt had been determined. In regard to the size of the debt, there is nothing new about the figure of Rs. 300 crores. It was an estimate made as far back as 1948 and has been repeated as such many times. As pointed out by Shri Krishnamachari in his statement, it gave only the order of the sum involved. In our view, it may be actually somewhat higher. But I was surprised to see the statement from the Pakistan Government that this figure of Rs. 300 crores had no basis. I understand that, as far back as 1952, broad details of a balance sheet, which gave a higher figure of the debt, were supplied to the officers of the Pakistan

Government by our officers. There was some correspondence about some of the figures furnished by us but, eventually, this correspondence, like correspondence on many other matters, petered out. In view of this, it is hardly correct to say that there was no basis for this figure.

It is difficult to understand the argument that payments fell due only after the debt is determined. On this pretext, no payment need ever be made simply by refusing to accept any figure as the correct figure of the debt. While the final figure would take some time to work out, the broad dimension of the sum involved is, in our view, quite clear and could easily be settled. We have already seven annual instalments overdue under the partition arrangements and the eighth instalment will fall due next August. When claims are made for other payments as due here and now, the fact that India has already overdue to

129

her a large sum on account of the partition debt cannot be brushed aside on the spacious ground that the debt has not been worked out.

I was equally surprised to see the statement that a sum of Rs 180 crores was due to be paid to Pakistan. We do not have any details of this claim. So far as we know, the highest figure mentioned so far has been about Rs. 100 crores. This was a figure which was communicated to us in a letter from the late Mr. Ghulam Mohammed in 1950. This included the sum of Rs. 49 crores on account of currency assets which was specifically mentioned in Shri Krishnamachari's statement also. The balance related to a number of miscellaneous items the exact figure in regard to which still remains to be determined. A figure of Rs. 100 crores was also mentioned in the Pakistan National Assembly by the Pakistan-Finance Minister on the 28th. August, 1957. The figure now put out is much higher but, as I said, we have no details.

I have mentioned certain figures on both sides. But it is obvious that they only give the broad dimensions of the picture and that the various claims and counter-claims will have to be discussed and accepted before a settlement is reached. For some years, we have tried to work out the figures and reach a settlement at official level but, in view of the large sums involved and the peculiar problems which some of the issues pose, it has not been possible to do so. The major issues have, therefore, to be settled at Government level. My predecessor had invited the Finance Minister of Pakistan for a discussion, but for a variety of reasons, it has not been possible to hold a meeting. It is my intention to renew the invitation and I hope it will be possible to hold an early meeting, discuss all the outstanding items and claims on both sides and reach a solution fair to both the countries. Meanwhile, I venture to suggest that there is no reason to get unduly concerned by the mention of an odd figure or an individual claim, whether in the Press or elsewhere.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Shooting Down of IAF Canberra

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on May 6, 1959 on the shooting down of an I.A.F. Canberra near Rawalpindi by the Pakistan Air Force on April 10, 1959. She made this statement in reply to a question by an Hon. Member of the House and said that the shooting down of the Canberra was "in flagrant violation of all norms of international behaviour as also a deliberate breach of reciprocity of relations in this regard between Pakistan and India."

Following is the text of the statement :

In a note dated 11th April, 1959, the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi alleged violations of Pakistan air space by Indian Air Force Canberra bombers at 0730 hours and 0930 hours respectively on the 10th April. In regard to the first allegation it was stated that Pakistan Air Force interceptors approached "a twin engined jet aircraft" while it was heading for Rawalpindi, and later instructed the pilot to accompany them and land ; that the aircraft ignored these instructions and "manoeuvred as if about to indulge in hostility against the interceptors" ; that one of the interceptors fired a warning burst of tracer bullets, but that the aircraft still continued manoeuvring in a hostile manner ; and that in the action that followed the aircraft was shot down and that from the wreckage it had been identified as an I.A.F. Canberra bomber.

In a note sent to the Pakistan Government by the Indian High Commission in Karachi on April 30, the Government of India have lodged an emphatic protest against the hostile act of the Pakistani authorities in shooting down an unarmed Canberra aircraft of the Indian Air Force which had strayed into Pakistan territory by navigational error on the 10th April, and in circumstances which prove conclusively that the act was planned and pre-meditated. In this note full details were given of the circumstances attending the incident proving beyond any doubt that no warning was given to the aircraft before it was shot down ; that this unarmed aircraft could not by any stretch of imagination be said to have taken any hostile action against the Pakistani interceptors ; that the Pakistan authorities were in no doubt at the time of shooting down that the aircraft belonged to the Indian Air Force ; and that the alleged confessions by the Indian airmen were fabricated so as to mislead public opinion both at home and abroad

It was also pointed out that Pakistan's action was in flagrant violation of all norms of international behaviour as also a deliberate breach of reciprocity of relations in this regard between Pakistan and India.

The Government of India have pointed out that this hostile act has done incalculable harm to good neighbourly relations between India and

130

Pakistan and have pressed upon the Government of Pakistan the urgency of taking immediately all remedial measures necessary to undo the harm done, to express their regret for this act of grievous injury and to agree to Me payment of full compensation for the loss of the aircraft and for the injuries sustained by the Indian airmen.

The Government of Pakistan were also informed that their allegation about a second I.A.F. Canberra aircraft has been thoroughly investigated and found to be utterly groundless.

PAKISTAN AUSTRALIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Incursions into Jammu and Kashmir

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Lok Sabha on May 8, 1959 on the incursions into Jammu and Kashmir by armed personnel from Pakistan or Pakistan occupied Kashmir during 1958-59.

The Prime Minister made this statement in reply to a question by several Hon. Members of the Lok Sabha. The statement, which was laid on the table of the House, says :

(a) (b) (c) (d)

Number of incursions by armed personnel Number of Loss of No. of cases U.N. Chief Military from Pakistan or persons Property reported to Observer's award Pakistan occupied killed U.N. Observers Kashmir 1958 35 1 Nil 35 4 awards of Violation against

Pakistan.

| | 1 award of | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------|-------------|--|
| Violation against and India. | | Pakistan | | | |
| | | 30 awards of No | | | |
| Violation | | • | | | |
| Pakistan. | | | agair | ist | |
| 1959 (upto | | | | | |
| April 15, '59) 18 Violation | 1 | Nil | 18 | 3 awards of | |
| Pakistan. | | against | | | |
| | | 15 awards of No against | | | |
| Violation | | | | | |
| Pakistan. | | | C | | |

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged on May 25, 1959 between Shri K. B. Lal, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. Tu Yu-yun, Counsellor for Commercial Affairs in the Embassy of People's Republic of China in New Delhi, extending till the end of 1959 the validity of the Trade Agreement between India and China concluded in 1954.

The total trade between the two countries in 1957 and 1958 amounted to Rs. 8.6 and Rs. 8.7

crores respectively. In 1957, imports amounted to Rs. 4.9 crores against exports of Rs. 3.7 crores. Imports during 1958 amounted to Rs. 5.3 crores against exports of 3.4 crores. The main items of

131

imports from China are newsprint, chemicals, steel, cassia and raw silk. Important among the Indian exports to China are tobacco, raw cotton, shellac and jute manufactures.

CHINA USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL COOPERATION MISSION

Financial Assistance

Uttar Pradesh will have an agricultural university on the pattern of the U.S. Land Grant Colleges, following an agreement signed in New Delhi between the Government of India and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission.

The agreement provides for Rs. 20.14 lakhs (\$ 424,000) of technical assistance for the development and operation of the university which will be located at the Terai State farm, Rudrapur. Of this, Rs. 14.28 lakhs (\$ 300,000 will be used for procuring books and scientific equipment from outside India and the remaining Rs. 5.86 lakhs (\$ 124,000) for securing the services of American specialists and consultants and for training in the U.S.A. of 2 Indian teachers.

The agreement was signed by Shri N.C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, for the Government of India and Mr. Howard E. Houston, T. C. M. Director, for the Technical Cooperation Mission.

This agreement supplements the T. C. M.

Technical Assistance of about Rs. 8.5 lakhs (\$ 147,000) provided last year, when this project was initiated. Total T. C. M. assistance for agricultural education and research so far has slightly exceeded Rs. 3.5 crores (\$ 7,500,000).

USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Tibet

Replying to a debate on the situation in Tibet, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on May 8, 1959 :

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this matter concerning the developments in Tibet has come up before this House as well as before the other House on several occasions in the course of the last few weeks and I have had occasion to make many statements on the situation arising from these developments. I should have thought that enough had been said for the time being about the basic facts. So those facts as known were challenged, in statements from China. Some of the statements from China, in so far as they related to India, were not accepted as facts by us. And I wondered sometimes whether it would serve any useful purpose for us to carry on this argument which could only mean really a repetition of what had been said. Nevertheless, it is perhaps a good thing for us to have this brief discussion here. But in the course of this discussion so many basic facts have been challenged, or basic ideas have been challenged, that it raises much wider issues than what has happened in Tibet.

The hon. Member who just spoke before me

with warmth said many things which challenged all the basic assumptions of our policy which has been accepted by this House and I think by the country as a whole with remarkable unanimity. Nevertheless, he challenged all those basic assumptions. Either he has never believed in those basic assumptions or what has happened in Tibet has made him change his opinion.

Now, I do not propose in these few minutes to discuss all the basic assumptions of our policy. All I would like to say now is that I do not hold with what the hon. Member has spoken. I do not agree with much that he has said and so far as Government is concerned, we are not going to follow the policy that he has suggested that we should follow. I should like to make that perfectly clear.

I may say in passing that we have laid no limitations on the Dalai Lama, except the limitation of good sense and propriety of which he himself is the judge. But for the hon. Member to suggest that we should allow him to do something which he has not himself suggested, that is,

132

making India the headquarters of some kind of a campaign and that we should allow the hon. Member and his party to join in this campaign is something which seems to be so odd, so remarkable of utterance that I cannot imagine how even he could have made it if he had thought about it. I need not say much about it, because it has no relation to what is happening in the world, or in India, or in Tibet, or in China or anywhere.

He also laid stress on the 1954 Agreement, the agreement with China with regard to Tibet. He said we should never have done it. Again I do not quite understand what meant by this kind of statement or this kind of view-point. What exactly he expects us to do is not clear except may be perhaps to hold public meetings in Ramlila grounds and deliver speeches. That is not the way that foreign policy of a country is conducted, by public meetings held in various places in India. Public meetings are important no doubt. But we have to come up against not only basic policies and assumptions, but hard facts in regard to foreign policy.

I have no doubt in my mind that the agreement we made with China with regard to Tibet was a right agreement. It was a correct agreement and we shall stand by it and it is not correct. even for him to say that that agreement has been broken. It may be said that he thinks that certain implications of that agreement have not been, according to him or according to anybody else, carried out. That is a different matter. But there is no question of that agreement having been broken. It lasts ; it functions.

I do not know how many people here know the background of all these problems. We have been moved naturally, we have had a kind of emotional upheaval, by recent happenings and it is quite understandable that that should be so because of certain intimate emotional and other bonds with Tibet, with the people of Tibet or the Mountains of Tibet, or Kailash or Manas Sarovar and so on, a mixture. We can understand that. And we can respect this emotional response. Nevertheless any policy that we lay down or attempt to lay down cannot be based on an emotional upheaval. They have to bear some relation to facts.

I do not know how many hon. Members know the history, the background of Tibet, of China, of Mangolia, of Bhutan and Sikkim and Nepal in the last few hundred years. I wonder how many have cared to look into them. I do not know whether the hon. Member who just spoke knows anything about it at all. I happen to know something about it and I have taken th trouble to read quite a number of books and histories, Chinese chronicles, Indian reports, etc. Here is the history of six or seven hundred years, or more, from the moment when Chengiz Khan invaded Tibet, when Kublai Khan also held Tibet in a peculiar way, considering the then Dalai Lama as a spiritual guru. It is a curious combination. Politically he was dominant in Tibet, but Kublai Khan considered the Dalai Lama as his spiritual leader, so that you see a curious combination coming up. And in fact for a considerable period the relationship of Tibet with China was very peculiar; in a sense, I believe I am not wrong in saying, the Chinese rather looked down upon the Tibetans from the Mangol times. The Chinese rather look down upon every country other than their own. They consider themselves as the middle kingdom, as the celestial race, a great country, whether it was the Tang kingdom, or the Ming kingdom or ultimately the Manchus

for a long period. The relations between China and Tibet varied from sovereignty or suzerainty, or half-sovereignty or semi-independence for long periods like this coming one after the other till the Manchu dynasty right up to the beginning of the twentieth century held full sway over Tibet, quite a considerable sway. Even in the last days of the Manchu dynasty, when it fell, it held some considerable influence in Tibet.

When the Manchu dynasty fell round about forty or fifty years ago it weakened. It weakened. but whoever held China, whether it was the Emperor, or whether it was President Yuan Shih Kai, whether it was the war lords after them or whether it was Marshal Chiang Kai-shek's regime, or whether it was the Peoples Government, they had one consistent policy from Emperor to the communist of considering themselves as overlords of Tibet. No doubt, when Tibet was strong, it resisted that from time to time. There have been occasions when, twice at least, Tibetan armies reached the capital of China-It is rather old history-as the Chinese armies came repeatedly into Tibet. There have been occasions when Nepalese army went into Tibet and Tibetan army came into Nepal. There was one occasion at least when a certain General from Kashmir. Zoravar Singh, who carried out a brilliant campaign across the Himalayas in Tibet only, of course, to meet a stouter enemy than Tibetan or anybody, the cold of Tibet. The temperature of Tibet put an end to him and his army there. All this is history, mixed history. There is no doubt that the countries with whom Tibet has been most intimately connected in the past have been Mongolia and China, naturally for historical and other reasons, religious reasons, cultural reasons.

133

But, all these do not count. In considering the present-day situation, we have to take things as they are and have been recently. We cannot think of Chengiz Khan's time or Kublai Khan's time or the Manchu Emperors or Chiang Kai Shek or anybody else. In regard to the present situation, what exactly are we after ? If we accept the hon. Member Shri Vajpayee's statement, we should, more or less, prepare for an armed conflict on this issue. We cannot pat somebody on the back and tell him to fight and say, we will cheer you from the background. That is an absurd situation. We must be clear in our mind what we are saying or aiming at. I take it that we aim at. whatever problems may arise, first of all, a peaceful solution of these problems. Peaceful solutions are not brought about by warlike speeches and warlike approaches. It is obvious that if some people in China think that by threats and strong speeches, they can frighten India, that is wrong. It is equally obvious that if some people in India think that by threats and warlike speeches, they can frighten China, that is equally wrong, Obviously not. Great countries, India or China, are not pushed about in this way. They react in the opposite direction.

So far as China is concerned,--not with us, but with other countries, we know very well; with the U.S.A., with other countries-China herself is a part of a military bloc system on the one side and China herself is intimately concerned with cold war. Not with us; but because of this bloc system. They have got used to ways of expressing their opinion which, personally I find, is not the right way in international parlance.

And now about the cold war technique, we have recently had some experience of that in regard to India. It is true, we have reacted against it. We did not like it. The question arises whether we should adopt that technique or not. It is an important thing, because it concerns our policy too. I think that neither that policy nor that way of expression which may be called cold war expression is right for any country : certainly not for us, unless we want to change our policy completely. We do not want to change it. We think it would be harmful from every point of view to change this policy. We should pursue that policy. That policy is based not so much on what the other country does, but on its inherent rightness in so far as we can understand it. We may be swept away now and then. It is a different matter. We are human beings. But, if we think coolly and calmly, we must realise that we must adhere to that policy. If so, our expressions of opinions, our challenges, our threats, etc., should not he made if they do not fit in with that particular policy.

That, I would submit to this House, is not a sign of weakness. I do not think any country in the world thinks that India, in the past few years, has adopted a policy of weakness. Sometimes have accused us of bending backward and of siding with this side or that side. I think they have begun to realise that if we are sometimes soft of speech, friendly of speech, it does not denote weakness, but a certain conviction that that is the only right way to deal with international problems, or, for the matter of that national problems. Therefore I submit that we must not talk about these warlike approaches and threats. We must not be overcome by anger even though, sometimes we may feel a little angry about events that are happening. We must show by our firm policy, and calm demeanour that we will continue that friendly effort that we have always made even when it comes right up to our borders.

There is a great deal of sympathy for the people of Tibet undoubtedly. Certainly not because the people of Tibet have a feudal regime. They have been cut off and have had a static social system which may have existed in other parts of the world some hundreds of years ago, but has ceased to exist elsewhere. Nobody wants that here. As a matter of fact, I am quite sure, even the Dalai Lama does not want it in Tibet. Here we see a strange thing, a society which had been isolated completely for hundreds of years suddenly coming out into the open, events throwing at into the mad world of ours, cold wars and all kinds of things happening, dynamic policies and fericious policies and authoritarian policies. Imagine the contrast in these two. It is a vast gulf. It is inevitable that painful consequences flow from this type of thing. You can lessen them. You can try to moderate the effect of that impact. You cannot simply wish it away. It was the policy, I believe, of the Peoples Government of China, who realised that a country like this cannot be treated in a sudden way; to go slowly about the so-called reforms or whatever it may be. Whether that policy has changed or not, I cannot say. Maybe it has changed somewhat. That is quite possible. Whether other changes are taking place in China, I cannot say. It was definitely a policy and they stated it publicly and privately that they realised this.

There is another difficulty in my or our dealing with these matters, and that is, that the words we use have a different meaning for other people. For instance, we talk of the autonomy of Tibet. So do the Chinese. But, a doubt creeps into my mind as to whether the meaning I attach to it is

134

the same as they attach to it. I do not think so. There are so many other words. I am not talking of any deliberate distortion. That apart. Quite apart from any distortion, the ways of thinking have changed. They have changed anyhow and the cold war methods have made them change even more. It is frightfully difficult really to talk the same language, the same language of the mind, I mean. That difficulty arises because of that also, and tremendous misunderstandings arise. However, I cannot go into all these matters.

One thing, I may say. Some reference was made, I think by Shri S.A. Dange, to some convention on Tibet by a certain Mazumdar. I have not heard of it except, today. In fact, just when I came, he heard something about it. In so far as I have seen all the papers-I did see them-I think that whatever that convention appears to aim at or whatever it seems to represent, seem to be very wrong. It is a wrong approach, and approach which will do no good to anybody at all, and may do a good deal of harm if really it was the approach of any responsible people in India. For we must realise first of all one thing. What do we want ? What are we aiming at? How can we get there ? What can we do about it.

I take it that we are sad, we are distressed at events in Tibet. Why are we distressed ? Presumably because we feel that a certain people are being set upon, are being oppressed whether the certain people, according to Shri S.A. Dange, are certain feudal landlords or some people like that or according to others, they are the common people of Tibet, or whatever it may be there it is. I have no doubt in my mind that it is difficult to draw the line in such cases between the top feudal elements and the others. They all can be mixed together. And as a result, for the moment, they are all uprooted.

Now where a society has existed for hundreds and hundreds of years-it may have outlasted its utility, but the fact is-uprooting it is a terribly painful process. It can be uprooted slowly, it can be changed even with rapidity, but with a measure of co-operation. But any kind of a forcible uprooting of that must necessarily be painful, whether it is a good society or a bad society. When we have to deal with such societies anywhere in the world, which as a social group may be called primitive, it is not an easy matter, how to deal with it. All these difficult things are happening. They should have happened; they would have happened, may be a little more slowly but with a greater measure of co-operation because such a change can only take place effectively and with least harm to the fabric, to those people concerned by themselves they may be helped by others, may be advised by others, but by themselves. The moment a good thing is done by bad means that good thing becomes a bad thing. It produces different reactions. That is, I cannot judge of what is happening in Tibet. I do not have facts, neither does anybody in this House, except broadly some odd fact here and there. But I am merely venturing to say that all these complicated systems not so easy to disentangle; anyhow, whatever it may be, have brought undoubtedly a great deal of suffering to the people of Tibet. And I should have liked to avoid it. But what can I do?

People talk in a strange way of a number of representatives of countries being summoned and orders being issued, this and do that. I am surprised that they should think on these lines, as if this can be done.

Here is, after years of effort, going to be, I believe, what is called a summit conference somewhere in Europe, where the great ones of the earth, Russia, and America, and England and France, and may be somebody else, Italy or whatever it may be, would be summoned to decide the fate of the world; it has taken years and years. What they will decide, I do not know. I wish them well. I wish they will come to some understanding. But the way casually hon. Members here say that we should issue orders and decrees, get together and decide or it will be the worse for you, seems almost - like a comic opera approach; it has no relation to reality.

It is a basic fact that China is a great country, and India is a great country, great in extent, great in background, great in many things. I am not talking so much about military power, although, from the point of view of defence or offence, no doubt, their potentials or actuals are considerable.

Now, looking at the subject from any long

perspective, or even in the short perspective, it is a matter of considerable consequence that China and India should be friends, should be co-operative. It does not mean that they should go the same path, but they should not come in each other's way; they should not be hostile to each other; it is neither good for India nor for China. And China may be a very strong country as it is, and is growing stronger, but even from the Chinese point of view, it is not a good thing to have a hostile India; it makes a great deal of difference to have that kind of thing-I am not talking in military terms, but otherwise. It is to the interest of both these countries, even though

135

they function in different and in many ways, not to be hostile to each other. If China starts telling me what to do, I am likely to be irritated. If I go about telling China what to do, China is likely to be irritated, even more than I am, because, I am supposed to be a soft person and the Chinese are not supposed to be very soft about these matters, maybe. So there it is.

Now, maintaining our dignity, maintaining our rights, maintaining our self-respect, and yet not allowing ourselves to drift into wrong attitudes and hostile attitudes, and trying to help in removing or in solving such problems as they arise, we may help a little-they cannot be solved quickly-that is the very utmost that one can do in the circumstances, or at any rate, creating an atmosphere which may help in doing this. How far it will go, I do not know.

So, I venture to say that this should be our broad approach in this matter. We cannot go any further. We might possibly help in that approach there.

After all, this House and the country have expressed in fairly effective language their reactions to Tibet developments, to events in Tibet. Nobody doubts them. But I might say, that talking in fiery and hostile language will not carry conviction but in fact, it will only lead to greater gulf being created and less possibility of any help being rendered in understanding or in finding a solution.

Therefore, I would beg to suggest that we should not allow ourselves to be swept away in these matters.

One thing which was referred to by two or three Members was the question of maps. Now, there is no doubt about it that this continuance of what are called old maps of China, which show certainly fairly large areas of Indian territory, as if they belong to the Chinese State, has been a factor in creating continual irritation in the minds of people in this country. It is not some crisis that has arisen, but it has been difficult for our people, naturally to understand why this kind of thing continues indefinitely, year after year. It is not. mind you, a question of some odd little pocket here and there which may be in dispute on which we can argue there are two or three pockets about which we have had, and we are going to have, discussions-but this business of issuing these maps which are not true to fact, which are factually untrue and which can hardly be justified on the ground of history, of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek's regime or any previous regime.

I shall just say one word more. I think Shri S.A. Dange talked about the palace of the Dalai Lama and all that. I think that is an exaggeration. First of 'all, it is not his choice. It is our choice. And it is rather slightly bigger than a normal house in Mussoorie. We had to find a biggish house because of the number of people involved.

As I have said, there is no question of surveillance on him except for security reasons and we have not prevented him from meeting anybody if he wants to meet. He has met, in fact, large numbers of people, some people go for darshan to him, and some individuals, often Buddhist representatives from Ceylon and other places are coming to see him; they all go there. Nobody prevents anyone. Certainly as for the odd newspaper man especially from foreign countries, who comes here in search of sensation, even him we do not prevent, but we do not welcome him because such persons reduce everything to high sensationalism.

The other day, I said in the other place that all this business of God-King etc., is not to my liking. He is the Dalai Lama, referred to as the Dalai Lama, and if anyone creates sensationmongering by saying God-King all the time. And I may say that the Dalai Lama himself does not like this business. Therefore, we do not want this whole occurrence to be reduced or kept up to the sensational level. That was why we were not at all anxious that so many correspondents should go there and beseige him; and then there will always be difficulties, interpreters and all that; and confusion will arise, and contradictions and all that.

Shri Nehru said : Now, we have to face the larger problem of these refugees. It is a difficult problem, and it has been thrust upon us.

If I may say just one word, before the 11th March-that is not so long ago, about seven weeks ago is it ?--we had no inkling of what might happen in Tibet. On the 11th March was the first word we got of some demonstrations in Lhasa by Tibetans, and on the 17th, six days later, came this business of, so it is said, shelling the Dalai Lama's palace. Shri Dange said something about bad marksmanship. I am only saying what he said. It is not bad marksmanship, but deliberately they were sent there as a kind of warning. Anyhow, then the situation developed on the 20th, fighting took place there. The situation developed rapidly after that, and the House knows what happened afterwards. The

136

Dalai Lama left there on the 17th evening, and arrived here at the end of the month, so that we really were rather overtaken by events. We did not know that the Dalai Lama was coming here till about two days before he actually entered India. We had imagined when we knew he was travelling south that he might come, but it was only two days before that that we heard that he would like to come, so that we were overtaken by events.

We had decided to accept him; later, when others come, we decided to allow them to come too, and there they are, all these refugees, apart from the Dalai Lama. The present estimates are about 10,000-and all kinds of refugees, the old, the aged, some young people, some women, and it is obviously going to be a bit of a problem for us. We are not going to keep them in barbed wire enclosures for ever; for the present we are keeping them in two or three camps. But the sooner we spread them out the better. May be some will have to remain for some time, I do not know. An. Hon. Member: One thing has intrigued many observers greatly, that the Dalai Lama has been elected by the People's Congress in China as one of the Vice-Chairmen. Because he is also a part of that State, has our Government received any request from the Chinese Embassy here that the Chinese Ambassador or any of his representatives should see the Vice-Chairman of the People's Republic?

The Prime Minister : No, Sir. We have received no such request. I stated, as you might remember, that the Chinese Ambassador would be welcome to see him if he so wishes.

An Hon. Member: I want to ask the Hon. Prime Minister if these 10,000 refugees that have come are all well-to-do feudal lords, or they are the common people of Tibet.

The Prime Minister: I cannot give any description of all of them. They have not reached, they are on the way, but it is hardly likely that Tibet will produce 10,000 lords.

USA CHINA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BHUTAN NEPAL MONGOLIA RUSSIA FRANCE ITALY

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Tibet

Replying to a debate on the situation in Tibet, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on May 4, 1959 :

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Mover of this motion spoke in such dignified and restrained language that I feel deeply beholden to him. He set a good example for all of us. In the course of this discussion this example has been more or less followed, not entirely ; but I do not wish to object to anything that has been said or the manner of saying it. Unfortunately in some other countries, and in China more specially, the way we function in our Parliament here or outside is perhaps not fully appreciated ; that is to say that it may not be quite appreciated that here everyone has a right to say-here in Parliament and indeed outside Parliament also and in the Press-everyone has a right to say whatever he feels like subject to some very very broad limitations of libel or slander, and that what he or she may say may indeed be in condemnation of Government, as it often is ; it does not represent Government's policy. I say this because objection is taken, has been taken in China to remarks made by Hon. Members in Parliament or outside or the Press. It is different here from what it is in China, and I am not saying that it is better, or not here or it is different here. Here one can see even in the last few weeks an amazing unanimity and similarity of words, expressions and slogans coming from various quarters, which shows an amount of uniformity which is truly formidable, and it has its virtues no doubt, but I am not criticising anything. But what I wish to say is that things said in Parliament sometimes convey a very different impression outside, and people do not realise that in such Parliaments as these are every viewpoint has the fullest expression and need not necessarily be right or wrong.

In this connection-not by way of again criticism but because Shri Bhupesh Gupta referred to a very unfortunate incident that happened in Bombay where Chairman Ammo Tse-tung's picture was shown grave discourtesy-I should like to refer to that firstly to express my regret again for it and at the same time to say that the facts of this particular incident as we know them, and know them correctly we are presumed to know them a little better than people sitting in Pekingnevertheless oddly enough our version of the facts is not wholly accepted by the Peking Government on a small matter, which is surprising. We are sitting here, we ought to know better what takes place in our country, about facts, whatever other opinions may be. However, it is very regrettable incident with which obviously Government had nothing to do. The party which organised it, I believe, is not represented in this House even. But what is not realised is that in the City of

Bombay pictures even of a leader of ours like Mahatma Gandhi have been burnt by some groups

137

or others. Two and a half or three years ago my humble self also has been treated in that way in Bombay and elsewhere. Well, we take that in our stride and, as the hon. Member who spoke last mentioned, a few years back President Eisenhower's effigy had the honour of being burnt near the ochterlony Monument. I regret all these cases, but what I am mentioning is that these things happen in a country like ours because of our laws, etc. They happen. Quite apart from law, I think it is a grave breach of decency to do this kind of thing or do anything else. We regret it. But people outside this country, some people, do not realise this and seem to imagine that somehow or other the Government or some Government officials must have connived at it, otherwise it could not have taken place, or they think that we should take the people who have done this by the scruff of the neck and throw in the dungeon.

The Prime Minister said : I am saying that it is rather difficult because it produces misunderstandings as to the way of functioning, our parliamentary procedures and the like, and other procedures where a Government does not permit opposition of any kind.

Hon. Members have referred to a statement made by me a few days ago which was read out in this House also. So far as the major facts are concerned I have stated them there and I have really nothing to add even though after that statement was made it was not accepted-the facts I mean; even the facts were not fully accepted by the Chinese authorities and the Chinese Press, which is unfortunate because again I would say that as to what happens in India I would imagine that we could be better informed than the Chinese authorities who presumably can only be informed through certain intelligence agents that they may have at Kalimpong or elsewhere. But I do not wish to enter into polemical argument about these minor matters because the issues before us are far more serious, far deeper, far deeper than Tibet, the whole of Tibet, although Tibet is important and we are discussing events which have cast their shadow round about Tibet too. That shows that they are really deeper than that, and therefore we have to be particularly careful as to what we say

and what we do. Now I accept the limitations and also the responsibility of what one should say on such occasions.

First of all, we must be alive to what we are aiming at. We are not, I hope, merely aiming at denouncing sombody or some government or some phrase. There has been too much of this denunciation and slogan-raising. I regret to say, in China recently, and some of the slogans have been quite extraordinary. But I do not think we should be so thin-skinned as to get upset by some slogans in the excitement of the moment. We must not be let off our main path because that is of very considerable consequence in the future.

I should like again to read a few lines of what I said in that previous statement to indicate what we aim at. I said this :-

"It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia-India and Chinawhich have been peaceful neighbours for ages past should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries which are so important from the wider point of view of the peace of Asia and the world. The five principles have laid down, inter alia, mutual respect for each other. Such mutual respect is gravely impaired if unfounded charges are made and the language of cold war used."

Shri Bhupesh Gupta asked rather rhetorically, "Do we stand by Panch Sheel ?" Well, sometimes I wonder if the words we use are used in the same meaning or with some different meaning in our minds but-I have no claim to superiority-so far as India is concerned, we have earnestly striven to stand by these principles and I do not think we have offended any principle. It is not for me to stand up and criticise or justify other countries, but we have tried to do that not because of some temporary policy, not because these five principles have been declared in some agreement-that was merely a confirmation of what we thought, as to what we said-but because we have felt, that that is the only way to function in this world of ours. Some people say, "Oh ! After all that has happened, you still hold by that." It is a curious

question. If these principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is not holding by them. Naturally, we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world ; we cannot live in isolation. But a principle should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it. One tries. Anyway, we are imperfect beings in an imperfect world. So I should like to assure the hon. Member opposite that so far as the Government is concerned. I cannot speak for every ordinary individual in India-we hold by those principles and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do. Some people certainly-as Shri Bhupesh Gupta said-taking

138

advantage of these occurrences in and relating to Tibet have raised a cry that India will now have to consider how far she can adhere to the policy of non-alignment. All that shows a strange misunderstanding of our ways of thinking in our policies. Non-alignment although the word is itself a kind of negative word-nevertheless has a positive concept, and we do not propose to have a military alliance with any country come what may, and I want to be quite clear about it, because the moment we give up that idea of non-alignment, we lose every anchor that we hold on to and we simply drift. We may hang on to somebody or some country. But we lose our own self-respect, of the country's. If one loses one's self-respect, it is something very precious lost. Therefore this business of thinking always in terms of getting something from this country or the other country is not desirable. It is perhaps not very relevant. It is said often in Pakistan, let us have a common defence policy. Now I am all for settling our troubles with Pakistan and living a normal, friendly, neighbourly life. We try for that. But I do not understand when people say that we have a common defence policy. Against whom ? Immediately the question comes up : "Against whom is this common defence policy ?" Are we going to become members of the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO or some body? We do not want to have a common defence policy which is almost another meaning of some kind of a military alliance. The whole policy that we have pursued is opposed to this conception. We want friendly relations with Pakistan. We hope we shall get them. But we are not going to tie ourselves up, our conceptions, our policies, with other countries involving military defence and attacking and all that.

So the present difficulties that we have to face in relation to the happenings in Tibet will, I hope, gradually pass. But it is a tragedy not only for Tibet, but a deeper tragedy for many of us that something that we have laboured for for all these years which may be said to be enshrined if you like in the Panch Sheel or in Bandung has suffered very considerably in people's minds. I may say I shall hold on to it, but the fact is in people's minds there is that crack. there is that suffering. there is that uneasiness, that something they valued might slip away. These words like all other words-Bandung, Panch Sheel; it does not matter what word you use-begin to lose their shine and to be hurled about without meaning, and in fact, just like even the word 'Peace' becomes almost like a thunderbolt or a minor war the way it is used. Sometimes the manner of using it-it is the manner-that counts. I have come more and more to believe that means are even more important than ends. They show to us that the way one does things is even more important than what one does. And that is why I have been aggrieved beyond measure at these various recent developments and at what is being said in China-the charges made against India. Shri Bhupesh Gupta did not say a word about all these, not a word. I can understand where these things lead to. Hon. Members of this House being seasoned public men and women may restrain themselves, may not allow themselves to be affected too much. But it is difficult for the general public not to be affected by such charges and they are charges, I do submit, which do not stand the slightest scrutiny. What have we done about this matter, about Tibet, apart from some speeches of things?

We have received the Dalai Lama and party, and subsequently we have received some thousands of refugees. We have given them asylum, and it is admitted-I don't think anybody denies it-that as a sovereign country we have every right to do so, and nobody else can be a judge of that except ourselves. Now is it suggested that we should have refused to give asylum to the Dalai Lama when he asked for it ? Well, if it is suggested by someone outside India I can tell them-I do not know about the handful out of the four hundred millions of people of India; I doubt if even a few thousands would have agreed with that policy;- I can tell them this that the hundreds of millions of India would have become angry at that action of ours if we had refused asylum to the Dalai Lama and his party. Almost everybody in India-a few may not have-approved of our policy, and it would have been an impossible thing, an utterly wrong thing, for us to do otherwise from any point of view, political, humanitarian or whatever you like. So this is what we have done. Of course we are charged with as having connived at Kalimpong; of Kalimpong being the commanding centre-this is the word they used. I think-of this rebellion in Tibet. Now it is said that the commanding centre has shifted to Mussoorie-I know words have lost their meaning, because I find it very difficult to deal with these charges. And why has the commanding centre gone to Mussoorie ? Because the Dalai Lama is there and because the brother of the Dalai Lama who normally lives in Darjeeling, I think, went to see him, and after seeing him went back to Darjeeling or Kalimpong. These are very serious charges against a country's leaders being made irresponsibly in this way by the leaders of a people whom we have not only honoured and respected but whom we have considered particularly advanced in culture and politeness and the gentler art of civilisation. It has been a shock to me beyond measure because, quite apart from everything else, I have looked up

139

to the Chinese and I look up to them still because of their great accomplishments, because of their great culture and all that, and it has been a shock to me that this kind of thing should be said and done in the excitement of the moment. I hope that excitement will pass.

Now, Sir, I want to tell the House exactly how these matters came into our ken. On the 11th of March, for the first time we got a message from our Consul-General in Lhasa saying that there was some excitement in the town and that a large number of people had come and visited him consisting of representatives of the public and some Tibetan officials, monks, heads of monasteries, etc. They had come to him with a series of complaints about the Chinese authorities there and they said that they were very much in distress. Now our Consul-General in Lhasa was naturally very embarrassed. What is he to do'? He did not wish to interfere; it was none of his business to interfere and he told them : "Well, I cannot do anything for you" and he reported to us. That was on the 11th-the message dated the 10th reached us on the 11th. That was the first information we had, that something was afoot there. After that the Consul-General sent us brief reports about the general excitement in the town, the tense situation and people holding meetings, not public meetings but group meetings, and all that. On the 14th he again sent us a message that a crowd of 5,000 Tibetan women had come to the Consulate-General with the same kind of complaints and asked him to accompany them to the Chinese Foreign Office in Lhasa to bear witness to what they said. At that again the poor Consul-General was exceedingly embarrassed. It was none of his business to do this and he said: "I cannot go" and he asked, "What do you mean by that?" Well, in short he said, "I just cannot go." Quite rightly. He reported it to us. We drafted a message-it was kept ready to be sent-to say: "Don't get entangled in what has happened and was happening in Lhasa." This was on the 14th. So this kind of thing went on. And it was at this time, when speaking, I think, in the Lok Sabha, I said that there was a clash of wills in Lhasa-whether that was a correct description. I do not know. The point was there was no actual fighting going on at this time; that came a few days later. On the 20th March when it started, how it started, I do not know, nor did our Consul-General know sitting in the Consulate, and he could not be expected to know when it started. And as we now know, fie did not know it then. On the 17th night the Dalai Lama and party left Lhasa, rather secretly. According to them, on the 17th afternoon at 4 o'clock, two shells or bombs, something like that, fell into a lake in the Summer Palace. Well, this made them think "Now this is the last moment, and now the Palace is going to be shelled and there is going to be war everywhere," and they left Lhasa. As far as I know-I am not sure-even then it was not fully his intention to leave Tibet. But as Lhasa was being shelled, subsequently that intention must have developed. Anyhow, in the course of a week, from the 11th to the 20th or the 21st, during these, say, ten days this was the news that came to us. We could do nothing about it and before the 10th or 11th we knew nothing about the situation except that we naturally knew that all kinds of cross-currents were at work at Lhasa and in Tibet. Then the question came before us,

of the possibility of the Dalai Lama coming here, and we decided that we should receive him. He came. As the House might know I resisted and I was asked repeatedly: "Are you going to throw your doors open to any number of refugees from Tibet?" I resisted that although in my mind I knew that I could not very well refuse asylum to people who were in great difficulty; I could not; but I did not want to say it and invite people to roll into India from all over the place. So that is the short story of what has happened and what we have done. And now we are called expansionists and imperialists and what not, all kinds of phrases, which I suppose would not make any real difference to what we are; nevertheless coming from those whom we consider friends they do hurt us.

Now I want just to give you a few facts. Again an extra-ordinary thing appeared in the newspapers in Peking. They go back now to what had happened in 1950, that is, to some memoranda that we had sent, when Chinese armies were entering Tibet. Very polite memoranda they were. The answers were not very polite, but the point now is that they refer to them, that what we wrote to them was after consultation with the British Government, that though we called ourselves independent we really acted as stooges or tools of the British Government.

It is, of course, completely wrong and untruthful. There was no question of our consulting the British Government. Our view on Tibet was different from that of the British Government.

Now, one thing about the Panchen Lama's statement. I was rather distressed to read it, that a statement should be made, so lacking in generosity and dignity, by a person who had been our honoured guest. I do not know about the petty things he says that somewhere his staff was not given proper accommodation. I cannot answer

140

that, whether at Aurangabad or some such place there was some difficulty because the entourage of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama was so big-hundreds of people with them. It was not quite so easy to make as much preparation as we wanted. About the refugees, now the latest position is that approximately 6,500 refugees are on their way down through the Kemeng Division of NEFA, 1,500 are trekking through Bhutan and 700 have come to Sikkim-round about 9,000. The Bhutan Government have asked us to receive the Tibetan refugees coming through their territories and we have agreed to do so. Thus we have about 9,000 refugees for whom we have made ourselves responsible for some kind of arrangements. A few of the refugees, when they entered India, were armed. They were disarmed on entry into India.

The refugees coming through NEFA will be accommodated temporarily in a camp at Mismari in Assam. Though the Assam Government are making arrangements for their shelter, medical relief, etc., the West Bengal Government have agreed to construct temporary camp somewhere in Cooch-Behar for the refugees who are coming through Bhutan. We are grateful to these two State Governments.

Special Officers to deal with the refugees have been appointed by the External Affairs Ministry. They are proceeding to Assam and West Bengal. It is not proposed to keep these refugees in these temporary camps for a long time and other arrangements will have to be devised for them. I cannot just say at present what or where, but it is obvious we are not going to keep them in camps.

One Hon. Member-I think Dr. Kunzru, may be Shri Shiva Rao--said something that we should allow these refugees to earn their own living and give them freedom to do many things. Broadly speaking of course we intend that. We are not going to keep them as prisoners in camps. In fact, our instructions to our officers at the border were to tell them that we do not assume responsibility for their indefinite up-keep. For sometime we would help them. And naturally to some extent we are responsible when these people are coming in. We cannot let them loose on India. Again, there is the question that they cannot easily be kept anywhere except in cooler climates-and we cannot send them to the rest of India simply-in mountain regions.

I think Shri Shiva Rao said something about China and the United Nations. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to say so, but obviously our policy in regard to the entry 'of the People' Government of China into the U.N. remains as i was. It is not that it is based on certain facts-b these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That would mean that we have n firm policies that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world.

Just one thing more. Shri Bhupesh Gupta talked about national uprising. Again it depend upon how you use that word. I do not know exactly what happened in Tibet. But as I said i my 'previous' statement, according to Chinese accounts this has been a fairly big affair, a ver large scale affair. Also looking at the surrounding circumstances as well as the past history of Tibet, one can very well imagine that apart from the so-called people representing vested intereststhey would be there-it is a fact that large number of Tibetan people-I cannot say whether they ar in a majority or a minority, but large number undoubtedly-went to the extent of taking this ste which they did, which really meant a very danger ous step. Anyhow it is there and one feels strongly about it.

Now so far as we are concerned, we have no interfered either from Kalimpong or Mussoori or otherwise. We have exercised our undoubte, right to give asylum. I have said that Dalai Lam is perfectly a free agent to go where he likes i India or go back to Tibet.

Some people-some foreign pressmen-sai about two days after he had come to Mussoori that we are keeping him behind barbed wire. Tha sounds rather horrible. The fact was that the Mussoorie police, to lighten their burden because of all kinds of curious people trying to go into the compound of the house, had put a little bar bed wire on that compound before he came, to b able to protect him, for his security and genera protection. But that was not to keep him in, and he goes, I believe, round about Mussoorie. H can go back to Tibet the moment he likes.

It is no use my going on repeating what have said earlier that the Dalai Lama is not kep under duress here, that he did not enter Indi under any duress, excepting the duress of circumstances, if you like-compulsion of events. An certainly, I can speak from personal knowledge having met him and talked to him, that he is staying there of his own free will in India and eve at Mussoorie. With all respect, I would say that anyone who denies this fact, well, is totally ignorant of facts and speaks without knowing.

141

Further, Hon. Members might have seen in the newspaper headlines-because odd remarks are given as headlines that I said that I would be happy if the Dalai Lama went back to Tibet. I did so. Somebody asked a question and I said, "Naturally I would be happy if he went with dignity." But that did not mean at all that I am going to push the Dalai Lama out or put him in an embarrassing position. It is entirely for him to decide what to do, when to do it. The only advice I gave him when I was with him was : You have had a very hard journey and very harassing experiences. If I may, as a person very much older than you, suggest it you might rest for a few days, and calmly think about the events and then do what you like."

One more matter, if I may say so specially to the press. I do not particularly fancy this constant sensational way of referring to the Dalai Lama as the God-king, and, in fact, I do not think he likes it either. This is not the Indian way, it is a foreign way of doing things. It sounds sensational no doubt. I hope that that word will not be used. It is good enough to refer to him as the Dalai Lama.

USA CHINA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN IRAQ INDONESIA BHUTAN PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Indian In Tibet

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha during Question hour on May 8, 1959 that a number of Indians were in Tibet but no authentic information was available of the number of Indian nationals there.

She said : "Apart from traders. a number of Muslims and Lamas from the Ladak region have been in Tibet for some time before the 1954 Agreement which prescribed certificates or permits which need to be carried for travel between the Tibet region and India. Our Consulate General is endeavouring to obtain information about their names and whereabouts."

Replying to a question Shrimati Menon said : "As far as we are aware, no Indian national has been killed or suffered injury during the present disturbances. So far we have not received any detailed information of any damage suffered by their properties.

"According to the reports received by the Government of India, a Tibetan woman, who was engaged as a water-carrier in the Indian Consulate General at Lhasa, died of the wounds received during the firing. The local authorities were informed or the death and her body disposed of."

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreement for Supply of Machinery Signed

An agreement for the supply of machinery, equipment and the technical services connected with the erection and commissioning of the Neyveli Thermal Power Station based on lignite between Messrs. Technoexport, Moscow, and the Neyveli Lignite Corporation was signed in New Delhi on May 6, 1959.

Shri N. S. Mani, I. C. S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Steel, Mines & Fuel, signed on behalf of the Neyveli Corporation and Mr. V. A. Sergeev, Counsellor for Economic Affairs, U. S. S. R. Embassy in India on behalf of Messrs. Technoexport. Mr. N.N. Kryukov, Charge d'affaires of the Soviet Embassy. was also present.

The cost of the machinery and equipment to be supplied under the agreement will be met out of the 500 million rouble credit afforded by the Government of U.S.S.R under the Indo-Soviet Agreement of November, 1957.

The deliveries of the machinery and equipment will commence from the second quarter of 1959 and end in last quarter of 1961.

The Thermal Powar Station will have an installed continuous rated capacity of 250,000 K.W. and is one of the schemes included in the Integrated Neyveli Lignite Project. The first unit of the power station will be commissioned by April 1961 and the entire power station by about the middle of 1962.

142

RUSSIA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Barter Deal

The Deputy Minister for Commerce & Industry, Shri Satish Chandra told the Rajya Sabha on May 6, 1959 that a barter agreement had been entered into with the Government of the United States of America for supply of foodgrains in exchange for manganese and ferro-manganese.

Shri Satish Chandra, who was replying to a question by an Hon. Member of the Rajya Sabha, said that under the agreement, 1.5 lakh tons of manganese ore (42 per cent); 25,000 tons of manganese ore (46/48 per cent) and about 75,000 tons of ferro-manganese were proposed to be exported to the U.S.A. against the import of 4.5 lakh tons of wheat from that country.

USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Financial Assistance

Two Agreements covering the allocation of Rs. 10 crores each to the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India (ICICI) and the Industrial Finance Corporation of India (IFC), out of U.S. P L. 480 rupee funds, were signed in New Delhi on May 21, 1959 between the Government of India and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission. These P.L. 480 funds will help augment the resources of the two Financial Corporations and enable them to render additional assistance to private industrial sector in the country during the Second Plan period.

The New agreements bring the total U.S. local currency assistance to India to Rs. 154 crores.

The agreements were signed by Shri N.C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance, for the Government of India and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director, for the Technical Cooperation Mission. The ICICI, set up in 1955 with a paid-up capital of Rs. 5 crores held jointly by India, U.S. and U.K. companies, encourages foreign and Indian private participation in the expansion of Indian private enterprise by providing loans, purchasing equity shares and underwriting of capital funds. The ICICI has received a Rs. 7.5 crores interest-free loan from the Government of India, representing the sale proceeds of U. S. steel grants to India and a line of credit of about Rs. 5 crores (\$10 Million) from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The IFC, established by the Government of India in 1948 also furnishes medium and long-term credits to private Indian Industrial concerns. It is estimated that the I. F. C. will require additional funds of the order of Rs. 20 crores during the remaining part of the Second Plan period for providing financial assistance to enterprises. Half of this will be met by this P.L. 480 loan. P. L 480 is an Act of Congress which authorises the U. S. Government to sell agricultural commoditie to friendly foreign countries and accept payment in local currencies, such as rupees. The money accruing from sale proceeds are then reloaned to be invested in economic development projects.

143

USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Western Samoa

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on June 10, 1959 on conditions prevailing in Western Samoa, a Trust

Territory under New Zealand Administration

Mr. President :

For the second time this year, the Trusteeship Council is engaged in the consideration of the final stages leading to the emergence of yet another Trust Territory, Western Samoa into an independent State. By its resolution 1922 of the 8th Special Session, the Trusteeship Council directed the Visiting Mission, which was to visit the Trust Territory of Western Samoa early in 1959, "to examine in consultation with the Administering Authority the extent to which the objectives of Trusteeship had been attained by the Trust Territory and the future steps necessary for their attainment".

The Visiting Mission, led by Mr. A. S. Lall, my predecessor as Leader of India's Delegations to numerous sessions of this Council has submitted a very comprehensive and able report for the Council's consideration. We have had the advantage, Mr. President, of studying this report very carefully and also of hearing the views of the Administering Authority on this report and on many constitutional, political, economic and social matters of importance to the Territory from Mr. Mc Intosh, the distinguished representative of New Zealand, and from Mr. Powles, the Administering Authority's Special Representative, with whose friendliness, ability and sympathy towards Samoan aspirations this Council is well acquainted.

May I be permitted, at the outset, to pay my delegation's tribute to the Visiting Mission. The Mission's report bears eloquent testimony to the great experience of its members in Trusteeship matters, to their wisdom and judgment and to the great pains that they have taken in ascertaining the facts of the situation in Western Samoa, in evaluating these facts, and in arriving at balanced and sound conclusions. We regard their report as a valuable contribution to the work of this Council, and of signal importance to the future of this Trust Territory.

Western Samoa with its relatively small geographical size and population has a special importance of its own. Its emergence from international trust will mark the birth of the first sovereign and independent Polynesian State in the Pacific. We hope that many big and small territories in that area, which are now Trust Territories or Non-Self-Governing Territories, will follow suit in the near future, thereby widening the area of freedom in that part of the world.

As I said on another occasion, "the moments in history when nations arise in full freedom and independence are not too many, and such moments, when they come, are always moving and of great significance to mankind". It is a privilege of this Council, and of us all who are its members, to be associated once again with the prospect of the birth of a new nation. That yet another territory finds itself on the threshold of independence is the highest vindication and fulfilment of the Trusteeship system.

We have never had any doubt as to the intention of the Government of New Zealand to bring the people of Western Samoa to maturity and independence in the shortest possible time. We were glad to hear reaffirmation of this from the distinguished representative of New Zealand the other day when in answering certain questions he said that "in the view of the Administering Authority, self-government and independence are synonymous terms" and that it is the purpose and the intention of the Government of New Zealand to give full independence to Western Samoa. Such a view is wholly id consonance with the Charter.

Indeed, so far as our delegation is concerned whatever may be the nuances of interpretation of the meaning of the expression "self-government," the assumption that the ultimate result of the Trusteeship system can be something short of independence is untenable, either semantically or in the spirit of the times we live in. For the Charter would be static deadwood instead of the dynamic and creative instrument that it is or ought to be, if it did not respond to the changing concepts of freedom and relationship between nations and peoples. I say this, Mr. President, because we wish to go on record as being unable to subscribe to the view that between self-government and independence there may be a variety of stages or degrees of freedom, as the end-product of the Trusteeship system.

In the same context and for similar reasons we welcome the statement on behalf of the Administering Authority that the mination of the

145

Trustiship system and the independence of Western Samoa are not contingent or conditional upon the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship with Now-Zealand; and that whether there should be such a Treaty or what its contents should be are matters entirely for the Samoans to decide in negotiation with the New Zealand Government.

We were happy, Mr. President, to be told that the Administering Authority has no apprehensions that the intermediate stage in the transfer of responsibility to the Samoan people over the next two years will not be accomplished satisfactorily or Oat the advent of Samoan indepandence will be delayed.

The Visiting Mission's report, apart from concerning itself with the future of Samoa and the steps preceding the independence of Samoa, gives us a picture of the existing conditions in that Trust Territory and the changes that should-be appropriately brought about before the advent of independence. The Visiting Mission has generally endorsed in its broad outline the timetable drawn up by the Administering Authority, which is reproduced in paragraph 174 of its report. Although this timetable is still to be discussed and agreed upon with the Samoan authorities and as the Mission itself recognises may require some modification in the future, the drawing up of this timetable, Mr. President, is fully in accord with the General Assembly resolution 1274 (XIII) which invites the Administering Authority to establish targets and dates of the various stages of development towards the attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship system. According to the timetable the future of Samoa will be decided at the 15th session of the General Assembly. It would, therefore, be somewhat premature to discuss the final and definitive form of Samoan independence at this stage or to prejudge the various issues that will arise in this connection and will no doubt be discussed in the Trusteeship Council next year, and subsequently by the General Assembly. My delegation, Mr. President, will therefore while wholly favouring Samoan independence at the earliest possible date and generally endorsing the Visiting Mission's conclusions will refrain at this stage from a detailed analysis of the timetable and the form and nature of Western Samoa's future association with New

Zealand.

While in the Territory, the Visiting Mission observed "some hesitation and some outright opposition to immediate self-government". However, the Mission has also noted that there is an overwhelming desire in the majority of the Samoan people and its leaders for immediate independence. The Administering Authority itself is in favour of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and the grant of independence to Western Samoa at the earliest date. In the circumstances, it is clear that the termination of the Trusteeship would be in conformity with the wishes of the people of Samoa. The Visiting Mission did well to press upon the Samoan people the need for a popular consultation by means of a plebiscite based on adult suffrage as the only means of ascertaining the true wishes of the people. We are happy that notwithstanding some initial hesitation the Samoan leaders and the Samoan Legislative Assembly were persuaded to this view.

On the recommendation of the working committee, which is composed entirely of Samoans the two Fautas and the members, of the Legislative Assembly have unanimously resolved that a plebiscite on the basis of universal adult suffrage will be-held to ascertain the wishes of the Samoan people concerning the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, and to obtain a popular ratification of the Constitution of the new State. In view of the prevailing sentiment in the Territory in favour of Matai suffrage this decision of the Samoan leaders and the legislature in the Territory which reflects their anxiety to comply with the requirements of the United Nations Charter, is a tribute to their commonsense and political wisdom. This, in our view is evidence of the respect in which the people of Western Samoa hold the Charter, as also of the flexibility of their traditional methods and beliefs. We would like to join the Visiting Mission in congratulating them on this decision which, as the Mission says, will facilitate' the termination of Trusteeship in Western Samoa.

Now that Western Samoa is on the eve of independence, we may be permitted to review the conditions in Western Samoa in the light of the necessary preparations in that Territory for the responsibilities that independence would bring to Western Samoa. If Western Samoa is to attain self-government and independence in 1961, it is necessary that the time between then and now should be used for fully preparing its people for the final transfer of power. It is obvious that the first essential is to produce a large cadre of civil servants capable of shouldering the responsibilities of administration. The economic viability of the new state after independence should be assured and for that purpose measures should be taken in hand which will result in the maximum development, both actual and potential, of the resources of the Territory.

All this means that a crash programme,

146

which is the expression used by the Visiting Mission and by the Administering Authority itself should be adopted for removing the existing deficiencies in these fields and for fully preparing the Samoans for independence. We are glad that there is general awareness of the need for this and indeed many of the proposals of the Administering Authority are dictated by the recognition of such a necessity.

As for Western 'Samoa's readiness for independence in paragraph 168 of its report the Visiting Mission has observed that "while deficiencies do exist in the preparation of Samoa for self-government, Samoa has been following since 1947 and particularly since the 1954 Constitutional convention, a planned programme of institutional development aimed at the attainment of self-government in the near future, and that the Samoan representatives have achieved some proficiency in the working of these institutions".

Though Samoa is a small territory in many ways it is well placed to live an independent life. Its per capita income compares favourably with the per capita incomes of many other countries which are now self-governing or independent. Though the population of Samoa is growing at a fast rate, the Territory possesses large untapped land-resources which are capable of development.

On the political side, the Legislative Assembly has been functioning satisfactorily for some time, and the Ministerial system of Government has been successfully tried out- What is necessary now is to transfer further responsibility to the Samoans and to give a fair trial to the Cabinet system of Government before the final transfer of power.

It is our hope that when Cabinet Government is introduced in the Territory, Cabinet responsibility will be real and that the reviewing powers of the Executive Council or the reserve powers of the High Commissioner or the Council of State, will be allowed in practice to fall into desuetude.

The working committee appointed by the Administering Authority in consultation with Samoan authorities is now engaged in the drafting of important legislation relating to citizenship and citizenship rights and of the Constitution of the new State. In the preparation and adoption of a citizenship law, we hope that the working committee and the Legislative Assembly will give due weight to the concern of the United Nations that a common domestic status should be developed for all inhabitants of Samoa regardless of race.

Our preference as a general rule is for an electoral system based on universal adult franchise but we would at the same time be opposed to any imposition of such a system against the wishes of the people. In so far as the Matai system conforms to the genius and traditions of the people of Samoa, we do not feel that it should be hastily condemned as undemocratic. We believe that in due time the Matai system will adapt and modify itself in response to the changing economic and social conditions and outlook. We endorse the Visiting Mission's suggestions made to the Samoan leaders that in addition to the general Matai roll, there should be a roll which might be called the Non-Matai roll, on which all persons whatever their racial origin, living outside the scope of the Matai system and not enjoying its privileges or carrying out its obligations should be entitled to register". While the implementation of this suggestion will not offend Samoan tradition, it will bring the electoral legislation of the Territory in closer conformity to modern electoral practice and the principles embodied in the Declaration of Human Rights. We also endorse the Mission's suggestion that the Constitution of Western Samoa, which is now under preparation, should contain "provisions on the lines of the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the contributions of other States."

The Administering Authority's annual report for the year 1958 states, and the Visiting Mission has also pointed out, that "the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are not met fully insofar as free and secret ballot and some other matters are concerned". The Visiting Mission has stated that certain provisions in the electoral methods whereby a candidate is elected simply because his nomination papers are signed by a majority of the Matai in his constituency "appears to be open to undue influence and pressure". The Mission appropriately observes that it knows of no similar provision in any other modern electoral system. Samoa being a Trust Territory, which is expected to achieve the final objective of the Trusteeship System shortly, it seems desirable that it should remove before the elections to be held on the eve of independence from its electoral system such provisions as are likely to arouse suspicion or criticism. We trust, therefore, that the Samoan leaders will in this matter of electoral legislation adopt the normal practice of holding elections under secret ballot whenever two or more candidates present duly completed nomination papers.

147

Needless to say that an efficient and adequate civil service is the backbone of any administration or government. We cannot too strongly emphasise that the Samoanisation of the Samoan Public Service should be carried out at an accelerated pace, and that the aim should be to prepare Samoan candidates for a great majority of 80 or so posts which are now manned by seconded non-Samoan officers. While we note with satisfaction the availability of scholarships and other training facilities provided by the Administering Authority and the Administering Authority's intention to continue to give assistance to Western Samoa in this as in other fields, we agree with the Visiting Mission that there is need for a wider range of training to equip the rapidly increasing number of Samoans to take over positions of importance in the Territory's public services. In paragraph 89 of its report, the Visiting Mission, stressing the great importance of this need, suggests that a list of posts for which Samoans ought to be trained should be drawn up by Western Samoan authorities as quickly as possible. As soon as that is done, we hope that generous assistance will be forthcoming from the Administering Authority in the preparation of an emergency programme for the training of selected Samoans to fill high administrative posts The Administering Authority and the Samoan authorities should also, in this connection, consider ways and means of availing themselves of such training facilities in public administration as may be obtainable from the United Nations.

The, question of economic viability of the territory, of paramount importance at all times, assumes special significance in the context of the impending independence of Samoa. The Visiting Mission has commented on the rapid growth of the territory's population and the fact that two of its three principal crops, namely, banana, copra and coco, are subject to severe price fluctuations in the world market. These are the two most important factors relevant to the economy of Western Samoa. It is obvious that the extreme dependence of Samoan economy on such products should be reduced. The curtailment of the already inadequate educational, health and social services, which followed the economic crisis caused by the drop in prices of copra and coco last year, is an ugly reminder of the comparatively precarious nature of the territory's economy. We were heartened to hear from the Special Representative that though the present economic situation cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory, it is not likely to worsen considerably in the next 20 to 30 years. Nevertheless, as no doubt the Administering Authority and the Samoan authorities themselves recognise and as has been emphasised by the Visiting Mission, urgent steps have to be taken for the diversification of agriculture. Already experiments have been carried out and it appears that the cultivation of coffee, avocado, spices and manila hemp is a distinct possibility. Side by side with the expansion of agriculture and diversification of crops, it appears necessary to introduce cottage industries, handicrafts and small industries not requiring too much capital, which will process the raw materials produced in the island. To this end liberal and imaginative credit and financing facilities such as can be provided by the Bank of Western Samoa will be of great assistance.

The observation of a survey team that "Western Samoa appears to have adequate resources at its disposal to finance its social services and accelerate economic development" is significant and hopeful and it is gratifying to note that a beginning has now been made in the field of economic planning. The economy of the territory being more or less exclusively agricultural, the first threevear plan appropriately lays emphasis on increase "in the productivity of agricultural resources" on diversification of agriculture through the introduction of new commercial crops, such as coffee, rubber, etc. and on the establishment of secondary industries based on the territory's produce. These are steps in the right direction. It seems to us that in the field of economic development also there will have to be a crash programme. In this task we are sure that the New Zealand authorities will extend all necessary assistance, as the financial and technical resources for economic development would hardly be within the capacity of the territory itself to furnish. We would endorse the Mission's recommendations (paragraph 122) that in view of the responsibility of the United Nations towards Western Samoa, favourable consideration should be given to any requests for assistance to Western Samoa by the United Nations Organisation such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the United Nations Special Fund etc., and by the Specialised Agencies.

Of special importance to the future economic development of Western Samoa is the Western Samoa Trust Estates Corporation to whose activities members of the Visiting Mission have paid tribute. It is encouraging to note that the Corporation has started making its financial contribution of the order of œ 30,000 annually to the administration's development resources. In the past the Corporation has been divested of large areas of its estates for various reasons with the result that its present possessions amount to some 32,000 acres of which only 15,000 are now tinder cultivation. We hope the Corporation will take steps to add to its land resources and to bring more land

148

under cultivation so as to enhance its ability to contribute to the economic and agricultural development of Samoa during the years to come.

In the field of social development including the provision of medical and health facilities, it is our impression that despite the set-back due to the financial stringency of 1957-58, the territory has made noteworthy progress. A programme for the control of yaws has been successfully completed with . the assistance of the World Health Organisation, and it may be expected that the participation of that Organisation in the proposed tuberculosis control project will produce equally noteworthy results. Samoa, perhaps, is the only Truss Territory where a maternity and child welfare centre exists in each village. These are commendable achievements, but we agree with the conclusions of the World Health Organisation that there is room for further expansion of health facilities, and we hope that the appointment of a Minister of Health will stimulate much needed progress in this sphere.

We would commend the observations of the World Health Organisation furnished in document T/1455 to the attention of the Administering Authority and the appropriate authorities of Western Samoa. The WHO has stated that the most appropriate assistance that the territory may expect from it would be in the form of fellowships for training more and better qualified Samoan personnel. We are confident that the Administering Authority will, in consultation with the Samoans, formulate its proposals for assistance from the World Health Organisation in the training of indigenous personnel.

As the Visiting Mission has noted in paragraph 125 of its report, the Women's Committees are doing impressive work in combating infantile mortality and in ensuring the proper care and nutrition of mothers and young children.

Women's activities need not be confined merely to the field of health and healtheducation. We have no doubt that Samoan women will continue to serve their country with distinction in numerous fields of national activity. We have noted with satisfaction that as against 351 male teachers in Samoan primary, secondary and vocational schools, there are 386 women teachers. The capacity of the Samoan women to render service to the nation cannot, therefore, be doubted. Last year my delegation had the occasion to offer its felicitation to Miss Fanafi Ma'ai'i,a young Samoan lady who had distinguished herself in academic studies. This year the Special Representative has given us the news of another young Samaon lady, Miss Teresa Hunter, senior warden of women at the Training College

in Western Samoa, who has performed a notable role in the biannual South Pacific Conference held at Rabaul recently. We hope that Samoan women, with their grace and intelligence will play an increasingly important role in their national life including participation in the political life of the country.

The Special Representative informed the Council the other day that a "somewhat agonising re-appraisal of the whole education problem" of the territory is now impending. In this particular sphere of the territory's development there are both bright and dark features which the Council should take note of. One commendable feature is that practically the entire adult population of territory is literate to some degree. In the field of primary education about 80 per cent of the children of school-going age are now on the rolls. A good educational basis, therefore. exists in the territory for the introduction of universal, free and compulsory education in Western Samoa. We realise that in view of the territory's financial limitations, it may not be possible at this stage to introduce universal free and compulsory education all at once. It is gratifying to note, however, that that is the aim ; and that the Administering Authority and Samoan Government intend to introduce universal, free and compulsory education at least in some selected areas on experimental basis in the very near future.

The immediate need in the field of primary education appears to be the development of an inspectorate and a system of inspection to bring the large number of Mission schools under an adequate measure of Government control and to ensure the requisite amount of uniformity in the instructions imparted in primary schools of different kinds and categories. The Visiting Mission's observation that the lack of a sense of common effort among the different groups of educational workers towards the establishment of a single public educational system for Western Samoa, will, we hope, be carefully noted, and measures suggested by the Visiting Mission to rectify the situation adopted without delay.

The Visiting Mission's impression "that the educational situation in Samoa is not satisfactory for a territory which is soon to be self-governing or independent" would appear to be based on the fact that development of facilities for vocational training, and for secondary and higher education has lagged behind with the result that unless expeditious measures are now adopted to fill the gap which has been allowed to grow in the recent

149

years, independent Samoa will remain dependent on expatriate officials and technicians for an indefinite period. We recognise the force of the views expressed by the Visiting Mission, and we wholeheartedly support the recommendations they have made on the subject.

We appreciate that for several years to come it will not be financially possible for Western Samoa to provide all the facilities it needs for vocational and higher education in the territory itself. The territory should, therefore, be encouraged to develop in consultation and cooperation with other territories in the Pacific region, higher educational facilities for common needs. While it may not be possible to establish new institutions at this stage, no effort should be spared in the further development of Avele Agricultural College, in raising the standard of instruction at the Samoa College, and in improving the existing facilities in the Teachers' Training College and in the district schools. We note with satisfaction the assurances given by the Special Representative that it is the intention of the Government of Western Samoa to establish a High School in the island of Savi'i before the end of 1960.

Mr. President, if we have ventured to examine sometimes perhaps critically, the existing conditions in the territory and to offer suggestions it is only because of our anxiety to see that Samoan independence is real and that the preparations preceding such independence are adequate and appropriate. Samoa is a small territory with a small population and with perhaps not enough natural resources. It will need all the Administering Authority's sympathetic care and guidance, in the preparations preceding independence, and, even after independence, there will be need for close co-operation between New Zealand and Western Samoa in various fields to the mutual advantage of both. We were very happy to learn of the assurance given by the Prime Minister of New Zealand to the Visiting Mission that his Government would closely and sympathetically consider the possibility of arranging substantial assistance in the implementation of the Visiting

Mission's proposals concerning the improvement and expansion of educational facilities existing in Western Samoa. This is indeed in line with the spirit in which New Zealand has through the years approached its tasks and responsibilities towards Western Samoa and is a happy augury for the future relations between New Zealand and Western Samoa.

Before I conclude, I would like also to express our appreciation of the remarkable work which the Fautua and other Samoan leaders in and outside the Government are doing to ensure a propitious and prosperous future for their country and community in the years of independence, the advent of which is now close at hand. We hope that as Western Samoa approaches nationhood and independence, its leaders and those of New Zealand, who are closely connected with Western Samoa, will continue their efforts to place this island territory in contact with the world at large. We have always believed that in this territory, and in others in the pacific area surrounding it, there is a culture and a civilization which the world has yet to discover. In his opening statement the other day, the High Commissioner pointed out that recent research has shown that the Samoans have lived in their islands from as early as 1,000 B. C., though little of their ancient history and culture is now known. We hope that with the emergence of the first independent Polynesian State and with the continued spread of education in that State, there will be a new revival and efflorescence of the culture and civilization of these peace-loving peoples.

INDIA USA WESTERN SAMOA NEW ZEALAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PHILIPPINES MALDIVES

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Ruanda-Urundi

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on June 29, 1959 conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian Administration.

Following is the full text of the statement:

Mr. President :

We have had a detailed report from the Administering Authority on the conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Besides, the Special Representative for the Territory and the distinguished representative of Belgium have further enlightened us on various points in the course of their patient and painstaking answers to various questions asked by members of the Council. We are grateful to them. We are now in a position to make our general observations.

The task, Mr President, of promotion of the economic and social welfare and preparation of the people of a Trust Territory to independence is an onerous one. This is primarily the responsibility of the Administering Authority but it is also at the same time a co-operative endeavour of the Administering Authority and the peoples of

150

a trust territory acting in mutual confidence and partnership. The Council can only help by its comments and commendations, criticisms and suggestions, made in a helpful and "constructive spirit. It is in this spirit that I would approach the Administering Authority's Report on Ruanda-Urundi for the year 1957.

We are happy to note that in the last twelve years, during which. Belgium has administered Ruanda-Urundi as a Trust Territory, considerable progress has indeed been achieved in many fields of the Territory's life.

In the field of health, to begin with, the progress made so far has been striking. As the World Health Organization points out, the administration deserves to be 'congratulated on the success of the 10-Year Development Plan since its formulation in 1951, particularly in regard to the expansion of medical care facilities, training of indigenous health personnel, control of malaria, tuberculosis and other infectious diseases, which were formerly prevalent in the Territory and in the improvement of water-supply. The construction of new hospitals and dispensaries has continued in the last few years with the result that the existing facilities of in-patient accommodation amount to one bed for each one-thousand of the Territory's inhabitants. This, in our view, is a major achievement for which the Administering Authority should be given credit. The increase in the strength of several categories of auxiliary health staff has also been satisfactory and has led to the expansion of health establishments. It is my delegation's hope that the training facilities that exist in this field will continue to be expanded so that indigenous staff can be trained in all the various fields of healthactivity before long.

We note with satisfaction the continuing increase of qualified medical personnel in Ruanda-Urundi, but we cannot fail to observe that as yet there is not a single qualified indigenous doctor in the Territory. Fully qualified medical personnel continues to be exclusively expatriate. This shortcoming stems from the fact that in the last few years secondary and higher education appear to have been comparatively neglected, and consequently there has been a dearth of suitably qualified young people who could be given higher training in medicine. Of educational facilities in the Territory, I shall speak later. We would, however, commend to the Administering Authority 'he observations of the World Health Organisation that in order "to assist in this evolution, consideration might be given to extending the scope of the pre-university institute recently opened at Astrider to include preparation for medical, dental and pharmacy studies".

In education, again, following considerable expansion and improvement of facilities during 1957, further noteworthy progress has been made during 1958. For example, as against 5764 primary classes or grades in 1957 there were 6033 in 1958. The percentage of expenditure on education in relation to the total budget of the Territory has also continued to rise. While these trends are satisfactory the fact remains that the percentage of children enrolled in primary and secondary schools to the total population of school-going age is no more than 21. If one remembers that the population of the Territory is itself increasing at a fast rate thereby adding, year after year, to the numbers of the children of school-going age, the rate of expansion of the facilities for primary education does not appear to be adequate, and as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has pointed out in its observations (Document T/1442) considerable effort is needed in the drive to make education universal, and that "energetic steps should be taken to palliate the serious falling off of school enrolment, and to provide six years, primary schooling for the maximum number of children". We are confident that the Administering Authority will take the necessary steps with a view to achieving such a goal.

Though the percentage of girl students on the rolls of primary schools has risen to 29 in 1958, the number of girl students is still small. The Special Representative's description of the position of women in Ruanda-Urundi indicates they are very far from occupying the position they ought to occupy if Ruanda-Urundi is to have a balanced, dynamic and creative society. It is, therefore, essential that special attention should be devoted to the education of girls with a view to elevating the position of women in Ruanda-Urundi. We realize the existence of social prejudices as a bar to progress. But the inertia has to be broken down. We are aware that the Administering Authority is conscious of the great need for special measures for the promotion of education among women, and it is heartening to learn that the indigenous authorities are also showing greater consciousness of the special efforts needed in that direction. It is, therefore, our hope that when we examine the educational conditions in this Trust Territory next year the representative of the Administering Authority will be in a position to give a more promising picture of girls' education in Ruanda-Urundi.

The Trusteeship Council has, on several

151

occasions, commented on the inadequacy of government's participation in the operation of educational institutions especially in the primary field. Out of a total of 2873 schools of the Territory in 1957 only 15 were government schools. While we recognize that the Administration shares a large part of the expenditure on Mission and private schools through subventions and subsidies, we feel that there should be greater direct participation and responsibility for primary education on the part of the Government. Side by side there should be further strengthening of the Government inspectorate for education to ensure supervision and co-ordination.

Our experience in India has shown that rapid increase in school attendance, specially in the school attendance of girls, cannot be achieved until the parents themselves have been educated. School education must, therefore, be accompanied by a sustained effort to achieve universal literacy through extensive programmes of adult education. From the information made available to the Council it appears that the activities for the promotion of adult education are confined largely to chapel schools. The number of adults attending these schools in 1957 fell to 460,000 from 620,000 in 1956. In addition there are six schools, which impart formal instruction in reading and writing to adults, and the attendance in these schools in 1957 was as small as 549. it is our view, and this is supported by UNESCO, that the programmes of adult education should be intensified. Sufficient use does not appear to have been made of media. of mass education, such as films, the radio and other audio-visual methods. The United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organisation should be in a position to lend considerable assistance to the Administering Authority in the promotion of adult education, and we would recommend that the Administering Authority should draw freely upon the resources that UNESCO may have to offer in this field.

The Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories gave a good deal of attention to the ways and means of popularising adult education among illiterate masses. The educational conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi are not very different from those prevailing in the neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territories. The conclusions of the Committee on Information would. therefore, be relevant to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi as indeed in respect of other Trust Territory in Africa. We would, therefore, commend a study by the Administering Authority of the Report of the Tenth Session of the Committee on Information in connection with the spread of education in the Trust Territory.

It seems to us that secondary and vocational

education in the Territory has been given inadequate attention in the past, and present problems of the Territory relating to the non-availability of suitably qualified personnel for higher training in, administration, in medicine and engineering, largely result from this fact. In normal circumstances, the percentage of secondary school enrolment to primary enrolment should not be below 25. However, the percentage of secondary and vocational pupils in the Territory numbering less than 3000 to primary pupils numbering 250,000 in round figures is just about 1.2. These figures highlight the necessity of adopting special measures for the promotion of secondary education in the next two or three years. It appears from the report that while the number of pupils enrolled in secondary and vacational schools registered a slight increase in 1957, there was no appreciable expansion in the facilities for secondary and vocational education. While some measures would appear to have been adopted to improve the situation, too much emphasis seems to have been placed on the academic element in secondary and vocational education. For example, the measures recently adopted relate to the establishment of "the upper humanities stream" the introduction of a rhetoric class and of courses of study in Greek and Latin. While the study of humanities has great value and should not be neglected emphasis could, in our view, be better placed at this stage on the professional, technical and vocational aspects of education. Training in handicrafts merits special consideration and should form part of the curricula of secondary and vocational schools. We note with some concern that whereas the 10-Year Plan provided for the establishment of 30 institutions imparting instruction in handicrafts, only 13 have so far been established. We note the increase in the number of students from the Trust Territory starting or continuing post-secondary and university education in the Belgian Congo and elsewhere. It must, however, be recognised that for higher education the inhabitants of the Territory should not have to depend on institutions abroad, but increasing provision for such education must be made, to the maximum extent possible, in the Territory itself. It is necessary that those who are later to become administrators, doctors and engineers, must as far as possible be trained in these professions in the territory itself so that they learn and develop their knowledge and skill in the milieu in which they are to serve their people.

Greater attention should, therefore, be paid to the establishment in the near future of institutions of higher education in the Territory itself.

152

The Council will, no doubt, note with satisfaction the establishment of social and cultural centres which are doing useful work in the Territory; and we hope that the number of such centres will continue to multiply in the future. The existence and augmentation of the scope of the activities of these centres is necessary for the social uplift of the Territory's inhabitants.

We note with some regret that the dissemination of information regarding the United Nations and the Trusteeship Council is not taking place in the Territory on an adequate scale. The 1957 Visiting Mission had noted that the people of Ruanda-Urundi knew very little about the status of their country as a Trust Territory and about the principles and purposes and the work of the United Nations. Absence of adult literacy and limited education would inevitably appear to restrict the spread of such knowledge, but nevertheless this matter deserves greater consideration by the Administering Authority. We hope that in view of the General Assembly's Resolution 1276 (XIII) the Administering Authority will give urgent consideration to the question of establishing a United Nations Information Centre in the Trust Territory.

In the economic field the Territory's budget has continued to increase, the ordinary part of it amounting approximately to twenty-million dollars in 1958. Even allowing for some difference in the real value of money, the people's purchasing power, and the Territory's total production would appear to have increased, despite the temporary setbacks in the production of minerals and coffee. The threat of famine has been considerably reduced in the last few years. While food production has increased, the Territory's economy has been further strengthened by the development of cash crops, such as coffee and cotton. The cultivation of tea which is being tried on an experimental basis might be a new factor of considerable significance to the Territory's economic future. These are achievements for which we wish to pay a tribute to the Administering Authority and the people of Ruanda-Urundi.

Though progress in the establishment of new industries and in the expansion of existing industry has not come up to original expectations, there is much for which the Administering Authority needs to be congratulated. It can be expected that with the development of new resources of electric power from the Ruzizi the expansion of industry will receive a new stimulus in the near future.

The state of the mining industry, however, leaves to be desired: There has as yet been no complete survey of the Territory's mineral resources. On the other hand, several mines of tin and tin-bearing ores, which had been worked satisfactorily, have been closed down for reasons, which are not clear and, at any rate, do not appear to be related to the best economic interests of the Territory. Tin exports constitute about 22% of the total value of the Territory's exportable produce and the production and export of tin to the maximum extent possible is, therefore, of crucial significance to the Territory's balance of trade and to its economy in general. We, therefore, hope that the Administering Authority will take expeditious action to restore operation of the mines that have been closed down. But of the 292 mines now in operation 182 are those which yield tin or tin-bearing ores. A large part of the labour-force engaged in extracting industry is employed in these mines. We hope that the Administering Authority will give them all possible encouragement to organize themselves into a trade union. We would also reiterate the recommendation of the 1957 Visiting Mission that the establishment of a bureau or department of mining in the Territory's administration should now be given serious consideration.

May 1, here, in passing mention how much we have regretted that the I.L.O. has not been able to participate actively in our examination or to assist us in the examination of conditions pertaining to labour, labour wages and social welfare work in the Territory. Our regret is the greater as we believe that the I.L.O. with its specialised knowledge and expertese in these fields has the competence to make a signal contribution to our deliberations. We hope that we shall not be deprived of the benefit of the I.L.O.'s assistance in our future work relating to Ruanda-Urundi and other Trust Territories.

Mr. President, the need for increasing the participation of the inhabitants of the Territory in the development and exploitation of its resources cannot be over-emphasised. So far there has been no visible evidence of such participation on the part of the indigenous inhabitants in any field. Even to-day almost the whole of the import and export trade and the wholesale trade of the Territory remains in the hands of Europeans. The FAO, the WHO and the UNESCO have, in their observations of the Administering Authority's report emphasised the necessity of allowing the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory their proper share in the formulation and implementation of the policies of the Territorial Government. It is to be regretted that no permits have so far been granted

153

to the indigenous inhabitants for the mining of the Territory's mineral resources. We would suggest that this situation should be rectified, as its persistence for any length of time may result in the perpetuation of foreign monopolies on the Territory's resources, which may not always work in the best interests of the inhabitants to whom these resources belong. No economic advancement and development of the Territory can be real and enduring without participation, and what is perhaps even more important, a sense of participation by the people of the Territory.

It is necessary in our view that banking and credit facilities should be developed in the Territory to enable the indigenous inhabitants to take an ever increasing share in the development and expansion of industries as well as trade. We are glad to note that indigenous participation in retail trade is growing, and we are confident that this trend will be strengthened by suitable measures on the part of the Government. This is a salutary trend which we hope will extend to other fields of the Territory's economic life.

The 10-Year Development Plan, which is now in its last lap, did not envisage or ensure participation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory. The new Plan, which will, no doubt, follow the previous one should rectify this situation. It will be appropriate at this stage to suggest that a national development council or board to advise the Administering Authority in the formulation of the new plan, and later to assist in its implementation, should now be formed. We would look forward to welcoming the establishment of such a body in the course of the next discussion of conditions in Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. President, on several occasions in the past we have expressed the view that it is obligatory on the Administering Authority to inform the Council of the way in which the Territory is associated with the European Common Market and of any opinions which representative bodies might express on that question. The Trusteeship Agreement entities the Administering Authority to constitute Ruanda-Urundi into a fiscal union only with adjacent territories. We doubt that the Administering Authority is competent to link, irrevocably, the economic future of of the Trust Territory to any other community or group of countries far away. Such a measure would be clearly inconsistent with the objective of the international Trusteeship system and with the provisions of the Agreement in respect of the Territory, as likely to inhibit or retard the economic independence of the Territory, which, in turn, might adversely affect the goal of self-government or political independence. From the statements on behalf of the Administering Authority before this Council it would appear that the one and the only consequence of the association of the Trust Territory with the European Economic Community is the allocation from the community's resources to the Territory of an overall credit of ten-million dollars for five years. This would appear to us to be an oversimplification. There are larger questions involved such as the direction of the Territory's trade and the exploitation of its mineral and other resources. These ought to be investigated in detail, and we would suggest that the Administering Authority furnish information to the Trusteeship Council on all the possible consequences of the Territory's association with the European Economic Community. What the Council is interested is to see that the economic interests in general and the resources in particular of Ruanda-Urundi are not mortgaged to outside interests, to the detriment of its own future economic and political independence. In this connection we are obliged to note that the opinion of the advisory organs in the Territory was not consulted before associating the Territory with the European Common Market.

In the field of agriculture my delegation notes with appreciation several measures relating to water-conservation, soil-preservation, drainage and cultivation of marshy lands and the resettlement schemes. The Council will no doubt take note with appreciation and commendation of these and of the improvements introduced in the method of stock-breeding and in the activities of the veterinary department of the Territory which, in view of the large livestock population of the Territory, are of special significance.

In its report on the Rural Economic Development of Trust Territories (Document T/1438) the Food and Agriculture Organization has made several useful observations concerning land-tenure and land-use problems in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. We commend these to the Administering Authority in the hope that it will invite the co-operation and assistance of the food and Agriculture Organisation in finding solutions to the many urgent and complex problems to which this Organization has drawn attention. We would, in particular, impress upon the Administering Authority the necessity of providing liberal credit facilities to enable peasants to adopt more modern and more productive agricultural methods. Another feature to which the FAO has drawn attention is the absence of agriculture co-operatives and programmes of community development and the lack of indigenous 154

participation in the few co-operatives and programmes of this kind which exist under government management. We hope that the Administering Authority will give due consideration to these observations.

Mr. President, in his opening statement the other day the distinguished representative of Belgium remarked that "to satisfy hunger is the essential need of man". That is, indeed, true but the truth of this statement is only partial. There are other essential needs of man, and the distinguished representative himself referred to at least one other, namely, the hunger of the spirit of man for a faith or belief or religion, and he pointed out how this particular hunger is being satisfied by the spread of the universal principles of Christianity. We cannot, however, ignore yet a third kind of hunger-the hunger for freedom which in its Collective aspect manifests itself as the desire for national independence.

Mr. President, the Administering Authority has done well in the economic field. Much has been done to satisfy the physical needs of the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi through extensive development work at enormous expense from its own resources, in the fields of agriculture, industry, health and education. We gladly acknowledge the success achieved hitherto in these fields. We note, however, that not much progress has been made in the last ten or twelve vears towards the political goal of self-government or independence-and, as I said on another occasion, these words we regard as synonymous. Political institutions such as they are in the Territory are in a rudimentary stage and the developments during the last few years-years which have seen revolutionary and historic changes in Africa and other parts of the worlddo not appear to indicate any measurable speed in the development of political institutions and the devolution of political authority to the people.

The Administering Authority has hitherto been cautious perhaps more than cautious-in the matter of introducing political reforms with a view to securing participation of the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi in the administration of the Territory. To some extent, Mr. President, such caution is understandable, having regard to the somewhat peculiar features of Ruanda-Urundi, including the socioeconomic composition of its population. However, the Administering Authority appears to have proceeded on the basis that education and economic development of the Territory should come before political reforms, and the introduction of democratic institutions. Such a theory would appear to have the partial backing of a section of Ruanda-Urundi population. The fact remains, Mr. President, that to treat social and economic development as apart and distinct from political progress is impossible in modern times; and the recent history of various countries which have newly emerged into freedom clearly shows that political progress can be delayed only at the risk of creating the most unhealthy pressures and eruptions. Likewise, political advancement without social and economic progress creates difficult and complex problems which tend to make political freedom shadowy. It is also now recognized as indeed experience has shown that the fullest participation of the people in the decisions connected with their social and economic development is essential. It seems to us, therefore, that social and economic progress, of which there is ample evidence in Ruanda-Urundi should go hand in hand with political progress and that the people of Ruanda-Urundi should increasingly participate in the decisions concerning themselves. In this way alone Ruanda-Urundi would be able to progress in a balanced and enduring way towards the attainment of the objectives set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

This is all the more necessary. Mr. President. because Ruanda-Urundi is in the heart of Africa and cannot remain isolated from the mighty forces that are surging around it. The whole of Africa is on the march and revolutionary concepts of social and political freedom are sweeping that great continent. The wave of African freedom can no longer be ignored. The, Administering Authority cannot be unaware of the developments in other parts of Africa, particularly in the territories in the neighbourhood of Ruanda-Urundi. It will be the path of wisdom to take note of these movements and forces; otherwise Ruanda-Urundi is likely to be left a straggler on the African continent, out of tune with its surroundings and with the aspirations and thinking of newly resurgent fellow Africans.

As early as 1955, my delegation expressed its appreciation of the measures adopted by the Administering Authority to establish the prototypes of future legislatures in the form of High Councils for Ruanda and Urundi, but while doing so we had also expressed the hope that the powers of these forums of discussion would be immediately extended to give them a representative and legislative character. In their scope, in the nature of their representation or in the quality of the powers these Councils exercise, they are no different today from what they were five years ago. At the level of High Council or Chiefdom Council or Sub-Chiefdom Council the real source of authority is still the chief, as it was then.

155

It is true that a General Council of Ruanda-Urundi is now an additional feature of the Territorial scene; but out of its 45 members, only 16 happen to be Africans who are not elected by the people. In answer to a question the Special Representative stated that "one of the great advantages of the General Council of Ruanda-Urundi is that as decisions are not taken by the majority, the opinion of the minority can be followed and can give rise to changes of decisions already taken." I assume that he was suggesting that the opinions of the African Members, who are in a minority, carry special weight with the Government of the Territory. This is satisfactory as far as it goes, but it is, in our view, no substitute for democratic practices and a democratically constituted body in the Territory.

In 1957 the Visiting Mission of the United Nations had concluded that the Trust Territory was ready to assimilate an increasing number of profound reforms. This conclusion has been endorsed by the Belgian Government then, but unfortunately apart from introducing an clement of indirect popular participation in elections at the level of Sub-Chiefdom Councils, little has been done to formulate or introduce profound reforms of which the Visiting Mission spoke in 1957. We would urge on the Administering Authority to undertake the reform of the General Council so that the African element should form a majority of members who are elected and not nominated by the Governor as at present.

Mr. President, the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi might have existed in geographical, economic and political isolation in the past, but today the picture is a very different one. To talk of geographical isolation of one part of Africa from the rest of the continent or indeed from the rest of the world, in this day and age would be anachronistic. The economic isolation has been broken down completely by the efforts of the Administering Authority itself, and the evidence of this is to be found in the charts tabulating information about the territory's trade with foreign countries. Even before the establishment of modern means of communication, such as roads and airport facilities, the concept of economic isolation of the Territory from its neighbours would have had limited validity. For, in centuries past, labourers, peasants and pastoralists have gone in their hundreds and thousands from Ruanda-Urundi to neighbouring Tanganyika, Uganda and the Congo. The Special Representative himself remarked the other day in his answer to one of the many questions that were put to him that emigrants, who go from Ruanda-Urundi to find

work in neighbouring countries bring with them new political ideas and aspirations from those territories.

Therefore, Mr. President, we are convinced that the speed of political advance in the territory needs considerable acceleration. This we think is the supreme task of the Administering Authority in consultation with the people.

The distinguished representative of Belgium said in his opening statement that what is most important is the spread of the democratic spirit, and this will require development in depth. This view is unexceptionable but we hope that it does not imply a continued slowness of progress in the political field. The "Manifesto of the Bahutu" and the "Statement of Views" of the High Council of Ruanda, the two documents with which this Council is familiar, give sufficient evidence of the, political maturity of the people of Ruanda-Urundi and of their desire and readiness for democratic association with and participation in the Government of Ruanda-Urundi at various levels. We believe that time has come for the Administering Authority to guide the people of Ruanda-Urundi towards the establishment of healthy and democratic institutions. For this purpose it is essential that opportunities should be given for the formation of political parties in the territory, of which there has been comparative absence so far and which the Administering Authority appears to have frowned upon in the past.

It is in this context that we welcome the visit of the working group constituted by the Belgian Government, which has had consultations with various people and organizations in the Territory. We understood from the statement of the distinguished representative of Belgium that these reforms will deal with (a) the exercise of legislative functions by indigenous bodies ; (b) the integration of the services maintained by the indigenous administration and the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory ; (c) the question of the development of central institutions of the Territory, such as the General Council and of their powers ; and, lastly, with the question of the introduction of universal suffrage in elections to the various Councils of the Territory. These will certainly be steps in the right direction and we hope that Ruanda-Urundi will soon make a measurable

advance towards self-government and independence-the goals of the Trusteeship system.

It is particularly gratifying to note that the Administering Authority considers that the time has now arrived to introduce universal suffrage at

156

least in elections to the Sub-Chiefdom Councils. The Trusteeship Council has made recommendations on the subject in the past, and we are of the view that this measure has already been considerably delayed. We, therefore, hope that the measures to be adopted in this regard at this late stage will be liberally conceived and equally liberally implemented. We also hope that the introduction of universal suffrage will not be restricted only to elections at the sub-chiefdom level. It is equally necessary to ensure the full participation of women in elections at various levels. No territory or country can go forward if its women, who constitute half the population, are denied their political rights. There are other Trust Territories in Africa where women play an effective and valuable role in their political life. There is no reason to believe that women of Ruanda-Urundi are less capable or that the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi is not equally progressive in its outlook or that its male population is less charitable towards its women than that of those other Trust Territories.

We have had occasion to point out that the dual European-indigenous character of the Territory's administration is likely to raise difficult problems when the time comes for the final transfer of power to the inhabitants of the Territory. We are, therefore, glad to note that the impending reforms will deal with the question of integrating the services of the two administrations. Apart from this particular aspect of the question it seems necessary that special attention should now be paid to the question of training indigenous personnel for high administrative posts of the Territory's government. While the number of Africans in the Belgian administration of the Territory has increased during the last few years, almost all the posts held by them are junior posts, and senior administrative posts continue to be held exclusively by Belgian personnel. This not only results in higher expenditure-I had pointed out earlier that about 32% of the entire administative expenditure is spent on European personnel

-but it also retards the Territory's progress towards self-government. In recent times, as is well-known, newly independent States have experienced serious difficulty owing to the inadequacy of trained personnel in administrative and other fields. While we note that recently a number of Africans have been promoted to junior levels in the Belgian administration, and that a limited number of scholarships for study and training abroad are made available to Africans, we feel that these facilities are inadequate and need to be expanded. We hope the Administering Authority will engage in a determined and extensive programme for the training of an ever-increasing number of Africans for the higher ranks of Ruandi-Urundi's civil service.

Mr. President, the Trusteeship Council has, in the past, shown considerable concern regarding the fact that a contingent of the "Force Publique du Congo Beige" is stationed in the Territory for the purpose of maintaining law and order. We regret to say that in our view there is no justification for the stationing of this Force in the Territory, at the expense of the Territory, amounting to over fourteen million francs per year. Whatever the historical origin of this Force, in our view it is neither necessary nor desirable to burden the Trust Territory, whose financial resources are inadequate, and whose budget suffers from a chronic deficit, with the maintenance and upkeep of a military or paramilitary force drawn from outside. If the Administering Authority considers it necessary to develop such a force to constitute the nucleus of the small territorial army, it should be created over the years from among the Territory's own inhabitants. It will give the people of Ruanda-Urundi the sense of responsibility for their own security.

Before I finish I would like to say a few words about the establishment of targets, with tentative dates for their fulfilment in the field of the Territory's political advancement. Both the General Assembly and this Council have on several occasions recommended the establishment of such targets by the Administering Authorities in consultation with the inhabitants of Trust Territories. We are therefore disappointed to hear what the distinguished representative of Belgium had to say on this matter. In answer to a question put to him, he said the following:- "If, during our consideration of the Territory's development, it should appear appropriate to establish certain stages, that will be done in agreement with the population concerned. But we refuse, as we shall always refuse, to commit ourselves to setting down timetables in the abstract."

Mr. President, my delegation has always made it clear that we do not believe that it is necessary to establish final timetables or that final time-limits for the achievement by a Trust Territory of the objectives of the Trusteeship system are essential. But we do believe that the establishment of intermediate targets with tentative dates for their fulfilment is essential and useful for stimulating and accelerating a Territory's development and can help the orderly and peaceful progress of a Territory towards the ultimate goal of independence.

157

The Administering Authority has itself drawn up plans and established targets and dates in the spheres of economic and educational development. The success of these plans would indicate the desirability of proceeding in a similar manner in the field of the Territory's political development. In his opening statement the distinguished representative of Belgium himself said that "the time is coming when this evolution"-I assume he was referring to the Territory's political evolution-"an invisible and salutary one, is attaining a level which must be reflected in the organic structures, in which we must readjust to the actual conditions." We interpret this to mean that the Territory has now reached a certain stage in its political development where planning ahead, in consultation with the people is not only feasible but highly desirable. Such planning, in our view, will be wise and will save the Administering Authority the painful processes of readjustment under the relentless pressure of circumstances. We would, therefore, earnestly commend the General Assembly's resolutions to the Administering Authority.

We note with some concern, Mr. President, that the people of Ruanda-Urundi do not yet enjoy many of the fundamental freedoms envisaged in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We view with satisfaction the partial removal of regulations and laws relating to compulsory labour, curfew and the movement of indigenous inhabitants from one area to another in the Territory. But the answers of the Special Representative to some questions that I put to him the other day clearly show that considerable restriction still exists on the movement of persons from agricultural to non-agricultural areas. Some formalities have also to be gone into in respect of movement of persons from one Chiefdom to another. These provisions appear to be contrary to Article 13 (1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, according to which "everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the, borders of each state". Apart from this aspect, it seems to my, delegation that such restrictions must inevitably inhibit enterprise and initiative, and affect the social and economic mobility of the population, which is essential to progress. Such restrictions are, in modern times, usually regarded as archaic and unprogressive. It also appears that because of various restrictions in the extra-customary areas, there is little encouragement for the formation of political organisations and the creation of free and healthy public opinion. It is hoped that the Administering Authority will give serious consideration to the question of removal of all such restrictions as early as possible.

Mr. President, I have spoken long and perhaps. in too much detail, but I have done so not only because it is our duty as members of this Council to subject reports of Administering Authorities to such constructive examination as might help in progress towards the objectives of Trusteeship System, but because we are appreciative of the progress achieved in Ruanda-Urundi under the Administering Authority in the social and economic fields, and we are confident of the capacity of Belgium, with its rich democratic experience and heritage, to guide and prepare the peoples of the Territory rapidly towards self-government and independence.

To be entrusted with the responsibilities of Administering Authority under the Trusteeship System of the United Nations is indeed a high and historic privilege. The record of the Trusteeship Council and of the Administering Authorities generally under this System has been a proud one. We have no doubt that under the impact of the great movement of freedom on the continent of Africa today, and under the guidance of the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council, the people of Ruanda-Urundi would soon attain their true and rightful political destiny.

INDIA USA BELGIUM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO UGANDA MALDIVES MALI **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

President Prasad's Broadcast Message

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad broadcast a message on June 15, 1959 on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the International Labour Organisation.

Following is the full text of the message :

I am speaking to you today on a special occasion. The International Labour Organisation is celebrating this year its 40th anniversary. India has been a member of this Organisation from the very beginning and it is well that we in India too join in the celebrations on this occasion and also celebrate the 40th anniversary of our membership of the I.L.O. Our Postal Department has issued a special stamp to mark this occasion and the

158

Indian delegation to the International Labour Conference which is now going on will naturally take part in the celebrations in Geneva.

After the first Great War, three international organisations were set up to help the cause of world peace-the League of Nations, the International Labour Organisation and the International Court of Justice. The work assigned to the I.L.O. was to help the cause of peace through the establishment of social justice. The main items of this work, then, were to secure improvement in the conditions of work by the regulation of hours of work, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of rest, recreation and social security, freedom to form trade unions and the organisation of technical and vocational education. This work has been going on continuously during the last 40 years and we can say that the people of the world everywhere have begun to enjoy the fruits' of the I.L.O.'s labours.

There are three main organs of the I.L.O.the International Labour Conference, which adopts international 'treaties' known as Conventions and Recommendations, the Governing Body which directs its affairs, and the Secretariat at Geneva in which some 800 nationals of nearly 60 countries carry on the work of research in social and economic questions throughout the year. Among these the International Labour Conference is perhaps the most important. It has been aptly called the World Parliament of Labour. Since 1919, representatives of governments, managements and workers have been taking part in this Conference. It has adopted 111 Conventions and the same number of Recommendations. These Conventions and Recommendations are placed before our Parliament regularly as soon as they are adopted and India has accepted so far 24 of these Conventions while a number of its labour laws have been influenced by some other international standards adopted by the Conference.

The I.L.O. has also redoubled its activities since 1944 as far as underdeveloped countries like India are concerned. The main features of this new work are the provision of technical assistance and the regional work.

The fact that even when India was under foreign rule, the I.L.O.'s influence could help in improving the conditions of our workers is a great tribute to this Organisation and we should appreciate it all the more when we realise that labour legislation and such other matters are the domestic affairs of each sovereign state. The I.L.O. has been gaining ground steadily only through the combined force of facts and international public opinion.

The chief armour of the I.L.O. is the study of facts. Its principal allies are public opinion and goodwill and its weapons are persistent and slow conversion through published data, negotiations and discussions. The major contribution of this great Organisation is that it has brought lasting improvements in working conditions, has enlarged the frontiers of social justice during the forty years of its existence and has given confidence to all men everywhere. When the International Labour Conference declared in Philadelphia in 1944, that "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere", it gave to humanity a new vision so that even the drooping and the wilted among mankind could straighten their backs and march towards the goal of Sarvodaya.

On this auspicious occasion, we pay our tribute to this great Organisation for all the good work it has done for social and economic progress. We are happy that the methods through which the I.L.O. functions are so much akin to the means through which India wishes to achieve Swaraj in the fullest sense. India has been an enthusiastic member of the I.L.O. more particularly since 1947, and I hope that the mutual co-operation between this country and the I.L.O. will continue in future. I have no doubt that this Organisation will achieve even greater success in the coming decades for the establishment of social justice. Its success is the success of all men of goodwill everywhere on whose work depends the future progress of mankind. It is never too often if we repeat the words of the founders of the I.L.O. that universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Prime Minister Nehru's Message

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru,

sent the following message to the International Labour Organisation on June 15, 1959 on the occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Organisation :

"I send to the International Labour Organisation, on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary, the good wishes of the Government and the people of India and our congratulations on the Organisation's record of successful endeavour and work in the field of international

159

co-operation. During the forty years of its existence, the world has changed greatly. Formed at the conclusion of the First World War, it saw the changes that came after that war and then it witnessed the Second World War. Since then even greater changes have taken place and new problems have arisen. Many countries, previously dependent on some colonial power, have gained independence and had to face the new problems that independence brought. These problems were essentially economic, for those countries, long suppressed in their economic growth by foreign rule, were anxious to develop rapidly and to raise the living standards of their people. Everyone of them had to face problems of industrial relations and to meet the challenge of new economic and social changes.

"Throughout this period, the I.L.O. has shown remarkable vitality and a capacity to adapt itself to the changing situation. From being an institution setting passive standards, it has developed into one which plays an active role in raising standards and helping the cause of industrial peace."

"I trust that the I.L.O. will continue to play its useful role and will not allow itself to be influenced by the tensions and conflicts in the political field."

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Shri G.L. Nanda's Speech

The Union Minister for Labour and Employment, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, who led the Indian delegation to the 43rd Session of the International Labour Conference, made a speech at the Conference held in Geneva on June 5, 1959.

Following is the full text of his speech:

I am repeating my visit to I.L.O. after 12 years. It coincides with a landmark in the history of the Institution-its fortieth anniversary. This is no small satisfaction to me.

When I first came to this place in 1947, the Organisation had already built up a magnificent record of achievement. Millions in many parts of the world had felt the impact of its activities in terms of better conditions of life and work. We remember with gratitude the pioneering effort of the I.L.O. during those earlier years.

In course of these 12 years, the I.L.O. had developed a new reach and depth in the concept of its functions and obligations and new areas have come within the scope of its activities. It happens that this period covers the tenure of the present Director-General, whom I met here, for the first time in 1947 and who himself had come to the I.L.O. scene as a newcomer that year. May I congratulate him on the excellent fare he has provided for us in the Annual Report, which is better every year like the work of the institution he represents?

I have spoken of the things done but it is clear that the mission of I.L.O. still remains largely unfulfilled. We have to recall frequently the inspiring words of the preamble to the Constitution of the I.L.O., which brings out the basic purposes of the Organisation, with the greatest accent on peace and social justice. Without peace we must lose all our gains of technical and social progress and without social justice there can be no peace for any community, small or big, whether a nation or the whole family of nations.

"And whereas conditions of labour exist, involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled, and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required" These words occur in the Preamble. Despite the vast increase in the capacity of mankind to create a world of plenty, these conditions still persist in large areas of the world. The cry for justice may still be heard from many quarters. In several underdeveloped and undeveloped countries, the levels of living of the bulk of the people are still extremely low, housing conditions have not improved and the number of those who suffer as a result of unemployment and under-employment has increased in spite of large efforts to stimulate economic growth.

The growth of democratic forces within a nation and the promotion of contacts between the nations, by the I.L.O. and other international agencies, may well have an unsettling rather than

160

a cementing influence, if there is no convincing evidence that the fruits of progress are being evenly shared within each community and as between different countries.

Through these years, international cooperation has developed and the I.L.O. stands pre-eminent in this sphere. but it appears that the acceptance of international responsibility has not gone far enough to bring about that extent of levelling up in the less fortunate areas of the world as to create an immunity against the forces of social and political disruption. Much more can be done by the more advanced countries to ensure that their policies do not harm or embarrass those who are lagging behind, but, on the other hand, enable them to develop and stand on their own legs. And if this is not heeded, obstacles will arise for the survival of democracy and the preservation of world peace. Social justice like peace is indivisible.

The code of international standards which

the I.L.O. has evolved through the decades is a remarkable product of co-operative endeavour among nations. A large leeway still remains to be made in the acceptance and implementation of these standards. Very often what is lacking is not the will but the means to ensure minimum standards of well-being to the bulk of the population in a country. It is, therefore, only right and proper that the I. L. O. should apply itself increasingly to the study of the processes of economic and social change and the basic causes of the present incapacity of certain countries to keep pace with the rest in respect of the observance of the standards which have been laid down.

The report of the Director General throws a revealing light on some of the deeper and more obscure issues concerning the forces of economic and social development. Each Region and each country has its special problems and no general theory of development will be of much avail to a less developed country in uncovering all its problems and furnishing guidance for the type of social action and economic policy which will be capable of producing the best results in each case. It is very welcome therefore that the Director General's Report gives evidence of a keen appreciation of the importance of the regional aspect both for its deliberative and its operational work. This emphasis needs to be greatly strengthened.

In the same context may be viewed the growing awareness of the importance of the institutional setting in which economic programmes are carried out. The success of these programmes and the rate of progress that is achieved in any country depend very much on the effectiveness of the institutions that exist or are being created for this purpose. In many places, it is the weakness in this respect which hinders progress while other circumstances may be favourable. This again is not a problem of a general kind. It has a distinctive character related to the situation in each area. There is a great deal of room and need for discovery and experimentation. The I.L.O. can assist in this search and in the task of readaptation to the rapidly changing conditions in the light of international experience. In India, we are constructing a new economic fabric. We are endeavouring to make the utmost use of the institutional arrangements which have their roots in the history and soil of the country, but we are also trying to develop a new frame-work which while fully geared to the demands of a complex

and quickly growing economy, would also be in accord with the temper and traditions of the country and the moral and social values which our people cherish. We have realised that the best way of securing social peace is to develop institutions-social, economic and political-to which the people may become passionately devoted because they satisfy their basic needs and urges.

For the purposes of the I.L.O., the machinery of industrial relations in each country has a special interest. We in India are engaged in a thorough review of the various institutions touching the employer-employee relations. We have recently introduced certain innovations to which a reference occurs in the Report of the Director-General. The Code of Discipline which has- won general acceptance on the part of employers, workers and the Government, as a voluntary arrangement, is designed to create an atmosphere in which industry can function smoothly and the rights and interests of workers are fully safeguarded. A Code of Conduct has been accepted by the main sections of organised labour to govern their mutual relations. We are about to enter upon a consideration of a Code of Efficiency and Welfare. To find a remedy for the recurring complaints about breaches of awards, agreements and legal regulations, machinery for implementation and evaluation has been set up by the Central Government as well as the State Governments.

A few months ago, a scheme for workers' participation in management was adopted and is being applied to a few selected establishments on a voluntary basis. I am convinced that unless an effective partnership is established between the workers and the managements in under-developed countries, the fullest use of resources of all kinds will not be possible and social tensions will not abate. It is only in day-to-day exercise of the

161

obligations and privileges of industrial democracy side by side with a steady advance towards a state of freedom from want and insecurity which will bring to the worker a realization of the meaning of freedom, give him a stake in peace and make him a staunch fighter for the values embedded in free institutions. I may mention here also certain features of the situation in our country in this context about which I do not feel happy. Works Committees, which have to be constituted as a legal obligation, show no signs of vigorous growth. Apathy of the workers as well as indifference on the part of the managements seem to be responsible for this state of affairs. The Trade Union movement in our country is divided on political lines and trade union rivalries are affecting adversely the interests of workers as well as industry. In the future economic organisation of our country, as I visualise it, the trade union must be one of the most important components of the new structure, carrying both high responsibility and great privileges. Without genuine unity, trade unions cannot attain this high status. And this will be the loss of the most vital element in the building up of a true and living democracy. We have done something already to remove the worst features of this discord, and we are exploring avenues of fostering internal harmony in the Indian Labour movement. We cannot, however, be oblivious of the fact that this problem is just a reflection of the big conflicts which have divided the nations of the world into warring camps. The attempts to resolve them on traditional lines have hitherto borne no fruit. We may have to fall back on other techniques of which Gandhiji spoke to us in our country, for tapping the moral reserves of humanity with the help of which Peace and Justice can be established in the world.

The question of employment figures prominently in the Report of the Director-General and I venture to make a few observations on this aspect. The employment experience of advanced countries is of limited help in dealing with the special features of the problems in underdeveloped countries. Here the main task is to remove the hindrances in the way of economic growth and to activise the economy so as to make it move forward fast enough The utmost that we in our country can do in the way of fresh investments would fall far short of the requirements of absorbing, from year to year, the new entrants to the labour force in non-agricultural operations. There exists now a large back-log of the unemployed and at the same time, under-employment, especially in rural areas, has already assumed serious proportions. It appears that our difficulties in the water arise also from the fact that a suitable institutional set up has not yet been developed in keeping with the special conditions which have emerged in the country. In India we are at present devoting intensive thought to the question of how we can

best harness the unutilised energies of our people in rural areas. In a democratic community this calls for a varied approach. The essence of it is that village councils and local organisations representing the people have to assume increasing responsibilities for building community assets, for providing minimum amenities and for local development generally. Everywhere the area of community operation in rural life has to be strengthened. it is also essential to arrange through local organisations and otherwise for special works projects which may reduce underemployment in stack periods and provide larger work opportunities than may arise in the ordinary course.

It is obvious that neither adequate standards of living nor full employment can be achieved without the most intensive effort on the part of all the people of a country which has to develop itself. As I see the problem, the nature of the effort in the coming years for securing this larger purpose has to be in the direction of raising the level of productivity continuously as also the level of enlightenment of the mass of workers and the people generally. I attach great importance, therefore, to the programmes relating to Productivity and Workers' Education which have been added to the armoury of the I L O. To these two programmes, I.L.O. should give increasing attention. In our country, we have taken up both in right earnest.

It is not workers alone who can gain by a programme of education. There is need for managerial development also. In an underdeveloped country reaching for a socialist horizon, the change in outlook and attitudes required on the part of persons responsible for running the economic machine is little short of a revolution. The way in which those who are in places of power and advantage discharge their obligations will to no small extent also determine the responses of the working class.

Rural development should claim increasing attention on the part of the I.L.O. in the coming years. I am glad that the Conference will discuss the subject at its next session. The Director-General's Report has taken notice of the Bhoodan movement in India which has now developed into Gramdan, i.e., villages in which the sense of personal property in land fades out and the village community becomes responsible for the wellbeing of every member. This movement bears

162

the seeds of a non violent agrarian revolution. In essence it is part of the wider aim of transforming the entire social and economic life of the people on the basis of the democratic values of truth and love. It is being guided by a great disciple of Mahatma Gandhi.

The Regional aspect of the work of the I.L.O., as I have mentioned earlier, is making a great appeal. It was only in November 1957 that, at our invitation, the Fourth Asian Regional Conference was held in New Delhi. We are grateful for this privilege. We expect that on the same lines, arrangements will be made for holding an African Regional Conference for special study of the problems of the African Region.

From the point of view of under-developed countries, I have also to suggest that the I.L.O.'s operational activities should be further broadened as a part of its regular programme. To give an example, more of direct operational and research work can be undertaken in under-developed countries, which, on the one hand, will enable the I.L.O. to have more first hand information of their problems and difficulties and, on the other, on the basis of its own rich experience, assist countries towards gradual attainment of the existing international standards. And may I also add that technical assistance to less developed countries should absorb much more of the resources at the disposal of the I.L.O. than has been found possible hitherto.

The ideological and political conflicts raging in the world are posing a threat to the very existence of what man has built up over thousands of years. The ferment and the turmoil may, however, well be a prelude to a new social synthesis and we may be on the eve of a new world situation, offering a broad common way towards world justice and world freedom, which all, according to their varying needs and experience, may tread. I take the more hopeful view because I believe that the affairs of Man are in his hands, but not in his hands alone.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister Nehru's Visit and Joint Communique

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to Nepal from June 11 to 13, 1959 at the invitation of the Nepal Government. On the conclusion of his three-day visit a Press Communique was issued simultaneously at Kathmandu and New Delhi on June 14,1959.

The following is the full text of the communique :

On the invitation of His Majesty the King of Nepal, the Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. paid a three-day visit to Nepal. The Prime Minister conveyed to Their Majesties the greetings and good wishes of the people and the Government of India. Shri Nehru was impressed by His Majesty's solicitude for the welfare of his people and his desire to strengthen the friendly relations which already exist between Nepal and India.

The Prime Minister of India also had several friendly and informal talks with the Prime Minister of Nepal and his colleagues in Government. In the course of these talks, a variety of subjects was discussed, including the present international situation and the recent developments in Tibet, and social and economic problems which are common to the two countries. There was an identity of views, the policies of the two countries, both in the international and domestic spheres, being animated by similar ideals and objectives. Both are convinced or the paramount necessity of world peace and the removal of the dangers of war, leading to progressive disarmament. The ample resources of the world could thus be diverted to the social and economic

advancement of people all over the world and, more particularly, in the under-developed countries.

The Prime Ministers are further convinced that in the interests of peace as well as national and human progress, no country should be dominated over by another and colonial control, in whatever form, should end.

The Prime Ministers earnestly trust that the talks at present going on in Geneva will lead to some steps being taken towards the lessening of tension and a progressive solution of the problems that threaten peace. They are convinced that they can best serve the cause of world peace as well as their countries' interests by adhering to the policy of non-alignment with military groupings and by maintaining friendly relations with all countries. In particular, they aim at greater

163

understanding and co-operation among the Asian countries.

Both Nepal and India are under-developed countries. India is at present half-way through her Second Five Year Plan and has had longer experience in planned development. The Prime Minister of India assured the Prime Minister of Nepal of his readiness to share this experience with Nepal. The two Prime Ministers recognised that each country is the best judge of its own needs. The geographical contiguity of the two countries, however, makes it inevitable that certain developmental projects can be best planned and executed by the joint endeavours of the two countries. The Kosi Project is the first such endeavour in co-operative development on a big scale. A similar project on the river Gandak is expected to provide irrigation facilities and cheap power to large areas at present under-developed in Nepal and India. The two Prime Ministers hope that an early beginning will be made with the execution-of this important project.

The Prime Minister of India was deeply touched by the kindness and courtesy of His Majesty the King and his Government and by the demonstrations of popular affection wherever he went in Nepal. He is grateful for this welcome which is largely due to the close bonds that exist between the people of Nepal and the people of India. There is no conflict of interest between the two countries and they face similar problems and have common approaches. The two Prime Ministers are determined to work for the welfare and advancement of the people in their respective countries, and to co-operate to this end.

NEPAL USA INDIA SWITZERLAND LATVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister Nehru's Speech at Royal Banquet

The Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to Nepal from June 11 to 13, 1959 at the invitation of the Government of Nepal. On June 11, Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Nepal gave a Banquet in honour of Prime Minister Nehru.

On this occasion, Shri Nehru made a speech in Hindi, an English translation of which is given below :

Your Majesties and gentlemen,

On this auspicious occasion, I am reminded of my last visit to this city and this country eight or nine years ago, when I came here for the first time at the invitation of your reverend father. I have been cherishing the memory of my first visit and it often tempted me to come here. You have just said that you invited me to come here some years ago, but it is only now that I have been able to be amongst you- I am sorry for this. It has not been simply due to the pressure of work that I have not been able to come here. The work is always there but there is a certain type of work that absorbs you completely and does not allow you to think of other things. Such were my engagements. But when you were kind enough to repeat your invitation some months back, when I met you at Kosi I was regretfully reminded of my inability to comply with your previous invitation and I readily accepted it. And now that I am here, an old hope seems to have been fulfilled.

Yours is a beautiful country and so is your city. But, whether I am in this country or in my country, or anywhere else my eyes are on the people. To look at their faces and into their eyes beaming with affection, does not simply give me a sense of satisfaction and joy ; it also creates a sort of relationship or bond between them and me. I had a proof of that affection once more here and for that I want to thank you, and the people of this city.

You know the sort of world in which we live. It is a complex and unsteady world; it often stumbles and sometimes one wonders why it has not yet met its doom. It has managed to survive so far, but the danger is always there. No one can say what will happen tomorrow. Who can take the responsibility of the whole world? At least your country or my country cannot take this big responsibility. There are bigger countries which play a major role in the affairs of the world and to a certain extent it can be said, they control the future of the world. But perhaps their power also is limited. It is difficult to say who controls the world. Even then it is hoped that the desire of the people of the world, which they have long cherished, will be fulfilled; that is : there will be peace in the world and that all countries and their people will flourish. There is no doubt that the people in some way or the other have always cherished this ideal of peace and progress but two new factors have appeared in the world of to-day. One of them is that war has become so dangerous that once it is started it will destroy, or nearly

164

destroy the whole of the world; and all civilization and culture, the achievement of thousands of years of patient effort, will come to an end. May be, some uncivilised people are left in some corner of the world. A great scientist perhaps Einstein once said that the war after the next will be fought with bows and arrows. Perhaps he meant to say that when the next war is fought, all the glorious achievements of the world will come to an end and if by chance some men are left they will sink into the state of the primitives who fought with bows and arrows.

Another new factor is this that for the first time in the history of the world, man has the power due to science or perhaps due to some other things, to eradicate almost all the wants and troubles of the world. For the first time it can be said that no body need live in poverty. It could not be said before because the world did not possess the means to feed, clothe and provide shelter to everybody. But the power which has come through science and through the products of science can eradicate all the wants. Of course, it will take some time. Nothing happens by miracle. Whatever our histories may say, it was never possible to provide all the people with the necessities of life and thus raise their standard of living. This thing which was beyond our power in the earlier time, has come under our power provided we devote some time and energy to it. It is a huge work but it can be done. It, of course, could not be done by any amount of effort in the earlier times.

Thus, these are the two new factors in the present-day world. On one side, there is the fear of war that will destroy the world, and on the other, the possibility of providing for all the people of the world which in a way, has been the dream of the people since time immemorial. One thing is good, another is evil. The problem before us is how to escape from this dangerous war. If we do not escape then there are no problems left to be solved. And if we do, then the problem before us is how to harness all our strength for eradicating all wants, troubles and diseases of the people. May be, you can solve this problem on paper. The time it takes will depend upon your capability to work. This problem is before us, in India, before you in Nepal and before several other countries. There are some countries of Europe and America where the problem of poverty has almost been solved. Actually nobody is poor there. May be, there are some poor people but their number is very small. They have other problems. But for the

countries of Asia and Africa this is the problem of primary importance.

I mean to say that there may be different problems before our countries but the basic problem before both of us is the same.

The first thing that we should understand is that whenever we go to another country we should represent our own country. Some people do represent their country but what is that thing of which they are the representatives. I often go out and often I think that if I want to represent India truly, I must represent the poor farmer of India and not the well-to-do people The farmer is needed most for India and really he is India. The well-to-do people are not India. The progress of India will be gauged by his progress. There is no other measuring rod.

This is the problem which constantly engage my mind, as I told you in the beginning. I grapples with it, struggles with it, tries to find a way out and sometimes achieves some sort of success. The problem before you also is the same. And certainly the same will be your difficulties, they may be even greater. The first thing to be accepted is that no problems are solved by miracle or trick. They are solved by hard labour and hard thinking. All that is obtained by one's trick is lost by another's trick It is not lasting. But all that is achieved by hard labour is lasting. It is only in the achievement of this that the nation progresses. And actually the brain and the brawn of the people are the real wealth of a country.

Thus, the problems that are before your and our country are basically the same, as they are before other countries also. We are closely related by history and tradition. Obviously, it is expected of us that we will help each other and co-operate with each other to the extent we can It is proper; but the important thing is the feeling behind it. It is necessary that our hearts should be clear. This does not mean that one accept all that the other says. This is not the meaning of friendship even between two individuals; how can it be between two countries. But it is necessary that our hearts should be clear and that we should look at each other with the eyes of love We must also trust each other. And it will be easy to do so if we keep our hearts clear

This will remove any misunderstanding between us.

In the present-day world we try, and it is proper to do so, to make friends with other

165

countries and if possible with all countries. We want to be friends with those countries with whom we had no relations before. Naturally, our relations should be closer and our ties stronger with those countries which are our old friends and companions and neighbours. In order to find new friends one does not forget the old friends. Otherwise, the new friends also will be forgotten and their friendship will not be stable.

Thus, it is expected of us from all sides and in all ways that, in this difficult time you and I have to work hard and we should work hard. We have to get busy and we should get busy. May be, we have to forget the less important things of the world for some time. But howsoever we may forget other things, we must remember that the activities of our two countries like our borders are joined together and they act and react on each other. We cannot forget this and also that our relations are old. This has benefited both of us in the past and shall benefit in future also. Of course, we should have friendly relations with other countries as well. But we must not forget that the basis of all relation is an older relation. If we renounce an old relation to form a new one then neither of the two is stable. All this was in my mind but above all was the warm and affectionate welcome which Your Majesties, your Government and your people extended to me. I am extremely thankful to you for that.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

The Ministry of External Affairs issued the following statement in New Delhi on June 30, 1959 on the status of the Dalai Lama in India :

A number of statements, allegations and counter-allegations on Tibet have appeared in India during the last three months from various sources. Among these is a statement made by the Dalai Lama during a recent press conference at Mussoorie, in the course of which he sought to answer some of the criticisms made against him. The Government of India do not take responsibility for any of these various statements. So far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, the Prime Minister has made it clear on more than one occasion that, while the Government of India are glad to give asylum to the Dalai Lama and show him the respect due to his high position, they have no reason to believe that he will do anything which is contrary to international usage and embarrassing to the host country. The Government of India want to make it clear that they do not recognise any separate Government of Tibet and there is, therefore, no question of a Tibetan Government under the Dalai Lama functioning in India.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreements for the supply of construction equipment needed in connection with the establishment of Thermal Power Station at Neyveli, were signed in New Delhi between India and U.S.S.R. on June 23, 1959.

The contracts, which have been executed under the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement, were signed by Shri N.S. Mani, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel, on behalf of the Neyveli Lignite Corporation, and the representatives of the 'Machinoexport', 'Stankoimport' and 'Techmachimport' of Moscow.

The total cost of the equipment to be supplied under these agreements will be about Rs. 29 lakhs.

166

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

WORLD BANK

Agreement on India's Canal Waters Cost

The Government of India issued on June 9, 1959 a press communique on the results of the talks the World Bank officials held in New Delhi and Karachi during the month of May, 1959 for solution of the Indo-Pakistan Canal Waters dispute.

Following is the full text of the communique

The Government of India have now received

information from the World Bank regarding the results of recent discussions in Karachi between Mr. Eugene Black, President, and Mr. W.A.B. Iliff, Vice-President, World Bank, and the Government of Pakistan. These discussions followed similar discussions held earlier in Delhi with the Government of India.

Though there are still several matters to be worked out in detail, these discussions have resulted in the formulation of certain general principles which would afford a basis on which it should be possible to move forward towards a settlement of the Indus Basin Waters question.

The Government of Pakistan have conveyed to President Black their willingness to go forward on the basis of a system of works proposed by the Bank. This system of works would be constructed by Pakistan, and one of its purposes would be the replacement from the three western rivers of the pre-partition uses on these canals in Pakistan, which were dependent on supplies from the three eastern rivers.

The Bank has reached an agreement in principle with the Government of India on the amount of financial contribution to be made by India towards the cost of construction of these works.

The transition period, that is to say, the period of time after which India would be entitled to the exclusive use of the waters of the three eastern rivers, would be approximately ten years.

In order to meet the full requirements of the Rajasthan and other new Indian canals which will be ready to withdraw water much before the end of this long transition period, the Bank has agreed to attempt to secure for India necessary financial assistance to enable the construction of a storage on the Beas which will be taken up as early as possible.

The above understandings are contingent on the Bank's success in obtaining assurances of adequate financial assistance from friendly Governments. Over the next two months, the Bank hopes to be able to obtain appropriate assurance in this regard.

A meeting of the representatives of India and Pakistan and of the Bank will be held in London early in August next to work out the Heads of Agreement of a Water Treaty between India and Pakistan, as also various details including regulation of supplies from the eastern rivers between India and Pakistan during the transition period.

After a period of 11 years, during which the Government of India have been patiently negotiating for a peaceful settlement of this problem and in which the World Bank has devoted for the last seven years considerable time, energy and expense, the Government of India see some prospect of a solution. They hope that, with goodwill on both sides and the assistance of the World Bank, it would be possible to reach before long a final settlement of the Indus Basin Waters question in the lasting interests of the people of the Indus Basin in both countries.

167

INDIA PAKISTAN USA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Cultural Agreement Signed

A Cultural Agreement between Czechoslovakia and India was signed in New Delhi on July 7, 1959.

The agreement aims at strengthening ties of existing friendship and promoting further understanding and closer cooperation in the fields of science, education and culture between the two countries.

His Excellency Ing. Jiri Nosek, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in India of the Czechoslovak Republic, signed the Agreement on behalf of Czechoslovakia, and Shri Humayun Kabir, Union Minister for Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, on behalf of India.

The Cultural Agreement, which consists of seven articles, will remain in force for a period of five years. It comes into effect on the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification, which will take place at Prague.

This is the ninth such agreement signed by India since 1951. The earlier agreements were signed with Turkey, Iraq, Indonesia, Japan, Iran, Poland, Rumania and the United Arab Republic.

The Agreement provides for the promotion of exchange of representatives of education, science, culture and arts between the two countries. They would also train each other's employees and grant scholarships to students in the scientific, industrial and technical fields.

Under the Agreement, co-operation would be developed between research institutes and artistic and literary associations in the two countries. Exchange of books, scientific and art objects and films has been provided.

There would also be exchange between the two countries in the field of physical education and sports.

The Agreement envisages the setting up, if necessary, of an Indo-Czechoslovak Advisory Committee in each country to ensure its implementation.

The following are the Articles of the Agreement :

ARTICLE I

The two High Contracting Parties shall promote :

(a) exchange of representatives of education, science, culture and arts of the two countries ;

(b) receiving of employees from the other party or other delegated persons recommended by the other party for the purpose of their training in educational, cultural, scientific, technical and industrial institutions of either country; (c) grant of scholarships to enable students to pursue their studies in the country of the other party in scientific, industrial and technical fields and other specialities ;

(d) co-operation between scientific and research institutes and artistic and literary associations ;

(e) organisation of scientific and artistic exhibitions, theatrical performances and film shows, music concerts and broadcasts on the Radio and Television transmissions.

To this end detailed arrangements will be made in each case.

(f) exchange and distribution of books, periodicals, scientific and art objects and films etc. of the other party.

ARTICLE II

The two High Contracting Parties shall consider the question of establishing cultural institutes in their countries according to the laws prevailing in each country.

ARTICLE III

The two parties shall promote so far as possible exchange between the two countries in the field of physical education and sports.

ARTICLE IV

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

ARTICLE V

In order to assist in the implementation of

169

the present Agreement and to suggest programmes for adoption under the Agreement, each High Contracting Party may, if necessary, set up in its own territory, an Indo-Czechoslovak Advisory Committee. Each Committee will be composed of persons designated by the Government in the country concerned and of representative (s) of the Embassy of the other party.

ARTICLE VI

The present Agreement shall be ratified with the least possible delay.

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

ARTICLE VII

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

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

Signed at New Delhi this day One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-nine.

For the President of the
Czechoslovak RepublicFor the President of
the Republic of India(ING. JIRI NOSEK)
Ambassador Extraordi-
nary & Plenipotentiary(HUMAYUN KABIR)
Minister for Scientific
Research & Cultural
Affairs

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA CZECH REPUBLIC INDONESIA IRAN IRAQ JAPAN TURKEY POLAND USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on July 27, 1959 about conditions in the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration

Mr. President :

We have now reached the conclusion of our examination of the annual report on the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration. As evident from the time devoted to this subject by the Council and the variety of aspects to which the members of the Council have directed their questions, great importance attaches to the Council's examination and discussion on Somaliland this year. On 2nd December 1960 Somaliland under Italian administration shall become an independent and sovereign State, as decided by the General Assembly in its resolution 289 (iv) of 2nd December 1950. This Mr. President, is the cardinal fact in the light of which we have to formulate our observations and comments.

Many illuminating documents and declarations and much informative material have been placed before us. We have had the advantage of the presence in the Council of the President of the Advisory Council as well as the Special Representative of the Administering Authority, as indeed we have been pleased to have with us His Excellency Haji Farah Ali Omar, Minister for Industry and Commerce of the Somali Government. We are grateful to them for so ably assisting the Council. I should not fail to mention, Mr. President, the petitioners who appeared before us. Their presence was in the best tradition of the Council and has helped to fill in many gaps. We are impressed by their calibre and the moderation with which they presented their views. They and the members of the Government of Somaliland who have been associated with us at this session of the Council give us confidence of the high quality of the leaders of Somaliland and their capacity to order their own affairs. Indeed this was strikingly confirmed by the joint statement on behalf of all the Somali parties, including the Somali Youth League, which was read before us the other day

by one of the petitioners, Mr. Hussain. This statement, which is a rare example of political harmony, augurs well for the future and will, we feel sure, generate the necessary goodwill in the Territory which will help in the solution of many knotty political and constitutional problems which remain to be solved before independence.

170

I said a moment ago, Mr. President, that the salient fact is the impending emergence of Somaliland to a full-fledged sovereign and independent State entitled to take part and play a worthy role in the comity of nations. It has been the singular good fortune of the Council in recent months to have been called upon to consider the present conditions and the future of three Trust Territories, namely, the Cameroons, Western Samoa and Somaliland. My delegation is proud to have associated with these discussions. We have rejoiced in the coming independence of the Cameroons and Western Samoa. We are especially happy at the prospect of an independent Somaliland. Somaliland is the closest land area in Africa to India, and if I may say so, Somaliland is our closest African neighbour. I feel, Mr. President, that the use of the word 'neighbour' is particularly appropriate in this case, as between Somaliland and India there have existed from time immemorial close commercial and cultural ties. There are many Indians in Somaliland and we know that they have received fair and hospitable treatment in that country. We are happy to acknowledge this and we look forward to close friendship and good neighbourly relations between independent Somaliland and India in the future.

Now that Somaliland is going to be independent in less than 18 months time, it is the future that interests us, as indeed it must be exciting to the Somalis. The past somewhat recedes into the background and the examination of the economic and social conditions in the Trust Territory during 1958 assumes less than usual significance. My delegation would, however, like to observe that the year 1958 has been one of steady progress in many fields, particularly in the field of primary education and public health. The number of students in infant and primary schools increased by about 18 per cent. In the field of public health, the most striking achievement is the excavation of large numbers of wells which provide better drinking water to people as well as aiding agriculture and livestock. The Somalisation of Government services has continued at a rapid pace and has, expect in some technical field, been completed. The services in the various Departments have come entirely under the control of the Somali Government. The few Italian officials who remain in the technical departments will no doubt be replaced as soon as qualified Somalis are available. The Somalisation of the outlying and central school systems was completed in 1958 apart from a very few posts which will be filled by Somalis as soon as suitable men are available. These facts not only show that the conditions appropriate and necessary for 'de jure' and 'de facto' transfer of power to the Somalis have been realized, but that the Somalis themselves have shown remarkable aptitude and adaptability and capacity to learn and to take control of their own affairs. If I may say so, these facts are also an eloquent tribute to the praiseworthy manner in which the Italian Government has, during its stewardship, prepared the Somalis for shouldering the responsibilities which freedom and independence will bring to them.

Let us turn to the future : The date for the emergence of Somaliland as an independent sovereign state has been fixed by the General Assembly and so far as we are concerned, this date is irrevocable. It is for the General Assembly who fixed this date for independence to discuss and decide upon the modalities and circumstances connected with the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Council at this stage is mainly concerned to see that in the months preceding independence there is no setback in the progress and preparations towards independence; that when the historic moment arrives, it finds the Somalis well prepared and capable of undertaking their responsibilities under conditions which permit the exercise of full freedom and the enjoyment of the blessings of independence in accordance with the will of the people; and that democratic processes and institutions are established which will enable them to take their destiny in their own hands and play a worthy role in the councils of the world.

It has been indicated by the Special Representative of the Administering Authority that the municipal elections and elections for the Legislative Assembly which were held in October 1958 and March 1959 respectively were highlights of the past year and absorbed a great deal of attention of the political parties. The municipal elections appear to have been generally peaceful and orderly; but the general elections of March this year were unfortunately preceded by serious disturbances in Mogadiscio, which resulted in much acrimony between the political parties. In the view of our delegation, Mr. President, among the many tasks facing the Government of Somaliland between now and the advent of independence, none is more important or worthier than the task to political reconciliation in the Territory. The joint statement to which I have referred earlier gives promise of the realization of a harmonious political atmosphere in the Territory. In this new atmosphere my delegation is confident that the problem arising from the fact that there is a considerable number of political prisoners will be harmoniously resolved.

The Council has, in the past, expressed itself on the Importance of a census and the preparation

171

of an electoral register. To my delegation it seems that the taking of census and the preparetion of an electoral register in Somaliland should not be an impossible task. In answer to questions the Special Representative informed us that there was in existence a machinery of administration whose authority ran to the remotest areas. We have also been informed that political parties, particularly the Somali Youth League, has an extensive organisation reaching out to the remote elements of the population. The administrative machinery being so well organised and extensive it should, in our view, not be beyond the bounds of feasibility to undertake a census and the preparation of an electoral register based on universal adult franchise which has been adopted for the Territory. In saying so, we are not under-estimating the difficulties of enumerating the nomadic population. Nomadic people, however, do not change their residence from day to day; they are usually seasonally nomadic, and as indicated by the Special Representative, thanks to the excavation of increasing numbers of wells for drinking water, the nomadic population is tending to get more and more settled. In any event, Mr. President, my delegation believes that the preparation of a census is an essential foundation for a modern State. We hope that the Somali Government will give serious consideration to this task as soon as possible. Once an electoral register is prepared. the Government will no doubt consider the question of future elections.

The framing of the new constitution will be among the most important tasks of the Somali Government. The content of the constitution is entirely for the Somali people themselves to decide. The Council, however, is naturally interested that the processes leading up to the formulation of the Constitution should be such as to give all important elements of the Somali people the opportunity, and what is even more important, the sense of having participated in the creation of their constitution. The Political Committee which has been established to draft the Constitution for submission to the Constituent Assembly and will in the near future consider the report of the Technical Committee, is at present composed of the President of the Legislative Assembly, and includes the Prime Minister and the Members of the Government, the Vice President of the Legislative Assembly, the heads of the Parliamentary groups, the Deputy Secretaries and three officials appointed by the Prime Minister and a representative of each recognised party represented in the Legislative Assembly, the latter representatives being appointed by the parties themselves. In regard to the new Legislative Assembly the situation is that some of the major political parties did not participate in the elections and had no representatives in the Legislative Assembly. Even in respect of some of the Deputies who claim to be representatives of two Opposition Parties, there is some controversy. Whatever may be the reason for the absence of certain political parties in the Assembly, the fact remains that the Political Committee as at present constituted does not appear to be representative of all political parties. It seems to us that it would be wise to reconstitute the Political Committee on a broader basis. We were happy to hear from the Special Representative that the Administering Authority was agreeable to this and would take the matter up with the Somali Government ; and we note with satisfaction that it is intended that the Constituent Assembly will consider in what form other interests such as administrative, cultural, regional, trade union and economic should take part in a consultative capacity in the preparation of the draft constitution. Apart from this, it

would seem to us appropriate that Constituent Assembly should itself have a broader based membership than the present Legislative Assembly in order to give it completely representative character.

The problem of the frontier between Somaliland and Ethiopia is still awaiting solution. My delegation endorses the hope that has repeatedly been expressed in this Council that a solution to this problem would be reached before the date set for the independence of Somaliland. There has been some development in this field recently with the nomination of Mr. Trygve Lie by the King of Norway in pursuance of the General Assembly Resolution on the subject last year. We hope that the discussions which are expected to start very shortly in regard to the preparation of the terms of reference of the Arbitration Tribunal will be successful.

In the economic sphere, we are happy to note the substantial progress that the Somali Government has achieved in agricultural production. The increase in banana, sugar and cotton production is very encouraging and we should like to commend the authorities for this progress. The significant increase in the share of direct taxation in the total of Territorial revenues is also commendable. We were glad to hear from His Excellency Haji Farah Ali Omar that about 74 per cent of the Seven-Year Plan of Economic Development, which commenced in 1954 had already been realised. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the territory has a difficult financial period ahead of it. It will first need to have a balanced budget in relation to normal working expenditure,

172

including that to which the Somali Government is already committed or which may be regarded as obligatory. It seems to us that for this purpose it will be necessary for the Somali Government to tap all internal resources. A newly independent country, however, cannot be content with a static economy. Among the most important tasks of Somaliland and one the fulfilment of which alone can make a reality of their freedom, will be the economic development of the country with a view to raising productivity and the standards of living and social conditions. For this purpose, Somaliland will undoubtedly require outside assistance in various forms which have now become a pattern of international relations. We are happy to know that the Governments of Italy, the USA and the UK have announced their intention of providing financial assistance to Somaliland after independence. In our view it is for independent Somaliland, in full freedom, and discretion, to seek and receive economic assistance from whatever source it might be available, without any prior commitment as to the source or nature or the conditions of availability of such assistance.

The United Nations Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly have in the past shown considerable interest on the question of economic assistance to Somaliland after independence. We share the hope of the Government of Somaliland and of other members of the Council that the agencies of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies will give the most sympathetic consideration to the request of the Government of Somaliland. The Administering Authority has already submitted several excellent projects on behalf of the Somali Government to the Special Fund. We have no doubt that these will receive every reconsideration by the Managing Director and the Governing Council of the Fund.

In the social and educational fields, we have observations to make except to note with satisfaction the efforts being made by the Somali Government to improve the living conditions of their people. In this connection, we would like to express our deep appreciation of the assistance given to the Territory by the Specialized Agencies, and in particular the UNICEF. One very striking item of progress in the social field has been the granting of suffrage to women. This is indeed a great step forward and we should like to congratulate the authorities for this significant development.

We wish the Government and the people of Somaliland well. We are confident of a 'bright future for them. We look forward to welcoming independent Somaliland in the United Nations and other world organizations.

INDIA MALI USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CAMEROON WESTERN SAMOA ETHIOPIA NORWAY ITALY UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. Rasgotra's Statement in Trusteeship Council on New Guinea

Shri M. Rasgotra, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Council on July 14, 1959 on conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea under Australian Administration

Mr. President :

For some days now the Trusteeship Council has been engaged in the examination of political, economic, social and educational conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. In this examination we have had the benefit of the able assistance of Mr. Jones, the Special Representative of the Administering Authority. In addition to the annual report and the information furnished to the Council by the Special Representative in his replies to a wide variety of questions put to him by members of the Council, we have before us the report of the Visiting Mission which visited the Territory earlier this year. We have perused all this documentation, especially the report of the Visiting Mission, with the care and interest that they deserve.

I would also like to express my delegation's appreciation of the observations submitted by the World Health Organisation on the Administering Authority's work in the field i of Health. We regret very much that other Specialised Agencies, who sit here with us in our deliberations, have not found possible or necessary to let us have the benefit of their expert knowledge in their respective fields. I assume that they share the anxiety and the desire of this Council to be of assistance to the Administering Authority in the discharge of its trust towards the people of New Guinea ; and we look forward to a more active participation on their part in its work.

May I begin by saying how well the Delegation of India realizes the uniqueness of the task and the responsibility of the Government of Australia in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. This task is no less than that of bringing into being a new society-a society with its own values, its own internal cohesion and its own inherent

173

strength to withstand the pulls and pressures of modern life-and to infuse in that new society the capacity and the vision to gain, uphold and exercise independence. We realize, if I may borrow the words of the Honourable, Paul Hasluck Australian Minister of State for Territories that "a deep-seated social change, in the sense of a change which leads to the construction of a new society, is fundamental to the attainment of every other objective of the Trusteeship System."

This task that faces the Administering Authority is onerous as it is noble; and we have confidence in the 'capacity of the Administering Authority to discharge it. The Visiting Mission discerned in the Territory some doubts on the part of certain sections of its inhabitants concerning the capacity of the Administering Authority to fulfil the Mission entrusted to it. I am glad to say that we have no such misgivings. The following passage from a speech of Mr. Hasluck's upon which I have drawn earlier is a tribute to the Administering Authority's consciousness of the magnitude of its responsibility and its good faith in fulfilling its obligations under the international Trusteeship System. Speaking before the Australian Institute of Political Science, Mr. Hasluck said :

"We are under an obligation to promote the welfare of the indigenous people of the Territory. We have accepted a trust towards the people of the Territory and intend to discharge it. We recognize that for a period we will have to make most of the decisions on what will best promote their welfare, but we have also accepted as a fact of the situation that one day the people of the Territory will wish to decide for themselves their own future, and we have accepted the idea that it is their human right to do The task before the Administering Authority is essentially one of development ; and it is akin to what the Government and people of Australia have accomplished in recent years, in their own land. For the Administering Authority, therefore the magnitude and complexity of the problems of New Guinea are not an unknown or an unfamiliar challenge. May I add that we have faith in the destiny of New Guinea, and we look forward to fruitful co-operation between the Administering Authority and the people of New Guinea in the making of that destiny.

The bringing into existence of a new society in New Guinea will involve a well-planned and coordinated effort of development in all the various spheres of the life of the people of the Trust Territory. And yet, if priorities were to be defined, the top priority, in our view, should be given to education. For the school, the primary school in the village, the secondary school in the district, or a technical and vocational school in an urban centre, must be the threshold of that new society. Education, in its broad sense must be the light that will illuminate the society that the Administering Authority seeks to build in New Guinea.

I must frankly confess that my delegation has serious misgivings about the educational advancement of the Territory to date. We are not quite convinced that the people engaged in education, administration officers and missionaries alike are quite clear in their minds as to the objective they are trying to achieve.

To take the Administration's policy concerning primary education first, it seems to us that the concept of primary education has been over simplified ; so much so that reading, writing and arithmetic would appear to be almost the whole of the curriculum. The bulk of some 2,700 primary schools run by missions are one-teacher schools. It would, obviously, be impossible to impart a full six or seven years course of primary education to pupils in these schools. The Special Representative has himself stated that, in fact, a large number of these schools are two or three grade schools imparting instruction for two or three years only. There is, therefore, the inevitable falling off of attendance in the limited

so.

number of higher grades in existing primary schools. Since a pupil's education, is not sustained beyond the second or third year of primary instruction, the whole effort and the expense of that instruction would tend to be wasted.

The Council will, no doubt, take note of the measures that the Administering Authority is adopting to bring mission schools under direct governmental supervision and to ensure in these schools a standard of instruction commensurate with that applicable and prevailing in Government schools and with the needs of the people. In addition, we would recommend that the Administering Authority should assume a more direct and expanding role in the provision of the facilities of primary education in the Territory. This will require a redoubling of the Administering Authority's efforts in providing trained and competent teachers, in building new schools, and in making ever-increasing budgetary provisions year after year. It is gratifying to learn that local Government Councils are taking increasing

174

interest in the establishment of primary schools, and we hope that the Administering Authority will spare no effort in sustaining and in stimulating further this initiative on the part of the people. The greater the participation of the people in the Administration's educational programmes, the greater will be their success. We also hope that the administration will take all possible steps to eliminate the spirit of competition or of conflict between the educational activity of the local Government Councils and that of missionary organisations, wherever such competition or conflict should come to evidence. While we attach great value to the educational work of the missions, we consider that the initiative of the peoples themselves should not be subjected to competition which may have crippling effects or may arouse bitterness among the population towards the missions themselves.

It is to be regretted, that secondary education in the Territory has not been given the attention it deserves in the last ten or twelve years. At present there are only four schools imparting secondary and technical education with a total enrolment of 371 pupils. The need for the development of institutions of secondary education cannot be over-emphasized. While for university and higher education the inhabitants of the Territory will have to depend for some time to come on facilities provided by the Administration in Australian institutions, complete dependence on outside facilities for secondary education is likely not only to prove exorbitantly expensive, but also the usefulness of such education will be limited. Besides, the scope and magnitude of programmes of this kind must necessarily be inadequate in relation to the Territory's needs. We note that emphasis is now being placed on the provision of intermediate and secondary schools in various centres in the territory, and we hope to be able to welcome at least five-fold increase in such facilities in the next two or three years. We would suggest that special attention should be given to the development of vocational bias in the facilities of secondary education that may be provided in the Territory.

There is little or no evidence of adequate consideration having been given to the education of illiterate adults in the Territory. This in our view has been a serious shortcoming of the Administering Authority's educational policy and programmes. If generations of youth are not to be allowed to live and grow in ignorance, the administration must develop programmes of mass-literacy. For the spread of adult education too exclusive a reliance cannot be placed on the showing of films and on educational broadcasts. We hope that the Administering Authority will give consideration to the suggestion I made during question time that planters and others, who engage labourers from the interior of the Territory should be encouraged to provide educational facilities for their employees on the plantations where they live and work. Facilities for teaching of the English language to workers would be particularly useful so that when they go back to their homes on the expiry of their contracts, these workers will take with them some knowledge of the language which is intended to become the lingua franca of the Territory. The need for educating the people of the Territory is so great that no opportunity of doing so should be missed.

We note with satisfaction that the Administration is taking steps to train more and more teachers. The special course of training conducted by the Department of Education in 1957 has proved successful, and we hope that the experience gained thereby will be multiplied. We would also suggest that in addition to the intensification of teacher-training programmes, suitable steps should be taken to make the wages and the status of teachers more attractive to New Guineans. The absorption into the Auxiliary Division of all indigenous teachers and instructors, which appears to be contemplated, will, in our view, be a step in the right direction, and we trust that it will not be delayed too long.

In the field of social advancement, we are happy to note the long awaited abolition of the curfew, and the consequent expansion in the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by New Guineans. We are confident that more liberal measures of this kind will follow in quick succession, The New Guinean society is showing signs of awakening. We are inclined to attribute to this awakening the dissatisfaction and discontent that the Visiting Mission noted here and there in the Territory. As social consciousness develops among the people of New Guinea, they will naturally demand equality of treatment and rights with Europeans and others residing in the Territory. The Administration will do well to anticipate developments in this regard rather than wait for the people to make demands, as they no doubt will, for the liberalization of their status and for improvement in the conditions in which they live.

One of the greatest tasks of the Administration is in health ; and as the World Health Organisation has pointed out, noteworthy success has attended the Administration's efforts in achieving the aim of placing health services within

175

reach of the whole population that these facilities will need to be expanded goes without saying. It is also clear that the progress that is desired in improving the health of the population cannot be achieved until the indigenous people are persuaded to engage themselves in health work. Here again, as in the field of education, increasing reliance and greater initiative should be developed among the people of the Territory. We would also suggest that the Administrating Authority should ensure that the training and other facilities are not concentrated in the neighbouring territory of Papua, and that a greater number of institutions of medical training and research should, in future, be located in the Trust Territory itself.

The Visiting Mission has noted in its report that it is the Administration's policy to build new hospitals in two stages, one for New Guineans and the other for Europeans, in close proximity to each other so that common services can be shared. While we commend the Administration's programme for the construction of base hospitals, regional hospitals, isolation hospitals, and district hospitals, we would state once again our view that the provision of separate facilities for Europeans and New Guineans is not only unnecessarily expensive, but the policy is also likely to arouse suspicion and misgivings in the minds of the New Guineans concerning the attitude of the Administering Authority towards racial equality and human rights in general. We trust, therefore, that this policy will be reviewed shortly and that discriminatory considerations of any kind will not be allowed to prejudice the Administration's accomplishments in this field.

Mr. President, it would not, perhaps, be inappropriate for me to say a word or two about the cargo-cult to which the Visiting Mission has devoted some considerable attention in its report. Cults of various kinds are in evidence in the most progressive of states and societies. The phenomenon witnessed in New Guinea is not, therefore, altogether unique, and it should not be allowed to create confusion in our thinking. There are many reasons for its outburst, but it would be most unfair, in our view, to attribute the manifestation of this phenomenon to some inherent defect or intrinsic short-coming in the mental health of the New Guineans. Nor is it easy to believe, as the Special Representative would have us believe, that it represents a hankering on the part of the New Guineans for the free distribution of goods and supplies of various kinds.

It is our feeling that a new awakening is spreading fast among the inhabitants of the Territory, and that it is approaching a turning point in its affairs when the Administration will have to move progressively and rapidly towards a whole new method of handling social, economic and political, development. In New Guinea to-day there is a progressive and prosperous though small European community, and inclose juxtaposition to it there is the vast mass of illiterate and comparatively poor New Guinean people. In circumstances of this kind it is not unusual for the poorer sections of the society to long for the prosperity, the wealth and riches of their more privileged neighbours. What expression this longing will find will, naturally, depend on the state of their educational and cultural advancement. It is not without reason that this cargo-cult is most in evidence in those sections of the New Guinean community which are more familiar, as witnesses, with the prosperity that western civilisation has the capacity to bring to people. This so-called cult, in our view, is evidence of the eagerness of the people for material, social and cultural advancement, and we are inclined to think that something far-reaching should have to be done before long to increase their production and to accelerate their educational, social, cultural and political development.

The multiplicity of religious missions, and the competitive, sometimes conflicting nature of their activities, may, as the Visiting Mission aptly notes, contribute to the mental confusion in the Territory. While we appreciate, with the Visiting Mission, the delicate position in which the Administering Authority is placed with regard to this question, we hope that the Visiting Mission's warning that this is a situation which may have in it the seeds of future discord and dissension and where old tribal feuds may well be turned into "new moulds" will not go unheeded. In referring to this matter the other day, the distinguished representative of Australia said that in this Council we should not discourage the competitive co-existence of contemporary ideologies. "It is another thing", he added, "when these ideologies are seized on by tribal groups for the purpose of perpetuating old tribal fueds; the criticism is then to be directed, not against the ideologies which are exploited for a particular purpose, but against those old tribal fueds". It is not our intention to "discourage the competitive coexistence of contemporary ideologies"; nor do we wish to contend the better judgment of the distinguished representative of Australia in matters relating to New Guinea. But one finds it hard to overlook the fact-the fact impressed upon us time and again, by the distinguished representative himself that the only organisation that exists in the unadministered parts of the Territory is tribal organisation; and that even in those parts

176

of the Territory which have been under Administration's control for some time the memory of the old tribal feuds remains yet unforgotten. Is it not right then, that instead of laying the blame on old tribal feuds, care should be taken that contemporary ideologies are presented to these unsophisticated people in such a way that they do not lend themselves to the revival or perpetuation of those old feuds in new forms?

In the field of economic development the shift of emphasis from concentration on establishing a sound foundation of Administration to a quickening of the economic advancement of the people is, in our view, a timely and welcome development. Economic development cannot be delayed in the hope that Administrative, political, social and educational development should first reach a point at which economic development can take place at a rapid rate. Progress in all these fields should go hand in hand if the new society is to advance to maturity in conditions of peace, order and stability. While commendable work has already been done in the development of agriculture and in the provision of agricultural extension services, the Visiting Mission correctly points out that the basic framework necessary for the development and sustenance of a modern economy is as yet lacking in the Territory. This shortcoming in our view results from the fact that little attention has thus far been paid to long-term integrated planning of the Territory's development in all the various fields. There are, indeed, plans of educational development, of crop-production, of hospitalconstruction and of the development of communications, but these plans are compartmental in nature, and they would appear to be conceived in isolation one from another. The highest priority, in our view, should now, therefore be given to the preparation of a five or ten-year plan of integrated economic development of the Territory as a whole and to the laying down of priorities, not only in each specific field of development but in relation to the plan as a whole. In framing such a plan the needs of the areas, which are yet to be brought under administrative control should also be anticipated to the extent possible. Incidentally, I may add here that we are unable to contribute to the Mission's view that the uniformity of development of the Territory as a whole is something impossible to

attain, and therefore the concept should be set aside at least temporarily. With due respect to the wisdom and judgment of the Visiting Mission we wish to express our disagreement with its somewhat oracular conclusion that festina lene is applicable to the opening up of new areas in New Guinea, as it is to many other human activities. The least that may be expected of an Administering Authority is to bring the whole of the area of a Trust Territory under administration as early as possible; for only thereafter can the functioning of the more positive aspects of the Trust, namely, the educational, social, economic and political advancement of inhabitants begin. The development of the areas already under Administrative control should, in our view, proceed simultaneously with the extension of Administration to new areas. That alone will work for the uniform and balanced development of all sections of the Territory and its inhabitants and inculcate among them a spirit of oneness and kinship which is essential to the growth of a new society or a new nation. While efforts to establish closer contact with the people in administered areas should no doubt be intensified, no effort should, at the same time, be spared in establishing and in extending contact with the people of the areas which still remain outside the active control of the Administration.

We feel that while the nucleus of a welltrained and devoted civil service exists in the Territory, its size is inadequate in relation to the needs of the Territory as a whole. We note with satisfaction that recruitment to the public services is being expanded, and that steps have been taken to amalgamate the indigenous employees of the Administration into the Territorial cadre. We would suggest that the Administration should give consideration to the establishment of a school of Administrative training in the territory. It is also our view that indigenous members of the Auxiliary Division should be encouraged to gain experience and to move upwards into more responsible positions in the Territory's Administration. The task of bringing the entire territory under administration which should have the top-most priority, will be considerably facilitated if trained indigenous civil servants could be pressed into service to establish contact with their people in the unadministered areas of the Territory. Mr. President. I have included these few comments concerning the public service in my discussion of economic conditions in the Territory because it is our experience that no economic development can be effectively undertaken without an efficient and well-organised indigenous civil service and that in modern states civil cadres are as much an instrument of economic development as of administration.

To go back to the economic field, while notable success has attended the development of the plywood production in the Territory, even more striking advances are in evidence in the diversification of the Territory's agriculture. Considerable efforts

177

will be needed in the immediate future for the establishment of both primary and secondary industries in the Trust Territory. We agree, however, that the further development of agriculture, especially indigenous agriculture-should, perhaps, for some time to come, continue to claim prior attention. In agriculture while the emphasis is, appropriately, on cash crop production to enable the Territory to earn its imports of capital investments necessary for the establishment of industry, we hope that cash-cropping will not be allowed to prejudice the production- of food crops. Even at present the Territory's imports of foodstuffs amount to some 2 million pounds annually, and it will be necessary to cut these down to size before long if the existing balance of trade is to be improved.

The annual report and the Special Representative's opening statement show that the Administration is conscious of the problems relating to the reform of the existing system of land tenure, which must be faced, and I do not, therefore, propose to dwell on them at length here. I would however like to say that my delegation is not persuaded to accept, with any certainty, the Administration's view that there is no shortage of land in the Trust Territory. Our misgivings are due to several reasons. First, as the Visiting Mission has stated, considerable uneasiness exists in the Territory about shortages of land that in some of the valleys these shortages are real, and that in several other areas, such as the Gazelle Peninsula, similar shortages are likely to appear soon. Shifting of populations from areas of shortage to areas of purplus land is one solution, though it certainly is not the ideal solution, as it brings new and unforeseen problems in its train.

I believe that it would not be an exaggeration to say that almost to any piece of land there are conflicting claims. Perhaps the rate of acquisition of land by the Administration in the past has been fast and needs to be slowed down further. Particular care needs to be taken in the leasing of land to Europeans because though the scale of European settlement in the Trust Territory has been relatively limited, the signs of bitterness and dissatisfaction among the indigenous population are already in evidence. The example of Fast Africa should be a sufficient warning against any liberal interpretation of the words "surplus land" and a too easy assumption that unused land is unowned, vacant, or waste, and can, therefore, be acquired by the government and subsequently leased out to non-indigenous settlers.

In our view, there are no reliable census figures to enable an accurate prediction of the growth of population and its pressure upon land in the years to come. It is also not known how much land is really required for a subsistence economy. On the other hand, if the economy in the future is to be based on cash-cropping, the land needs will, again, be different. Since the Administration, appropriately, encourages indi genous economic development, and since such development must be based on agricultural expansion it is probable that the indigenous people will require any surplus land that there be for their own needs. It may be possible to ascertain their present needs by research, and to say that the land 'under cultivation now is enough for those needs, but no forecast can be made of the future needs of the indigenous people. The fact that land is only leased to Europeans and leases expire would not in itself avert a serious situation such as we have witnessed in some other parts of the world. It is for these reasons that we advocate special and persistent caution on the part of the Administering Authority, in this matter of acquisition of land and of its leasing to European settlers.

As I said earlier, the Administering Authority's efforts-successful efforts-to diversify the Territory's agricultural produce are to be commended. We note that research work is being done in the Territory and in Papua to find a greater diversity of suitable crops which could be introduced in the Territory. We would recommend in this connection the establishment, as an experimental measure, of at least one government plantation operated by the Administration in the Trust Territory on the lines of the coconut plantation at Orangerie Bay in Papua. Such a plantation will surve as a model to indigenous planters while at the same time carrying out experiments in the mechanisation of agriculture and cropprocessing. A plantation of this kind would also serve as a centre for the intensive training of indigenous growers of New Guinea and of staff for the extension services of the Territory.

New Guinea is a wholly tropical country. It seems to us that its soil and climate would lend themselves to sugar-cane production and there might be a real potential for the development of a sugar industry in the Territory. This is borne out by a passage which I came across in a speech made by the Honourable Ian F. G. Downs, Member of the Legislative Council, which I quote

"In New Guinea and Papua we have never grown sugar on a commercial scale although the Territory is the source of the world's best sugar plant variety".

Mr. Downs went on to mention "the tragic

178

effect" which a big sugar industry in Papua and New Cuinea might have upon the economy of northern New South Wales and Queensland, but we are confident that the Administering Authority will not allow considerations of this kind to stand in the way of the full development of the Territory's agricultural and industrial potential.

Before I pass on to the developments in the political field, I express my delegation's appreciation of the progress that has been achieved in the establishment of new co-operative societies and in the general expansion of indigenous activity in agricultural and industrial fields.

By and large, Mr. President, we would say that the Administration has made a good logical start of political advancement in the field of local government. The increase in the number of local government councils during the year under review is encouraging. The way in which these councils have been functioning is also encouraging, and their success indicates the soundness of the Administering Authority's approach. We also hope that the Trusteeship Council will not allow the development of kivungs, which are described as "unofficial village councils covering groups of three or four villages and acting as advisory bodies to village officials and administration officers" to pass unnoticed or without due commendation. But of particular interest to this Council is the increase in the number of local government councils from 6 in 1956 to 18 in 1959. We have per-used with interest the exchange of views that took place between the Visiting Mission and some of these Councils, and we are confident that the Administering Authority will do the needful to remove some of the complaints and grievances that they placed before the Visiting Mission. The Visiting Mission tells us that it encountered interest and enthusiasm in new council areas and that there is a demand for the establishment of councils in the western highlands and in several other areas of the Trust Territory. In the light of this prevailing sentiment in favour of these organs of local government, we hope that the Administering Authority will not allow its enthusiasm to be diminished by sporadic opposition to councils of this kind here and there. We hope that the Administration will also take steps to remove whatever causes may be for the complaints arising from non-indigenous opposition to the establishment of local government councils. It is important that even suspicion of such opposition in the minds of the indigenous inhabitants should be carefully and assiduously removed.

The Visiting Mission has pointed out that Administration officials sometimes tend to be somewhat skeptical of the motivations that lead indigenous people to ask for the establishment of local government councils. There is, in our view, nothing wrong in people being motivated by "pride and prestige" in their demands for local government councils. Motivations of pride and prestige in such matters should not be cast aside lightly. It is in fact a happy augury for the future of these councils that people should view them as something to be proud of; and their request for more councils we hope, will be viewed by administration officials with the sympathy and understanding that they deserve. We are confident that such misconceptions concerning the nature of the councils as may exist, will be effectively removed by the education and benefits that people are bound to derive from their functioning.

We view with considerable satisfaction the

convening, earlier this year, of a conference of local government councils in Madanz. We had hoped to hear about the establishment, in fact, of an area council at least in the Gazelle Peninsula where half a dozen local government councils have been functioning well for some time. We feel that the Administering Authority has done well in the past to keep a little ahead of the interest of the people and we hope that in the future also it will continue to stimulate initiative rather than wait for initiative or demand to develop on the part of the people for the establishment of area-councils or regional councils or for the expansion in the scope, responsibility and powers of local government councils.

It is gratifying to note that indigenous members who were appointed to district advisory councils, have performed their duties ably and well. Steps should now be taken to appoint indigenous members to town advisory councils as well. The Special Representative said the other day that this had not been done so far because in the administration's view the indigenous inhabitants of towns would not be interested in appointment to town councils. We feel that inasmuch as some indigenous inhabitants do reside in towns, permanently or otherwise, they are entitled to representation on these councils, and their representation on these councils will serve as a useful means of social and political education. We trust, therefore, that every encouragement will be given to the indigenous inhabitants to take active part in the functioning of town advisory councils.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that in this generally encouraging picture of developments in the field of the Territory's political advancement the character and composition of the Legislative Council continues to remain a depressing feature.

179

The Trusteeship Council has so often commented on this subject in the past and several of its members have made suggestions and recommendations of which the Administering Authority is aware. In the words of Mr. Downs, himself a Member of the Legislative Council : "the present council is a farce of democracy and a bad example for the people". The Visiting Mission has also stated that some of the Territory's people are dissatisfied with the composition of the council and with the appointment by the Administration of indigenous members, They would prefer to elect the persons who are to represent them in the Legislative Council. This is a natural aspiration, and the criticism that the Visiting Mission came across is in our view, justified. We are glad to be assured that the Administration is contemplating an increase in the number of indigenous members in the council. We also note the Visiting Mission's view that there are men in the Territory who would make effective indigenous representatives on the Legislative Council. The observers who have been attending the proceedings of the council for some time would no doubt be among these persons. In reply to a question the other day the Special Representative gave an impressive list of men of ability, who have rendered praiseworthy service on District Advisory Councils. We hope that the Administering Authority will not allow discontentment to grow in the Territory with regard to the composition of the Council and the nature of the representation of the Territory's indigenous inhabitants on it. In our view not only should indigenous representation on the council now be substantially increased, but such representatives should be elected and should have full backing and support of the indigenous inhabitants.

During our questioning of the Special Representative I had pointed to the undesirability of vesting political representation and the power to influence the Territory's administrative and other policies in non-indigenous missionary organismtions. It emerged from our discussions that not only do the missionary organizations have in their own right representation on the Council equal to the representation granted to the vast mass of indigenous inhabitants, they also have the right to vote in the election of three other nonindigenous members. This results in the grant of undue weightagey to an alien element numbering about 1200 in the Territory's population, and the continuation of this practice cannot be expected to have a salutary effect on the growth of democratic organs of political power in the Trust Territory. We would, therefore, hope that the Administering Authority will take immediate steps to rectify this situation.

Mr. President, there are two other matters on which I wish to comment briefly before I finish. The first of these is the question of the dissemination of information concerning the United Nations in the Trust Territory. While we have no desire to minimise the efforts of the Administering Authority to spread information about the United Nations in the Trust Territory, the fact remains that the Visiting Mission, whose report is before us, like its predecessors, found little awareness of the United Nations amongst the majority of New Guineas, or of its role in relation to the Trust Territory. We recognize that Melanesian Pidgin is not the best medium to explain anything except of the simplest nature ; and that consequently, information booklets and posters concerning the United Nations are of little value except, perhaps, to the children in the upper classes of schools where social studies include teaching about the United Nations. During questions and answers it became clear that the United Nations Information Centre in Sydney is unable to lend much assistance to the Territory's Administration in this task. We feel that the establishment of a United Nations Information Centre in the Territory itself will facilitate this task considerably as its staff will be in a position to establish personal contact with the Territory's inhabitants by learning their language, and to disseminate information more successfully about the United Nations in conjunction with such programmes of adult literacy and fundamental education as the Administration may adopt in the future. We would therefore suggest that the Secretary-General might give consideration to the establishment of a United Nations Information Centre in the Territory with the co-operation and agreement of the Administering Authority, which we are confident, will be readily forthcoming.

Not infrequently have we heard the distinguished representative of Australia raise his eloquent voice in opposition to any suggestion concerning the establishment of intermediate timetables and targets with dates for their fulfilment in the economic, social, educational and political advancement of Trust Territories. We are gratified to note, however, that while thus maintaining its opposition in theory to the establishment of targets and dates, the Administering Authority has in fact set target dates from time to time on the advice of the Territorial Administration. The Minister for Territories informed the Visiting Mission that in response to the wishes mainly of the Trusteeship Council, he had set target dates for bringing the whole of the Territory under control

180

as quickly as possible, but he had informed the Administrator that if sound administration made it impossible to realize them, he would not criticise them. May I assure the distinguished representative of Australia that in such a circumstance nor will we of the Indian Delegation criticize him or his Government for failing in the fulfilment of this or other targets on the dates fixed for 'their achievement. Mr. President, we wish to renew our recommendation that the Administering Authority should continue to proceed in its task of advancing the Territory's development by defining intermediate targets with tentative dates for their fulfilment in all fields. We do so not from any doctrinaire attachment' to targets, but because we believe that in any underdeveloped territory rapid, orderly and peaceful progress can be achieved through careful planning of the successive stages of development that it is intended to achieve. And what are intermediate targets, if they are not successive stages of a long-term and well-co-ordinated plan? Targets are sometimes fulfilled, and sometimes progress falls short of them. In either case, they act as an incentive to those who plan them, and to those for whose benefit planning is intended. We hope, therefore, that the distinguish. ed representative of Australia will be as flexible in his opposition to the establishment of inter. mediate targets and dates as we are flexible either in our advocacy of targets and dates and understanding in our assessment of the results achieved.

INDIA GUINEA USA AUSTRALIA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGUILLA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged at Djakarta last week between the Ambassador of India to Indonesia, on behalf of the Government of India, and the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, extending up to the 31st December, 1959, the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries.

The principal items included in the schedule of commodities for export 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 household uetnsils.

The main items included in the schedule of commodities for export from Indonesia to India are copra and cocoanut oil, palm kernels and oil, essential oils, spices including betelnuts, timber, tin rubber, hides and skins, canes and rattans, gums and resins, tanning materials, sisal fibre and tobacco wrappers.

INDONESIA INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

ITALY

Air Agreement Signed

A bilateral air transport agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Italy was signed on July 16, 1959 at Rome. The agreement which was signed by Shri Khub Chand, Ambassador of India in Italy, on behalf of the Government of India, and by H.E. Hon'ble Alberto Polchi, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the Government of Italy, will come into force as soon as it is ratified by the two Governments.

Under the agreement, the designated airlines of the two countries will have fair and equal opportunity for the operation of air services on the following routes :

For an Airline Designated by the Government of India : India, Karachi, Kandahar, Jeddah, Behrein, Kuwait, Dharan, Teheran, Basra, Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut, Tel Aviv, Cairo, Athens, Istanbul, Sofia, Belgrade, Rome or Milan, Vienna, Geneva, Zurich, Prague, Paris, Brussels, Frankfurt or Dusseldorf or Berlin, Copenhagen, London, Shannon, Gander, Montreal, Ottawa,

181

Vancouver, Boston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles.

For an Airline Designated by the Government of Italy : Italy, Istanbul, Athens, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Beirut, Damascus, Baghdad, Basra, Teheran, Dharan, Kuwait, Bahrein, Jeddah, Kandahar, Karachi, Bombay or Calcutta, Rangoon, Bangkok, and thence to (a) Saigon, Hongkong, Manila, Tokyo, and (b) Singapore, Djakarta, Darwin, Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane.

The agreement also provides machinery for the determination of the capacity and the frequencies of the services that may be operated on the above routes.

ITALY INDIA PAKISTAN SAUDI ARABIA KUWAIT EGYPT IRAQ ISRAEL LEBANON SYRIA USA BULGARIA GREECE TURKEY YUGOSLAVIA AUSTRIA BELGIUM CZECH REPUBLIC FRANCE SWITZERLAND DENMARK GERMANY CANADA UNITED KINGDOM PHILIPPINES INDONESIA JAPAN REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE AUSTRALIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

NORWAY

Indo-Norwegian Agreement Signed

An agreement for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between India and Norway was signed in New Delhi on July 20, 1959. H.E. Hans Olav, Ambassador of Norway in India, and Dr. B. Gopala Reddi, Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure, Government of India, signed on behalf of their respective Governments.

The Agreement, which has to be ratified, will become effective in India from the assessment year 1959-60.

The Agreement was signed following talks between the two Governments at official level in February this year when a draft agreement was initialled.

NORWAY INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Financial-Assistance

The Soviet Union has made an initial offer of a fresh credit of 1,500 million roubles (Rs. 180 crores) for utilisation towards the implementation of the Third Five Year Plan.

A press communique issued in this connection by the Ministry of Finance on July 30, 1959 says

When Shri Swaran Singh, Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel, and Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of Industry, were in Moscow recently, discussions took place between them and members of the Soviet Government on the question of external assistance for India's economic development. Following these discussions, and in order to help in meeting India's needs, the Soviet Union have made an initial offer of a fresh credit of 1500 million roubles about (Rs. 180 crores) to be utilised towards the implementation of the Third Five Year Plan, and the Government of India have gracefully accepted this welcome offer of assistance.

With the latest offer of Rs. 180 crores credit, U.S.S.R. assistance to India to date would total about Rs. 313 crores.

In February, 1955, the Soviet Union agreed to supply on credit equipment and structural steel works worth Rs. 63.07 crores for the Bhilai Steel Plant. Nearly the whole of this credit has been utilised.

In November 1957, the Soviet Union offered further credits to the tune of about Rs. 60 crores to be availed of from 1959 onwards. The schemes selected for financing out of this credit, subject to negotiations with the Soviet Government are (1) Heavy Machine Building Works, (2) Mining Machinery Plant, (3) Power Station at Neyveli, (4) Optical Glass Factory, and (5) development of Korba Coal Fields.

Under an agreement concluded in May this year, the Soviet Union will make available to India credit worth about Rs. 9.6 crores for establishment of State enterprises which will manufacture drugs, medicines and surgical instruments in India.

Apart from these credits agricultural machinery and equipment valued roughly at Rs. 76 lakhs were offered as gifts at the time of the Soviet Prime Minister's visit to India towards the end of 1955.

182

RUSSIA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement Signed

The Government of India propose to establish multichannel wireless telegraph and radio telephone services between India and the U.S.A. and, the Philippines. The plan also provides for independent telegraph channels to be leased out to users in India who may want to have their own direct radio teleprinter link with the U.S.A.

This is envisaged in an agreement that was signed in New Delhi on July 25, 1959 between the Government of India and the Mackay Radio and Telegraph Company, Inc., of the U.S.A., under which the company would supply telecommunication equipment for- the establishment - of wireless telegraph and radio-telephone link between the Calcutta Station of the Overseas Communications Service and the Mackay Radio Station at Manila and the U.S.A.

The company will supply all the equipment required by the Overseas Communications Service for its Calcutta Station, together with the equipment required for leased channels to be rented out by the O.C.S. to subscribers in the country.

The equipment will be supplied on credit. The amount would be repaid by the Overseas Communications Service from its foreign exchange earnings from the leased channels. It would be free of interest.

The agreement makes it, possible for the O.C.S. to open up without any initial foreign exchange expenditure a circuit for which it had been planning for long and which would considerably augment the communication facilities between India and the U.S.A. At present, India has a rather weak telecommunication link with the U.S.A. via Tangier.

The agreement also provides for further dollar credit, if required, for very high frequency equipment to replace the present landline link between Calcutta and the transmitting and receiving stations of the O.C.S. about 33 miles away from the city.

The negotiations were conducted on behalf of the Government of India by Shri D.C. Das, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Transport and Communications (Departments of Communications and Civil Aviation), and on behalf of Mackay Radio and Telegraph Company by Mr. T.S. Greenish, Vice-President of the Company. The agreement was signed by the latter and by Shri P.J. Rodgers, Director-General of India's Overseas Communication Service.

USA INDIA PHILIPPINES

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Loan Assistance to India

An additional loan assistance of \$ 20 million (Rs. 9.5 crores) has been given to India by the U.S. Development Loan Fund under the terms of an agreement signed in New Delhi on July 27, 1959.

The loan, to be repaid over a period of 15 years, will enable India to procure heavy and light structural steel, light rails, plates, wires, black sheets, strips, tool, alloy and special steel and other steel mill end products, required for industrial projects in the Second Five Year Plan. The significant feature of the loan is that it involves no drain on India's foreign exchange resources because repayment will be in rupees.

With the latest allocation of \$ 20 million, the total D.L.F. Loan assistance to India since June 1958 aggregates \$ 195 million (Rs. 92.6 crores). The Development Loan Fund is an agency of the U.S. Government created in 1957 with the specific purpose of assisting free nations develop their economic resources. Since its inception, D.L.F. has appropriated \$ 850 million (Rs. 404 crores). India's share, to date (Rs. 92.6 crores) represents 23 per cent of the total.

The agreement was signed at a brief formal ceremony in the Ministry of Finance. Mr. Winthrop G. Brown, Charge d'Affaires of the American Embassy, signed for D.L.F. and Shri N.C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs, signed for the Government of India.

183

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Trade Agreement Signed

A new trade agreement was signed in Delhi on August 11, 1959 between India and Afghanistan.

The Agreement takes effect from July 21, 1959, the date on which the old Agreement expired. It will be valid for a period of one year, but will be automatically extended for a further period of one year unless either of the contracting parties gives notice to the contrary two months prior to the expiry of the Agreement.

Letters were exchanged on August 11, 1959 between Mr. M. R. Younossi, Leader of the Afghan Delegation and Shri K. B., Lall, I. C. S., Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, setting out the arrangements agreed upon between the two countries for the development of trade.

The two Governments have re-affirmed their desire to promote trade between India and

Afghanistan, and to take such special steps, in terms of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the two countries, as might be found practicable in this regard.

An important feature of the Agreement is the understanding between the two delegations on the. measures necessary to achieve, within the framework of their respective import, export and foreign exchange regulations, a balance of trade between the two countries.

It has been agreed that facilities will be afforded to registered importers for import into India of dried and fresh fruits, asafoetida, cumin seeds, inedible animal and vegetable crude material and medicinal herbs from Afghanistan. These facilities are intended to strengthen and streamline the traditional trade between the two countries, which is financed by traders in Indian rupees.

In addition to traditional payment and trading channels, it has been agreed that a special selfbalancing account will be opened by the Da Afghanistan Bank with the State Bank of India. The import of hides and skins from Afghanistan is proposed to be licensed freely,- and its sale proceeds will be credited to the special account which would be used for financing Afghanistan's expenditure in India including that on Afghan purchases from Indian sources.

The Government of Afghanistan will, on their part, afford facilities for import from India of goods such as cotton and woollen textiles, tea coffee, dried fish, vegetable products, agricultural products, chemical products, soaps, engineering goods, electrical goods, household and building requirements, hardware, rubber manufactures leather manufactures and products of handicrafts and cottage industries.

It has also been agreed that the Government of India will afford facilities for the export of Afghan goods through India to other countries.

The two Governments will consult each other periodically to review these arrangements with a view to improving upon them to the advantage of the two countries.

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Technical Assistance

Replying to a question regarding French technical assistance for the establishment of a Pilot plant for industrial research in India, Shri Humayun Kabir, Union Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on August 12, 1959 that the French Government had agreed to arrange practical training in France for a few scientists of the Laboratories of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in their respective fields for pilot plant development. French experts, he said, would later assist in the setting up of a pilot plant development cell in India under the Council.

The Minister further said that the entire expenditure in connection with the deputation of Indian scientists and the assignment of French experts would be borne by the French Government. Necessary action to avail of these facilities was being taken by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research.

185

FRANCE INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

Shri C.S. Jha's Letter to President of the Security Council

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council on August 7, 1959 protesting against the construction of Mangla Dam by Pakistan.

Following is the text of the Letter

I have been instructed by the Government of India to invite Your Excellency's attention to further violation by the Government of Pakistan of the sovereignty of the Union of India and of its territory in Jammu and Kashmir; and of the provisions of the resolution of the Security Council of January 17, 1948. The violation was broadcast in its various transmissions by Radio Pakistan which is an official agency, on July 17, 1959 in the following words:-

'The pace of construction of the Mangla Dam is to be stepped up this year with the capital grant of two crores and twenty lakhs of rupees. The work to be executed includes the construction of a railway line and road links with hinterland. The total cost of the project was originally estimated at 23 crores of rupees but subsequently revised and raised to 140 crores of rupees. The dam will be 365 feet high and nine thousand feet long. Its reservoir will have a capacity of over four million acre feet. Started in August 1955 the project is expected to be ready in 1966. On completion it will provide irrigation facilities to about thirty lakhs acres of land and generate three hundred thousand kilowatts of hydroelectric power.'

Your Excellency will recall that India first protested to the Security Council against the Government of Pakistan's unlawful decision to go ahead with this project as far back as August 21, 1957 (S/3869), and once again on January 20, 1958 (S/3939) when the Government of Pakistan signed an agreement with certain foreign engineering firms in connection with this project.

On its own admission, as recorded by the U.N. Commission in its report and its resolution of August 13, 1948, the Government of Pakistan committed aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Under the resolution of 13th August, 1948, the Government of Pakistan was asked to vacate this aggression and that Government agreed to do so. The aggression has however, not been vacated so far and, what is worse, the Government of Pakistan is, by going ahead with the construction of Mangla Dam in this part of Indian territory which they have occupied by force of arms, changing the topography of the area and exploiting the resources and the people of the area, who are Indian nationals, for the benefit of its own territory and nationals. Pakistan's unlawful occupation of Indian territory is further aggravated by this latest act of exploitation which is not only in violation of the resolutions I have already mentioned above but also contrary to the categorical assurances which the U.N. Commission gave to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council.

The Government of India would like to make it clear that they can not accept a position which implies that all these violations committed by Pakistan and their consequences are to stand condoned in total disregard of international law and the practice of civilized nations.

"I request that this communication may kindly be circulated as a Security Council document and be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN LATVIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Replies to Questions in Rajya Sabha

The Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru gave the following replies, during question hour in

186

the Rajya Sabha on August 25, 1959, to questions on alleged Chinese activities against Sikkim and Bhutan and Indo-Tibetan trade

An Hon. Member: Will the Hon. Prime-Minister be pleased to state whether Government are aware of the Chinese plans regarding the neighbouring areas beyond Tibet such as Sikkim, Bhutan and border areas of Assam as recently reported by Shri H.V. Kamath after extensive tour of those areas ; and if so, what preventive measures are being adopted by Government in the matter ?

The Deputy Minister: The Government are not aware of any such plans and have no valid, reason to think of their existence. The Government are fully alive to their responsibility for the preservation of the security of India.

An Hon. Member: Will the Hon. Prime Minister be pleased to state whether Government's attention has been drawn to the report which appeared in the Hindustan Times (Delhi Edition) of the 13th August, 1959, to the effect that the Chinese authorities in Tibet have begun a war of nerves against the people of the Himalayan region bordering on Tibet and, in particular, against the people of Bhutan and Sikkim ; whether Government are aware that, in a pamphlet issued by the Chinese authorities, Indians have been described as inheritors of British regime, and that a cry has been raised for the 'liberation' of the Bhutanese, Sikkimese and Ladakhis from their capitalistic oppressor, namely India; and if the answers to the

Questions above be in the affirmative. what steps Government propose to take in the matter ?

The Deputy Minister: Government have seen this report ; they have however no information about the contents of the speech by the General referred to in this report. They have also no information about the pamphlet to which reference is made.

Instances of anti-Indian propaganda in the Tibetan region have however come to the attention of Government and Government have drawn the attention of the Chinese authorities to this.

An Hon. Member : As a protest against the fact that our Lhasa Consulate office is being kept under restraint by the Chinese, are we also going to put the same sort of restrictions on the Chinese Consulate office at Kalimpong ?

The Prime Minister : It is not quite correct to say that our Consulate General is under restraint. There are some difficulties there in regard to people who want to visit the Consulate-General. Sometimes they do not find easy access to it. Some of them, more especially those people who are Ladakhi Muslims, who want to come there are not permitted to do so usually by the sentry. But the people in the Consulate can go about in Lhasa at any rate, not outside Lhasa; for that they require permit.

Asked if there is any truth in the newspaper reports that the Chinese are trying to extend their influence in Bhutan, Sikkim, Ladakh and the border areas of Nepal, the Prime Minister said : That is the main question. It has been answered'. There are some reports of these things. We have. no information as to their validity or of any responsible person having said this. But the fact remains that so far as Bhutan and Sikkim are concerned, they are in treaty relations, with us and we are responsible for their defence. I cannot imagine any foreign authority doing anything which is an infringement of their sovereignty. In any event any such infringement would be an infringement of our undertakings with Sikkim and Bhutan, and we shall certainly resist every such intrusion

Asked further whether the Government are thinking of devising ways and means for encouraging our people particularly of the border areas, so that they may not be cowed down by the aggressive moves of any foreign power, the Prime Minister said : I do not know what he means. Ways and means to what-shall I say, to raise the morale of the people there ? I hope the morale of the people in the border areas is good.

Replying to a question whether it is a fact that on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan military concentration is taking place by the Chinese, the Prime Minister said : We do not know, Sir.

Asked if it is a fact that there is a certain sort of concern in the minds of the people in Bhutan and Sikkim with regard to the Chinese activities, the Prime Minister said : Yes Sir, that is natural. Ever since the troubles in Tibet, as refugees are doing it, there has been a measure of anxiety in the minds of the people and the authorities in Bhutan and Sikkim.

Asked further whether there has been any proposal from the Prime Minister of Bhutan- to interview our Prime Minister here, Shri Nehru said : It does not require any proposal. Whenever fie comes here, he is our guest, and I see him frequently. There is no very great for-

187

mality about these things, and I believe he is coming here soon.

An Hon. Member: Will the Hon. Prime Minister kindly state whether the Bhutan Government have asked for any help from the Government of India for defence under the Indo-Bhutan Treaty for Perpetual Peace and Friendship signed in 1949?* The Prime Minister : The question of their asking for any specific aid, military aid, does not arise. Yes, in the past Bhutan had sometimes taker. or purchased from us some small arms and the like. But they, as well as we, know that if there is any aggression against them, it is our responsibility to help them.*

USA BHUTAN INDIA CHINA NEPAL MALI **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Indo-Tibetan Trade

An Hon. Member : Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether the Indo-Tibetan trade has been affected by the political disturbance in Tibet; what was the volume of trade between India and Tibet prior to the Tibetan upsurge, And what is the latest position ?

The Deputy Minister: Yes, Sir. The Indo-Tibetan trade has suffered considerably during the last few months especially since the disturbances. The total volume of Indo-Tibetan trade during the quarter Jan. March, 1959, was Rs. 81.98 lakhs approximately. The figure, however, declined to Rs. 26.82 lakhs approx. during the quarter April-June, 1959.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether Government have taken any measures for the restoration of normal trade between the two countries?

The Prime Minister : Well, Sir, I do not recall all the measures but we certainly want normal trade to be restored and we are pointing out to the Chinese authorities in Tibet the difficulties that have arisen in regard to it. For instance, one of the major difficulties is the question of payment and the currency. Many of our traders cannot deal in the goods there except in Chinese currency and they find it difficult to dispose of the goods there. All these difficulties have arisen and we are pointing out these things as much as we can because we cannot interfere in the internal trade arrangements otherwise.

Asked whether it is a fact that all sorts of impediments are being put against the Indian trade being run smoothly and that particularly the Indian traders who are engaged in trading in Tibet are not allowed to even borrow money from the local moneylenders, the Prime Minister said : That is what I said, Sir, that there are difficulties. I do not know whether one such relates to the question of borrowing money but I imagine it is difficult to borrow money.

An Hon. Member : The question is not only of the Indian currency being made legal tender or not. The Indian traders who have been doing business in Tibet have had to completely suspend their business and I would like to know what the Government is doing either to restore normal conditions there or to rehabilitate the traders. This is a very serious matter because a very large number of people are affected by this.

The Prime Minister : We cannot force trade on another country. If a country deliberately wants to stop it, it can do a hundred and one things over-hand and under-hand to make it difficult for the trader to function. We cannot deal with such a matter. If there is any breach of treaty regulations, then we can take up that matter.

Replying to a question whether the Government of India was consulted or at least was informed by the Chinese Authorities of their intention to declare the Indian rupee as not legal tender in Tibet, the Prime Minister said : There is no mention of this in the Treaty. All that the Treaty says is that customary rules will continue to prevail. You can interpret that as you will but there is no special reference in the Treaty to the rupee being legal tender or not.

Shri Nehru continued we were not consulted and we can hardly raise an objection to the fact we were not consulted by them before they made changes. The point is that where such changes are made, they must not in the interests of the countries concerned, have an immediate upsetting effect on past transactions. It is open to any country to make a change for the future so that the traders and others know where they stand but making a change which applies to past transactions does create a tremendous amount of difficulty because after they have paid for some goods, then let-us say, 50 per cent, or 75 per cent, of the value suddenly disappears. Therefore, normally it should not apply to past transactions.

188

An Hon. Member : It is reported that Indian traders residing in Tibet are not being allowed to enter the Indian Consulate-General. Is it a fact and, if so, have the Government thought it necessary to take any action in that regard ?

The Prime Minister : I do not think there is any difficulty in regard to the Indian traders coming to the Consulate-General but some people like the Ladakhi Muslims who claim to be Indian nationals and whom we are prepared to accept as such but who are not accepted as Indian nationals by the Chinese authorities at present have difficulties in coming to the Consulate-General.

INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No 1995 LAOS International Commission for Supervision and Control

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on August 10, 1959 that the attention of the Government of India had been drawn to the recent developments in Laos, which had threatened the Geneva Agreements.

The Deputy Minister, who was replying to questions during question hour said :

"In view of recent developments, India has suggested that the International Commission should be reconvened for the purposes of conciliation and mediation. This, however, has not been possible owing to the objection of the Government of Laos. Some signatories of the Geneva Agreements have been in favour of the reconvening of the International Commission for Laos. "The Government of India feel that any step taken in Laos should be in keeping with the Geneva Agreements. The machinery laid down by these Agreements was that of the two Co-Chairmen and the International Commission. Any variation of the procedures laid down should be within this framework of the Geneva Agreements and should have the approval of the parties concerned".

LAOS USA INDIA SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Morarji Desai's Statement in Lok Sabha on Pakistan's PartitionDebt to India

The Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on August 6, 1959 on the outcome of the financial talks held in Delhi from July 31 to August 2, 1959 between him and the Finance Minister of Pakistan.

The following is the text of the statement:

The House will remember that I made a statement on the floor of the House on the 7th May, 1959, in which I gave a short account of the various major items in dispute between the two countries and the order of the sums involved in each. At our meeting, we broadly reviewed the various items in an effort to arrive at an overall settlement. I believe it was common ground between us that these disputes should be settled as soon as possible in the interest of both the countries, that considering the magnitude of the sums involved in some of the claims it would be difficult to take individual items separately for settlement and that our efforts should be directed towards the simultaneous settlement of all the major issues. It was really not a question of holding up one matter because something else was held up.

Ultimately, whatever one country has to pay to another has now to be paid in foreign exchange and when claims are outstanding on both sides, a simultaneous settlement of these claims is more or less inescapable.

While on a number of items the sums involved are either easily ascertainable or could be estimated with a fair amount of precision, the real difficulty arises in connection with the partition debt due to India, of which seven annual instalments are already overdue while a further instalment will fall due on the 15th of this month. It is obvious that some agreed estimate, however tentative, of this debt is necessary if an overall settlement of the various items has to be made. Honourable Members will remember that certain figures of how the debt should be worked out were sent to Pakistan some years ago. There was

189

some correspondence on those figures but matter was not further pursued. We both realised that it was essential to get the dimensions of the debt before further progress could be made. At the last meeting, officials of the two Governments got down to the real task of getting the figures originally prepared, checked and agreed. Obviously, in the short time available, it was not possible for them to make more than a good beginning in this essential process. We both agreed that both countries should proceed vigorously with the checking and finalisation of these figures so that in the next few months at least a close approximation of the sum involved would be available on the basis of which a settlement would be reached. It is our intention to see that this is vigorously pursued.

A number of points of detail also arose during the discussions about which further information had to be obtained by either side. This will all be collected so that when we next meet We shall have as full a picture as possible of the various issues.

I do not think that this House or the public outside should feel any sense of disappointment that the meeting has not produced immediate results. Considering the long period over which the various claims have been in dispute, I am sure the House will appreciate that it is not easy to reach conclusions without the necessary details. The sums involved are also so large that it would be unfair to both the countries to take snap decision. The real gain of the meeting is that the ice has been broken and I am looking forward to the various matters requiring further examination being dealt with expeditiously in both, the countries so that when the next meeting of the Ministers is held, it may be possible to reach a satisfactory settlement. I would in this connection make one appeal. A settlement will be greatly assisted in my opinion if in both the countries exaggerated claims are not put out and isolated issues given undue prominence.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Statement in Lok Sabha on Canal WatersDispute

Shri Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation and Power, said in New Delhi on August 3, 1959 that on the basis of the understanding reached by the President of the World Bank with the Governments of India and Pakistan on the Indo-Pakistan Canal Waters dispute, discussions will be resumed on August 5, 1959 in London between the representatives of India, Pakistan and the World Bank, with a view to working out Heads of Agreement for an International Water Treaty.

The talks, the Minister continued, will also cover matters connected with the regulation of supplies from the Eastern rivers during the transition period and with the uses which must be reserved for India in the upper reaches of the three Western rivers before they enter Pakistan.

The Minister was making a statement on the latest position regarding the Indo-Pakistan Canal Waters Dispute in the Lok Sabha on August 3, 1959.

He said : "In my statement of September 1, 1958 concerning the negotiations on the Indo-Pakistan Canal Waters question, I brought to the notice of the House that the plan of replacement works submitted by Pakistan at the London meeting of July 1958 was under examination. Our comments on the Pakistan plan were conveyed to the Bank when the talks were resumed in Washington in December 1958. Along with our comments the Indian representative put forward an alternative plan of replacement works.

"An important feature of that plan was the diversion of the waters of the Chenab at Marhu through Indian territory for supply to Pakistan at suitable points. It was much less expensive than the Pakistan Plan and had the merit of enabling the replacement works to be completed in a relatively short period. But it was not acceptable to Pakistan.

"Although in the course of the discussions in Washington, Pakistan signified, for the first time, its unconditional acceptance of the division of waters as suggested by the Bank in its proposal of 1954, it continued to have reservations on some of the other features of the Bank proposal.

"As there was no prospect of an agreement between the parties, the Bank felt that it should put forward, for consideration by India and Pakistan, its own proposals for a settlement of the dispute.

"In May 1959, Mr. Eugene Black, President of the Bank, visited New Delhi and held consultations with the Prime Minister and the Ministers for Irrigation and Power and Finance.

"In the course of the discussions he put forward certain general principles as furnishing a basis for the implementation of the Bank proposal

190

of 1954 for the division of waters of the Indus Basin. He also visited Karachi and held similar consultations with the representatives of the Pakistan Government.

"The position as it has emergred from Mr. Black's discussions in Delhi and Karachi may be briefly summarised as follows

(a) The Government of Pakistan have conveyed to the Bank their willingness to go forward with a system of engineering works to be constructed by Pakistan, one of whose purposes would be the replacement, from the three Western rivers, of the pre-partition supplies of those canals in Pakistan which were dependent on supplies from the three Eastern rivers. Particulars of these works have not been furnished to India as India will have no concern with their planning construction, costs or operation.

(b) The Bank has reached an agreement, in principal, with the Government of India on the amount of financial contribution to be made by India.

(c) The transition period, that is to say, the time required by Pakistan to construct and bring into operation the works mentioned in (a) above and after which India would be entitled to the exclusive use of the waters of the three Eastern rivers, will. be approximately 10 years.

(d) These elements of agreement are contingent on the Bank being able to secure for Pakistan adequate financial assistance from friendly Governments for the construction of these works in Pakistan.

"The House will recall that the Bank proposal of 1954 provided for a transition period of 5 years. This estimate was based on a system of replacement works which consisted mainly of link canals and did not include any storages.

"It was later felt that this estimate was somewhat optimistic and limited storage may be necessary. The engineering works now proposed are materially different from the replacement works formerly contemplated and, according to the Bank, they will also provide for replacement of the waters now drawn by Pakistan from the Eastern rivers, though it will take about 10, years to construct and bring them into operation.

"We would not have accepted a transition, period of 10 years as the basis of a settlement if it was calculated to postpone unduly the date we had in view for the opening of the Rajasthan canal., We have agreed to it on the clear understanding, that the link canals, already constructed in Pakistan, would be operated from 1960 onwards to their full designed capacities.

"We have also been assured that the Bank would try to obtain the necessary financial assistance for the construction of a dam on the Beas to make available perennial supplies to the Rajasthan canal well before the expiry of the transition period now suggested.

"The running of the link canals in Pakistan to full capacity will enable India to adhere the target date for opening the Rajasthan canal in 1962 or, even earlier, if the canal can be completed earlier, But for the first few years this canal, like the Bhakra canal, will have to function largely on a non-perennial basis.

"The Beas dam may take 7 or 8 years to complete but limited perennial supplies will be available for Rajasthan canal in about 6 years when the dam can be expected to begin impounding water, although not to its full capacity."

The Minister also said : "The House will agree that the acceptance by the parties of certain broad principles as the basis of an agreement constitutes an advance towards a settlement of this difficult question.

"This satisfactory result has been achieved by the unremitting labours of the World Bank and the personal interest of its President whose contribution to the success of the recent talks it is difficult to over-estimate.

"While there may be reasonable grounds for optimism, it cannot be said that from now on everything is smooth sailing and that there are no difficulties ahead. Many hurdles have still to be crossed before a final settlement of the Indus Waters Question can be reached."

PAKISTAN LATVIA USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Dues

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation and Power, stated in the Lok Sabha on August 4, 1959 that, as a result of further correspondence on canal water dues against Pakistan, Pakistan Government had made another payment of Rs. 16,21,370/- representing 'undisputed'

191

charged for the period from October 1, 1957 to September 30, 1958.

The Minister was giving a written reply to a question by Shri Vidya Charan Shukla and Shri D.C. Sharma regarding the result of further correspondence with the Government of Pakistan on settlement of the disputed as well as the balance of undisputed charges and the latest position of outstandings on these accounts.

The Minister also stated that the amounts outstanding from the Government of Pakistan, both 'disputed' and 'undisputed', up to the period ending September 30, 1959, were as follows

Disputed Rs. 1,08,92,340/-

Undisputed Rs. 21,76,561/-

Hafiz Saheb added that the matter was under correspondence between the two Governments.

PAKISTAN LATVIA USA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Indo-Pak. Financial Talks

The Finance Minister of India and Pakistan met in New Delhi from July 31 to August 2, 1959 and discussed the various financial issues outstanding between the two countries.

After the meeting was over, a joint communique on their financial talks was issued simultaneously in New Delhi and Karachi on August 3, 1959.

The following is the text of the communique:

The Finance Ministers of India and Pakistan assisted by officials of the two Governments, met in New Delhi, from July 31 to August 2, 1959, to discuss various monetary and financial issues outstanding between the two countries. They went over the whole ground, and, while there was a meeting of minds on many matters, it was realised that for an overall settlement it was necessary to obtain further details, particularly, in regard to the partition debt before the discussions could be carried any further. It was accordingly agreed that representatives of both the countries should meet and discuss details as often as necessary so as to enable them to obtain an agreed picture before the end of this year. The two Finance Ministers would meet shortly thereafter to take final decisions.

The officials took the opportunity of reviewing certain other outstanding matters and it was found possible to clear a number of them. In particular, it was agreed that in respect of persons who migrated from one country to another after June 30, 1955 but before June 30, 1959, arrangements should be made either through the respective High Commissioners or through the normal banking channels for the payment of their pensions. It was further agreed that provident Puna moneys of such Government servants and employees of Local Funds and semi-Government institutions also should be allowed to be transferred likewise. These arrangements would also apply to migrants who belong to the partitioned Provinces.

There was a full and free exchange of views in a very cordial atmosphere and it is hoped that this will be a prelude to an early and satisfactory settlement between the two countries.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Construction of Mangla Dam

Replying to a question whether the construction of Mangla Dam in Pakistan-occupied territory of Kashmir is being continued in spite of protests lodged by India, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on August 3, 1959:

"Yes, Sir. According to a recent broadcast by Radio Pakistan, construction work is to be stepped up this year with the help of a capital grant of Rupees 2.5 crores."

Replying to another part of the question Shrimati Menon said: "For its own benefit, Pakistan is exploiting the people and resources of the territory of the Union of India which it continues to occupy by force in defiance 'of the Security Council resolution of January 17, 1948 and the U. N. Commission's resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949, all of which have been accepted by Pakistan.

"In addition to the town of Mirpur, about 122 villages will be submerged and about 100,000 people, who are Indian nationals, deprived of their land and livelihood.

"The project will irrigate 3 million acres of

land, mostly in West Pakistan and produce 300,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power to be used, again mostly in West Pakistan."

She said : "The Government of 'India have already lodged two protests with the Security Council against Pakistan's. violation of the sovereignty of the Union of India and of its territory in Jammu & Kashmir. The violation arises from continued Pakistan aggression in Jammu & Kashmir against which India's complaint is already pending before the Security Council."

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinese Incursions intoNEFA

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sahba on August 28, 1959 in reply to an adjournment motion:

Sir, I can very well understand the anxiety of the House to have information as fully as possible about the situation on our border areas. It is rather difficult for me to deal with these various adjournment motions as they are often based on wrong names, wrong areas, wrong locations. So, instead of my endeavouring to deal with each adjournment motion, I shall give some specific information.

Shri Hem Barua's motion is completely upside down-one place here, one place thereand has no connection with the events or anything. He has derived it from some paper (Interruption). Sir, may I continue?

192

In the course of the last two or three years, sometimes, not very frequently, there have been cases of some kind of petty intrusion on our border areas by some platoon or something of the Chinese troops, which was nothing very extraordinary, because there is no demarcation at all and parties sometimes may cross. We drew the attention of the Chinese Government in 1957-58 to this and they withdrew, there the matter ended.

One instance I have already quoted, which was a more serious one. In Ladakh last year, a small police party was apprehended by them, and that matter is still under dispute or under correspondence. Now, in June this year, the Chinese Government protested to us that Indian troops had shelled and intruded into Chinese territory by occupying a place on the border of Migyitun, and some other place along the frontier-this is in Tibet-NEFA-and they accused us that our troops had entered into some kind of collusion with the Tibetan rebel in forces or "bandits", as they call them, carrying on illegal activities against the People's Government of China. We replied that there is no truth in this allegation, and we expressed surprise that the Chinese Government should give credence to these wrong allegations. Ultimately nothing happened there. We stayed where we were, and there was some dispute about the line.

Now, there are two matters that I would particularly like to mention : one, of course, is of very considerable importance and it is topical now. I shall come to it later. The first one is that on the 7th August an armed Chinese patrol, approximately 200 strong, violated our border at Khinzemane north of Chuthangmu in the Kameng Frontier Division. When requested to withdraw, they pushed back, actually physically pushed back, our greatly out-numbered patrol to a bridge at Drokung Samba. Our people consisted of ten or a dozen policemen and they were about 200, about ten times us. They actually physic-ally pushed our men back. There was no firing. Later on., the Chinese detachment withdrew and our forces again established themselves. All this was over a question of about two miles. I might say, according to us, there is an international border. Two miles on this side is this bridge and two miles on that side is our picket or the small force. So, our patrol party was pushed back to the bridge and two miles away they stood facing each other.

Then both retired. It is not quite clear to me why they did so; it is a mountain and perhaps during night time both the forces retired. Whatever it was, later on the Chinese withdrew and our picket went back to the frontier and established a small picket there. The Chinese patrol arrived later and demanded immediate withdrawal of our picket and lowering of our flag there. This request was refused. Then there was some attempt by the Chinese forces to outflank our people, but so far as we know our people remained there and nothing further happened; that is, on the border itself. That is one instance which happened about two weeks ago.

The present incident I am talking about is a

193

very recent one and, in fact, is a continuing one. On the 25th August, that is three days ago, a strong Chinese detachment crossed into our territory in Subansiri Frontier Division at a place south of Migvitun and opened fire. Hon. Members will remember, I just mentioned Migyitun in connection with the Chinese protest that we have violated their territory and were in collusion with some Tibetan rebels. That was their protest made in June last, and there the matter ended. Now, round about that area, a little further away but not far from it, this Chinese detachment came and met, some distance away, our forward picket of about a dozen persons. It is said that they fired at our forward picket. They were much larger in numbers; it is difficult to say in what numbers, but they were in some hundreds, 200, 300 or may be, even more They surrounded this forward picket which consisted of 12 men-1 N.C.O. and II Riflemen of the Assam Rifles. They apparently apprehended this lot. Later, apparently, 8 of these 1I Riflemen managed to escape. They came back to our outpost. The outpost is at a place called Longiu. Longiu is about 3 or 4 miles from our frontier between Tibet and India as we conceive it. Longju is five days' march from another post of ours in the interior, a bigger post called Limeking. Limeking is about 12 days' march from the next place behind it. So, in a way this Longju is about three weeks' march from a road-head. I merely mention this to give the House some idea of communications, transport, distance and time taken. I was saving, on the 25th they captured this forward picket of ours, but 8 of them, having been captured, apparently, escaped

and came back on the 26th the next day. The Chinese again came and opened fire and practically encircled this picket and the post. In fact, they came forward and encircled this post, Longju, and although there was firing for a considerable time, we had no account of any casualties. Our people apparently fired back too. When these people were more or less surrounded at Longju they left that picket and withdrew under this overwhelming pressure. This has happened only the day before yesterday evening. So, we have not been able to get any exact particulars of what has happened.

The moment this information came, we immediately protested to the Chinese Government about it and took certain other steps in that area to strengthen our various posts, Limeking and others, as we thought necessary and feasible. we have, in fact, placed all this border area of NEFA directly under our military authorities. That is to say, it was dealt with by the Assam Rifles under the Assam Rifles Directorate which was functioning under the Governor and the Governor was the agent of the Government of India in the External Affairs Ministry. The Assam Rifles will of course remain there and such other forces as will be necessary will be sent but they will function now under the army authorities and their headquarters.

All these have taken a little time. As I pointed out, it takes weeks. In this particular place Longju, I imagine that this small picket of ours-, it was probably altogether about 38-may have run short of ammunition because there was no supply coming in. We tried to send supplies by air. They were dropped but they missed them. It is a mountainous area ; it is not easy. It is slightly risky to send paratroopers there, risky to the men in these mountainous areas. We do not think it was desirable or worthwhile to do so at that place--dangerous. Anyhow, we have taken such steps as were feasible.

In fact, while I was sitting here, I have heard from our Ambassador from Peking. When he handed over this note to the Chinese authorities, the reply was that their information was different. The Director said that the information the Chinese Government had received was contained in the note handed over to Kannampilly, one of our men there. Regarding the incident at Migyitun, according to their report, it was the Indians who fired first ; the Chinese frontier guards had opened fire only in self-defence. They had received no information yet of the clash at Longju on the 26th August. This is the Chinese answer. The Director said that the situation in this sector of the border was tense because Indian troops were continuously pushing forward. We see here the same kind of language, a repetition of the reports we have, say, between India and Pakistan ; that is, we make a statement and an exactly opposite, contrary statement is made by the other side, as to who started firing.

I confess that in these matters I give credence to our own reports and I believe it is true because I would rather believe my own men who are there and who are trained men, not used to exaggeration, and also because the circumstantial evidence also supports their account. In fact, our Ambassador pointed this out to the Chinese people. So that is the position. I need not say that, while 1, do not wish to take an alarmist view of the situation, in itself these are minor incidents, but it is a little difficult to understand what lies behind these minor incidents. In any event, we have to be vigilant and protect our borders as best as we can.

An Hon. Member : Our Prime Minister has clearly indicated the general attitude of Government In this matter. We are in a delicate situation

194

where, on the one hand, China is a friend of ours and we have a broad foreign policy which has the approval of every section of the House. I wonder whether this going into the details will help anybody or the Opposition. Why should we raise these details and small things here and there ? The problem is a big one. Can we not leave matters to the Government in such big questions and can we not have one policy on big matters ? In small internal matters, we may have different policies.

The Prime Minister : On the question of broad policies, well, broad policies are in our mind. We have to face here a particular situation. Any country which has to face that situation has to stand up to it. There can be no doubt about it. There is no alternative for us but to defend our country's borders and integrity. Having said that, at the same time, we must not, as often happens in such cases, become alarmist and panicky and thereby take wrong action.

Obviously, apart from some past information, I have given the latest information to the House, including the telegram which came to me while I was sitting here. In this telegram, apart from other things, our Ambassador has said :

"I pointed out that four persons"-it is really three-"were still missing as a result of the incident of the 25th August and that on the 26th August, Chinese troops had over-run Longju, which the Chinese knew very well to be within Indian territory. I reiterated our Government's wish that the Chinese Government should take immediate steps to see that there was no assertion of supposed claims by force. Differences should be settled by negotiations."

We have taken the line that minor border incidents and border differences should be settled by negotiations. We must distinguish between this and that broad approach of the Chinese maps which have brush coloured hundreds of miles of Indian territory. That is totally and manifestly unacceptable and we have made it clear. We stick to the MacMohan line. But it is quite another thing that in this long line there may be minor arguments about a mile here or a mile there. These arguments have been there before the Chinese came to Tibet. Even With the Tibetan authorities, these arguments about a mile of grazing ground here or there have been there. We admit that these are differences which exist and which should be settled. We think we are right, but let us sit round a conference table and settle them. We are prepared to take up any matter like that, but when it comes to huge chunks of territory, it is not a matter for discussion.

The one or two instances that I have stated are, again, according to us clearly intrusion into our territory. But suppose that there is some question of a Tibetan or Chinese case about a mile here or there, well, we are prepared to discuss it. But from such information as we have received and which I have placed before the House, when their forces come, envelop our check-posts and capture them after firing, it is not the normal peaceful way of approaching these questions, even if there is a dispute. Therefore, this matter becomes a much more serious one than some incidental or accidental border affray.

I think an Hon. Member asked about what lies behind this. I cannot say; it is not fair for me to guess. It will be guess work, of course; I cannot imagine that all this is a precursor to anything more serious. It seems to me so foolish for anybody, including the Chinese Government, to function in that way, and I do not give them the credit or rather the discredit for folly. Therefore, I do not think they will do it. But so far as we are concerned, we shall naturally be prepared for any eventuality and without fuss or shouting keep vigilant.

Some Hon. Member, I think, gave me some advice and gave some advice to our men as to how they should do, where they should air-drop and where they should not. These are things for them to consider, not for us, as to where it is possible, where it is desirable or where it is not.

An Hon. Member suggested a discussion on this. I am always in favour of a discussion in this House but I do not see how a discussion in this ease will serve anyone's purpose. When things are happening, I shall place the facts before the House as they take place and if any step is to be indicated, I shall place that also before the House.

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Chinese Incursions intoNEFA

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha . on August 31, 1959 in reply to a short-notice question :-

195

On August 7, 1959, an armed Chinese patrol entered Indian territory by crossing the border at Khinzemane in Kameng Frontier Division of N.E.F.A. They pushed back our patrol which was greatly out-numbered, a mile or two to a small bridge at Drokung Samba. Later the Chinese detachment withdrew.

On August 14, another Chinese patrol tried to out-flank Khinzemane, but did not succeed and withdrew. We have had no further reports from this area since then and it may, therefore, be assumed that our position at this border remains undisturbed.

There was another Chinese incursion into Indian territory in a different area in the N.E.F.A. on August 25. Ibis was in the Subansiri Frontier Division a little south of Mygitun and slightly beyond Longiu where there was an Indian out. post. This Chinese detachment came up against an Indian forward picket and opened fire on them. This Indian picket consisted of I N.C.O. and 10 Riflemen. Our picket was apprehended by the Chinese, but later eight of the eleven Riflemen managed to escape to our outpost at Longju. On August 26, the Chinese troops approached Longju and opened fire on our post- It appears that our men at this post had to abandon their position on being encircled. We have had no further information of subsequent developments in this area.

We protested immediately to the Chinese Government about this intrusion of their troops into Indian territory and their opening fire on our men. The Chinese Government have themselves lodged a protest with us based on the allegation that our armed troops intruded into their territory south of Mygitun and opened fire on their guards at this place. According to this Chinese note, the Chinese frontier guards fired back in selfdefence. In this Chinese note, it is also mentioned that the dead body of an Indian was recovered by them.

The Prime Minister continuing said: I may add, Sir, that since this reply was drafted, the reply that I have just read out, we have received some little further information from two of our men from Longju who were contacted and according to them, our party had come away from Longju, about two days' march from Longju and had established a forward post at GALLEN. It is not clear whether the Chinese patrols have occupied Longju or are merely moving round about it.

An Hon. Member : May I ask whether it is a fact that some more incursions have taken place recently ? There were some reports in the press to the effect that some more outposts belonging to the Assam Rifles have been occupied. Is that statement correct ?

The Prime Minister: We have no information on that subject and, on the whole, we get fairly quick information about the N.E.F.A. border and I should imagine that those reports are not correct.

In reply to a question whether government are taking any steps to prevent such incursions Shri Nehru said : 'It is hardly possible for me to tell the House what military or like steps we have taken in such matters. It is not possible, if I may put it that way, to prevent an incursion over a two thousand mile frontier but it is possible to take. some steps to repulse that incursion or to strengthen our defences but the House should remember that while it is our duty, of course, to defend our borders and to strengthen them and thus protect the integrity of India, one does not normally, in the case of big countries suddenly start as if there was a war between them and hit out all round. One considers these things and one tries to settle matters by talks, etc. At the same time, one defends oneself at the time of an attack. It does not obviously make very much of a difference physically to China or to India whether a mile or two in the high mountains belongs to them or to us but it does matter very much if a treaty is broken or an aggressive attitude is taken. Where these matters occur, we have to follow a double policy one, of course, of defence, and the other always to settle these matters by conferences.

Asked whether there is any information about the eight men who escaped from Longju and have whether they returned back to our outpost, the Prime Minister replied : I have just said that two of them were contacted and they gave us some information. I do not quite know where the remaining six are. It is possible that they may be with our other men. It is very difficult. We can get information from an outpost but people in between two outposts cannot send messages.

Replying to a question whether, in regard to this particular territory where incursions have been made by the Chinese, there is any doubt about the ownership of the territory, or, are we certain that it belongs to us, Shri Nehru said : Yes, the Chinese not only doubt it out claim ownership of that particular strip. I do not know how far it is correct but they claim that particular

196

strip and they said to our men that that strip belongs to them. Whether they are justified in doing so or not is another matter.

Replying to another question whether it is possible for the Prime Minister to indicate the reasons why the Chinese have taken to this aggressive action against us in these areas at this time, the Prime Minister said : It is obviously a matter of conjecture. First of all, I would like to distinguish between the position in North. east and the position in Ladakh. The position in Ladakh is different from the position in the North-Eastern Frontier Agency and these borders. All these borders are parts of the so-called MacMahon Line. If you accept the MacMahon Line you accept all that frontier really from Burma onwards to a good long way to Nepal. That does not apply. to the Ladakh border which was for all these long years under the Jammu and Kashmir State and nobody knew exactly - what was happening there, although some British officers went a hundred years ago and drew a line and the Chinese did not accept that line. That matter is clearly one for consideration and debate but that does not apply to this area. Here there was a MacMahon Line and undoubtedly this is in our view a clear case of aggression. Why they have done so, I can" naturally say exactly. It is a conjecture.

CHINA USA INDIA BURMA NEPAL **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Mnisiter's Statement in Lok Sabha on Occupation of LadakhiTerritory by Chinese Forces

The following is the full text of a statement by the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, in Lok Sabha on August 28, in reply to a shortnotice question as to whether it was a fact that a portion of the Ladakhi territory had been recently occupied by the Chinese forces, and what action had been taken in the matter :

There is a large area in Eastern and North-Eastern Ladakh which is practically uninhabited. It is mountainous, and even the valleys are at a high altitude generally exceeding 13,000 ft. To some extent, shepherds use it during the summer months for grazing purposes. The Government of India have some police check-posts in this area, but because of the difficulties of terrain most of these post are at some distance from the international border.

Some reports reached us between October, 1957 and February, 1958 that a Chinese detachment had crossed the international frontier and visited Khurnak Fort, which is within Indian territory. The attention of the Chinese Government was drawn to this, and they were asked to desist from entering our territory. They were also informed of our intention to send a reconnaissance party in that area. It may be mentioned that there is no physical demarcation of the frontier in these mountainous passes, although our maps are quite clear on this subject.

Thereafter, at the end of July, 1959, that is last month, a small Indian reconnaissance police party was sent to this area. As this party consisting of an officer and five others was proceeding towards the Khurnak Fort, it was apprehended by a stronger Chinese detachment on July 28, some miles from the border inside our territory. It appeared that the Chinese have established a camp at a place called Spanggur well within Indian territory.

On learning of this, a protest was immediately lodged with the Chinese Government of the violation of our frontier and the release of our reconnaissance party was asked for. In their reply, the Chinese claimed. that that part of the territory was theirs, but added that they would release the persons who had been apprehended. We sent a further note to them expressing surprise at this claim and giving them the exact delineation of traditional international frontier in this sector. We urged once again that the Chinese party well within our territory should be withdrawn. No reply has yet been received to this note. Our party was released on August 18.

Replying to a question whether this place is about 15 miles within our territory and also whether this is the only place which is under occupation by the Chinese troops or they have occupied some other areas also, the Prime Minister said : It is somewhat difficult to deal with this question as an adjunct to the main question. Of course, there have been some frontier troubles in two or three places widely separated; and it would be hardly correct to say that our area is under occupation of the Chinese, that is, under any kind of a fixed occupation. But their patrols have come within our territory two miles or three miles or thereabouts. That is our knowledge, so far as we know.

Replying to another question whether the Chinese had built a road across this territory joining Gartok with Yarkand and whether this road which passed through Ladakhi territory has been there for the last year or so, the Prime Minister said : Yes, that is in northern Ladakh,

197

not exactly near this place but anyhow in the Ladakhi territory.

About a year or two ago, the Chinese had built a road from Gartok towards Yarkand, that is Chinese Turkistan; and the report was that this road passed through a corner of our north-eastern Ladakhi territory. The House will appreciate that these areas are extraordinarily remote, almost inaccessible, and even if they can be approached, it takes weeks and weeks to march and get there. In that connection, a reconnaissance party was sent there. I cannot exactly say when, but I think it was a little over a year ago, some time last year; I could give the exact date, but that is immaterial here; this reconnaissance party was sent there. In fact, two parties were sent; one of them did not return and the other returned.

An Hon. Member: What happened to them?

The Prime Minister : When it did not return, we waited for it for two or three weeks, because these were remote areas. When it did not return we suspected that it might have been apprehended or captured by Chinese authorities on the border. So we addressed the Chinese authorities ; this was more than a year ago. We addressed them about a month after this incident, and they said, yes, some of our people had violated their border and come into their territory, and they had been apprehended but because of their relations with us etc. they were going to release them, and they did release them afterwards, that is, after they had been with them about a month or so.

That is concerning this road about which the Hon. Member was enquiring. In all this area, there is no actual demarcation. So far as we are concerned, our maps are clear that this is within the territory of the Union of India. It may be that some of the parts are not clearly demarcated or anything like that. But obviously, if there is any dispute over any particular area, that is a matter to be discussed.

I may say that this area has nothing to do with the MacMahon Line. The MacMahon Line does not extend to the Ladakh area; it is only on the other side. This was the boundary of the old Kashmir State with Tibet and Chinese Turkistan. Nobody had marked it. But after some kind of broad surveys, the then Government had laid down that border which we have been accepting and acknowledging.

An Hon. Member : Does it mean that in parts of our country which are inaccessible, 'any nation can come and build roads and camp there ? We just send our parties, they apprehend the parties and because of our good relations, they release them. Is that all ? The road remains there, the occupation remains there and we do not do anything about it.

The Prime Minister : I do not know if the Hon. Member expects me to reply to that. There are two or three types of cases here. These are border and frontier questions. In regard to some parts of the border, there can be no doubt from any side that it is our border. If anybody violates it, then it is a challenge to us. There are other parts regarding which it is rather difficult to say where the immediate border is, although broadly it may be known. But it is very difficult even in a map to indicate it : if a big line is drawn that line itself covers three or four miles, one might say, in a major map. Then there are other parts still where there has been no demarcation in the past. Nobody was interested in that area. Therefore, it is a matter now--it should be a matter for consideration of the data etc. by the two parties concerned and decision taken in a normal way, as and when there is some kind of a frontier dispute. In this particular matter, we have been carrying on since then our correspondence. concerning this particular North-East area, and suggesting that this should be considered by the two Governments.

An Hon. Member : The Hon. Prime Minister just now said that if anyone occupies our territory, it is a challenge. May I know what positive steps are being taken, or have been taken, to enforce security measures on this border area ?

The Prime Minister : There are thousands of miles of border. The Hon. Member should be a little more specific in his question. If he is referring to this particular corner, the Achin area, that is an area about some parts of which, if I may say so, it is not quite clear what the position is. It is not at all that particular area. About other area, the position is quite clear. The difficulty comes in regarding some places where there is no absolute certainty about it ; in other places, we are quite clear and certain about it. The border is, I believe, 2,500 miles long.

In reply to a question whether Government's attention has been drawn to a statement of the President, 'Azad Kashmir', blaming India for the Chinese occupation of Ladakh and urging the Security Council to take over the responsibility of the frontiers of Jammu and Kashmir, and if so, what is the reaction of Government to that, Shri Nehru said : I believe I did hear about

it. I attach no importance to it.

198

Replying to another question if these troubles on the border are over the same areas of our territory which the Chinese had indicated as their territory in their maps, and if there is any implication connected with this, the Prime Minister said : This particular question that I answered related to one area. There are other areas too where we have had, and we are, in fact, having some trouble now. I do not want to mix it up with this. Then there will be confusion in one's mind. This is an area with a frontier of over 2,000 miles. I was only venturing to say that by putting two or three places together, there would be confusion in the Members' minds. Let us take them separately so that they may be separate compartments. There is no question of defence or not. For instance, take the Assam Tribune's statement. There is utter confusion in the Assam Tribune's mind about various territories which are thousands of miles apart which have nothing to do with each other. It has lumped them up and said-I believe in the statement in the Assam Tribune that 1,000 Chinese came over the Nathula Pass in the Kameng Frontier Division. It shows utter confusion in the mind of the writer of this. He does not know his geography, although he lives in Assam. It has nothing to do with it. The Nathula Pass is between Sikkim and Tibet and nothing has happened there. Nobody has come across there. It is said that a thousand men came there and put up the Chinese flag. It is completely baseless-I am referring to the statement so far as Nathula Pass is concerned. So far as I know, I have not heard of a Chinese flag being hoisted anywhere there.

As I was saying, there have been cases, and there are continuing cases in one or two places, of Chinese aggression. Therefore, I want to keep these separate so as not to produce confusion in the mind of Hon. Members here. If this question is over, I shall proceed to the other question and deal with as they come.

Shri Nehru said : The Chinese Government's maps are on such a small scale and in broad splashes that some parts of Ladakh appear to be included in them. But they are not accurate enough. What we are discussing, and the question which I have answered, relates to about two or three miles. Two or three miles are not visible in these maps. But it is a fact that part of Ladakh is broadly covered by the wide sweep of their maps.

CHINA USA ANGUILLA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Chinese Construction of Road in Ladakh

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha, on August 31, 1959 in reply to a short-notice question on the construction of a road in Ladakh by the Chinese

According to an announcement made in China, the Yehcheng-Gartok Road, which is also called the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway, was completed in September, 1957. Our attention was drawn to a very small scale map, about $2 \frac{1}{4} \times 1 \frac{3}{4}$ inches, published in a Chinese newspaper, indicating the rough alignment of the road. It was not possible to find out from this small map whether this road crossed Indian territory although it looked as if it did so. It was decided, therefore, to send reconnaissance parties in the following summer to find out the alignment of this road. Two reconnaissance parties were accordingly sent last year. One of these parties was taken into custody by a superior Chinese detachment. The other returned and gave us some rough indication of this newly constructed road in the Aksai Chin area. According to their report, this road enters Indian territory in the south near Sarigh Jilganang lake and runs north-west leaving Indian territory near Hajilangar in the north-west corner of Ladakh.

Representations were made to the Chinese

Government in a note presented to the Chinese Ambassador at New Delhi on the 18th October, 1958, drawing their attention to the construction of the road through Indian territory and the arrest of 15 members of the Indian reconnaissance party within the Indian border. The Chinese Government in their reply presented on 1st November, 1958 notified the release of the party and claimed that the road ran through Chinese territory. A further note expressing our surprise at the Chinese contention was presented to the Chinese authorities on the 8th November, 1958. Reminders have been given subsequently. No further answers have been received.

The Aksai Chin area has a general elevation of over 17,000 ft.

The entire Ladakh area including Aksai Chin became a part of the Jammu and Kashmir State as a result of a treaty signed in 1842 on behalf of Maharaja Gulab Singh on the one side and the Lama Gurusahib of Lhasa-this is the name written in the agreement which I am quoting-and the representative of the Emperor of China on the other. Ever, since then this area has been a part of the Jammu and Kashmir

199

State. Various attempts at demarcating the boundary between the Jammu and Kashmir State and Tibet' were made subsequently by British officers. The Chinese Government was asked to send their representatives to cooperate in this work. They did not take part. The Chinese Commissioner, however, stated on the 13th January, 1847 as follows

"I beg to. observe that the borders of these territories have been sufficienly and distinctly fixed so that it would be best to adhere this ancient arrangement, and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measure for fixing them."

The British officers were also of the same opinion. Although no actual demarcation was made on the ground, maps were prepared on the basis of old usage and convention. These maps have been used in India for the last hundred years or so. They include the Aksai Chin region as part of Ladakh. Since the boundary of the Aksai Chin region with China-Tibet has not been marked on the ground, once or twice questions have been raised about the exact alignment of this boundary. Old Chinese maps have shown a different alignment.

Asked why Parliament was not taken into confidence earlier with regard to this matter, the Prime Minister said: There was not much to take into confidence about, Sir. This was-I gave the date-about November last, and we sent then our protest and subsequent reminders. This is an area peculiarly suited obviously for some kind of consultations and decision as to the facts, because the facts are very complicated, the Chinese claiming that area. In fact, without our knowledge they have made a road in that extreme corner and we have been dealing with it in correspondence. No particular occasion arose to bring the matter to the House, because we thought that we might make progress by correspondence and when the time was ripe for it we would inform Parliament.

As Hon. Member : In view of the fact that the Chinese claim that this admittedly Indian territory is within their frontier and that our protest was lodged as far back as July or August 1958, and in view of the fact that the Chinese claim is unjustified and no reply has been sent to the Indian Government, do not the Government contemplate ousting the Chinese from this Indian territory by force ? Will not the Government of India at least consider the advisability of bombing the road built in our territory out of existence ?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir. Government will not consider that course, because that is not the way Government would like to function in such matters. The Hon. Member started by saying that this is admittedly Indian territory, but the Chinese would not agree to it. That is a contradiction in terms. As a matter of fact, it is Indian territory and we claim it so because we think that the weight of evidence is in our favour, maps etc. But the Chinese produce their own maps, equally old, which are in their favour. And the territory is sterile.

It has been described as a barren, uninhabited region without a vestige of grass and 17,000 ft. height. In places like this, decisions can only be made by conferences, by agreement. Countries do not, should not go to war without proceeding in these or other ways over such matters.

Asked whether the building of this road has been stopped, the Prime Minister said : The road was built. Roads in these areas, Sir, are rather of a peculiar type. In these very high areas the ground is so hard, harder than normal cement and the only thing you have to do to build a road is to even the ground a little and remove stones and shrubs. I cannot even now say when it was built. But reports about it, as I said, reached us from a small Chinese map two years ago. There is also from the Chinese point of view, another question that arises, i.e. whether it is part of Chinese Sinkiang or part of Tibet, because according to some Chinese claims, it belongs to Chinese Sinkiang, some old claims which were advanced later on.

Replying to a question whether there are any persons under arrest with the Chinese still, Shri Nehru said : No, Sir.

Replying to another question whether Government have received any further reports to say that the Chinese have extended their occupation and control over larger areas than when we got information first about this road, the Prime Minister said : Not about that particular area, Sir, but I think there is another question, I am not quite sure..... That is different. There is no question about that. There was a report, this month, in August, not about this area, but an area near Ladakh, a considerable distance away from this area, on the eastern area of Ladakh border of Tibet, where a Chinese detachment was seen by a reconnaissance party, a small Indian patrol in that area ; and ultimately I think 7, 8 or 10 persons-I don't remember the number-were apprehended by the Chinese and later released. The same claim arises here, they say it is their

200

territory and we say it is ours. And the matter arose, as I said, this month and we are carrying on correspondence about that territory. These places are not demarcated on the land. We go by our maps which the Chinese do not recognise and they go presumably by their maps, whatever they have. And this was four five miles according to our maps, may be seven or eight miles, I am not sure, where the Chinese patrol came. And we are told that they have established a small check post a little within our side of the international border there, just on the eastern Ladakh border of Tibet. This is near a place called Chusun near which we have one of our own check posts.

An Hon. Member : The Prime Minister stated a little while ago that this portion of Ladakh is absolutely desolate and unfertile and that not even a blade of grass grows there. Even then China is attaching importance to that area and is building a road there. I would like to know, when China is attaching so much of importance to this desolate bit of land, why when the territory is ours or is under dispute even, we do not attach any importance to this area ?

The Prime Minister : I talked only about the Yehcheng area, not about the whole of Ladakh although the whole of Ladakh, broadly speaking, is 11,000 to 17,000 and 20,000 feet high. Presumably the Chinese attach importance to this area because of the fact that this route connects part of Chinese Turkestan with Gartok-Yehcheng. This is an important connection.

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinese Propagandaagainst Bhutan and Sikkim

Answering a short-notice question in Lok Sabha on August 28, 1959 as to whether the Government of India had seen reports in the press about Chinese propaganda in Sikkim that Bhutan and Sikkim were part of Chinese territory in the past and are bound to return to the Chinese mother land within the next few years ; and if so, the action to be taken to remove the anxiety created by these reports among the people of Sikkim and Bhutan and border territories in India, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said

We have seen occasional reports in the press to the effect mentioned by the Hon'ble Member. It is not possible for us to check up the authenticity of these reports. Such reports are naturally causing concern to the people of Sikkim and Bhutan and elsewhere in the border regions of India. Our position is quite clear. The Government of India is responsible for the protection of the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan and of the territorial integrity of these two States and any aggression against Bhutan and Sikkim will be considered as aggression against India.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether the Governments of Sikkim and Bhutan have by now apprised our Government of the situation obtaining there ? The Prime Minister said that he has seen only newspaper reports.

The Prime Minister : We have been in touch with both the Governments, naturally, I cannot say exactly whether this particular matter was referred to by them. But the fact remains that, if I may use that word, they are not happy about the situation. They are rather nervous about what is happening round about them.

An Hon. Member: As the reports indicate, the Chinese troops are all along the 500 mile border of Bhutan and Tibet; and it has also come to our notice that the traditional route to Bhutan which passes through a portion of Tibet has been closed. In the circumstances, may I know what help the Government of India is going to render to save Bhutan's economy at present ? May I also know whether the Defence Ministry has studied the entire situation from the new position which has been created at present ?

The Prime Minister : A big question, Sir. It is true that there have been some recent difficulties in a person going to Bhutan from India by the normal route which crossed a little corner of Tibet below Yatung, a route, in fact, by which I went last year this time or a little later. There will be difficulty for Bhutanese people to cross that route. Therefore, they are using other routes. There are other routes from India, of course ; only they are longer and sometimes more difficult and these routes are being improved. In fact, quite apart from recent incidents, there is a programme of road building in Bhutan, roads from India to Bhutan and within Bhutan, and we are helping them in building those roads.

As for the Hon. Member's enquiry about the Defence Ministry, the Defence Ministry no doubt keeps all these things in view and it is difficult for me to discuss what exactly the Defence Ministry may consider right or proper under a certain set of circumstances.

201

Replying to a question whether Government have received any reports of harassment of Bhutan and Sikkim citizens by the Chinese troops or Chinese nationals, the Prime Minister said : So far as I know, I do not think there has been any incursion of Chinese troops into Bhutan or Sikkim. The Chinese troops came to those borders probably because the refugees were coming through that way, possibly to stop them or in pursuit of them. Probably, they were not more gentle with the refugees. One can imagine that. But I do not think there kind of conflict was any with the Bhutanese as such. It may be that some threats were thrown out occasionally and some Bhutanese have heard them.

Replying to another question whether the Prime Minister can give a clear guarantee that in no case the Chinese will be allowed to set up any post in Bhutan or Sikkim as they have done in Ladakh, Shri Nehru said :

That is a very odd question. I do not think, not only this poor Prime Minister, any Prime Minister can give guarantees of that type. All we can say is that as I have said already any kind of incursion into Bhutan or Sikkim will be considered incursion into India, that we shall abide by the assurances we have given to them. How we shall abide by them and in what manner if circumstances arise is a matter for careful consideration. It is not a matter of a direct statement made in this Muse or elsewhere but of action, if necessity arises, difficult action, very difficult action and action the burden of which will have to be borne by this House. It is not an easy matter in which an easy assurance can be given which may rather sound pompous.

CHINA BHUTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinese Threat to India'sFrontiers

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 13, 1959 in reply to adjournment motions :-

I entirely agree with the Hon. Member that the integrity of India should be safeguarded at all costs. There can be no doubt about it ; every Member in this House agrees.

Now, coming to this particular motion, it is based apparently on a news item today which itself is based on some despatch to a London newspaper. In this newspaper reference is made to a speech that Mr. Chang Kuow-Hua is supposed to have delivered on a certain day. I have not seen that report of the speech-I do not know. A report of that speech was given in the official Chinese paper called China Today. I have read that report. This particular passage is not there. That of course does not lead us to believe that it is not possible, but it is not there. Anyhow, it would be an exceedingly foolish person who would make the remarks attributed to this gentleman about Ladakh, Sikkim and Bhutan. We shall try to find out whether any speech was delivered on that date and, in so far as we can, what the contents of that speech were. We have had no information from any reliable source of such statements being made by any person who can be considered reliable. Therefore, it is rather difficult for me to

deal with something in the air.

As for the report that there are large forces-Chinese forces-there are Chinese forces, pretty large forces, I believe, in Tibet. It might even be called 'very large forces' all over Tibet, which came there when this rebellion started there. We have no exact information as to the extent of these forces. I do not think that any large forces are concentrated on our frontiers. Some are there, no doubt. Anyhow, we are quite awake and alert over this matter, and if we get any reliable information I shall place it before the House. I may say that in one of our last notes to the Chinese Government, which was sent I think on the 23rd July, we protested inter alia against the propaganda, in the Chinese official organ, describing India and Indian as imperialists.

In reply to a question whether it is a fact that the Chinese Government have sent some communications to our Government, of late. suggesting that the MacMahon Line no longer prescribes or describes the international boundary as it was not ratified by the Chinese Government, and as it was only a British creation there should be some sort of redrawing of the line, the Prime Minister said : No, Sir ; we have received no such communication now or at any earlier stage. So far as we are concerned, the MacMahon Line is the firm frontier, firm by treaty, firm by usage, firm by geography. There are minor pockets, small areas in the MacMahon Line or elsewhere on the frontier, where some arguments have occasionally arisen, where questions, sometimes of a mile or two this way or that way, have arisen in the past, and discussions have taken place and will continue, no doubt. So, sometimes we have these

202

arguments about these matters. In fact, we are having, I think, about one or two matters even now but they do not affect the major frontier line called the MacMahon Line.

An Hon. Member : May I know from the Prime Minister that when Mr. Chou-En-lai made a reference to our undefined frontiers with our southern neighbours-when he said like that--did he include India with the southern neighbours ? Did he have that in mind ? The Prime Minister: I cannot say or interpret Premier Chou En-lai's speech and what he has in mind. But the impression that was given to us by Mr. Chou En-lai some years back was, having regard to all the circumstances, they accepted this, what is called MacMahon Line-unfortunately, we might have a better name for it ; but still, they accepted that as the international frontier.

CHINA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM BHUTAN

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indian Pilgrims

The Prime. Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on August 24, 1959 in reply to an adjournment motion :

The Hon. Member has said many things just now for which I do not know what support and evidence he has. So far as this motion for adjournment is concerned, I have read it two or three times without being able to understand exactly what the Hon. Member means by it. It says :

"The grave situation arising out of the hostile attitude of the Chinese Communists towards Indians as evidenced from the warning contained in a recent note..."

I take it that the note referred to is the one issued about intending pilgrims. I do not know why that should be taken to mean a hostile attitude to anybody. It may mean, as he himself has hinted, that conditions in certain parts of Tibet are so insecure that pilgrims are not safe. I shall read out the exact message that we received in regard to this matter. The Chinese Foreign Bureau in Lhasa conveyed to our Consul-General there the following message. I am giving it as received.

"In view of that, at present the PLA are launching a punitive expedition towards a tiny minority of remnant rebels that are there. The Consul-General would be kind to tell the Indian pilgrims that for the sake of safety it is better for them not to come for pilgrimage or come in as fewer as possible this year. If they insist to come the responsibility of safety should be borne by themselves."

Now, the meaning is quite clear that they are carrying on expeditionary or another hostile activities there and conditions are not safe for people and for pilgrims and they warn pilgrims that they should not come or, if they come, they should come as few as possible at their own risk.

It is true that under the terms of our agreement with China, pilgrims are allowed free access, but where conditions become bad internally, whoever may be responsible for it, we can hardly go on saying that we will go and you will be responsible for it. Technically it may be true. Anyhow, this indicates that conditions are not normal there and that some kind of conflicts are proceeding.

As regards the date on which that note was received, the Prime Minister said : I should imagine-I do not know-about two or three days ago or just in the last few days. It is quite recent. I am not sure of the date but I saw it, I think, about two days ago, probably. As for the reference to Indians being kept within doors, I am not aware of that at all or of any order to the effect that Indians should keep within their houses.

Asked whether the note appeared in the papers Shri Nehru replied : I am sorry that I am not aware of that fact in spite of what the papers say. In other words, what the papers say, so far as I am concerned, is not correct. I cannot guarantee everything, but we are likely to have more correct information of the internal conditions in Tibet. After all, we do get messages from our Consulates and Trade Agents. I cannot say about what happens in the interior, somewhere

203

where there is no Consulate or Trade Agent, but we have not received any such information from our Consulate or Trade Agents. What has happened is that sometimes, when the disturbance took place in the cities there, for a few days or may be two or three weeks, people were not encouraged to go out from certain areas in the cities, in Lhasa from the Consulate area to other areas. They were not allowed and movement in these areas was restricted. But that was at that time. So far as I know, no such house arrest business is taking place and movement is not restricted except outside the city area, that is, probably some kind of a permit is required to go outside the city areas or outside a certain major part of the city to certain other part of the city, like at Yatung.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether it is a fact that all attempts made by our Ambassador in Peking to meet Mr. Chou En-lai to discuss the position of Indians in Tibet have so far not succeeded? If it is so, what is the information with the Hon. Prime Minister about it ?

The Prime Minister : Mr. Chou En-lai is the Prime Minister of China. Most Prime Ministers normally do not discuss these matters with foreign Ambassadors. It is the Foreign Ministers who discuss these matters. I may discuss them in my capacity as Foreign Minister. Prime Ministers are not easily accessible. They are more accessible in India than in most other countries.

Replying to a question if it is a fact that the Police is still posted in front of the office of the Indian Consul-General in Lhasa and the Indians who go there are being interrogated by the Police, the Prime Minister said: Yes, Sir. I am not quite sure exactly what the position now is, but there were some sentries posted in front of the Consulate-General, who checked people, without permits, trying to come in. In particular, the report we got was that some of these Ladakhi Muslims, who wanted to come to consult our Consulate-General, were stopped from coming.

INDIA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on India's Trade

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 6, 1959, in regard to an adjournment motion on the difficulties experienced in India's trade with Tibet:

I do not think that this is a matter for an adjournment motion. But I can very well understand Hon. Members being interested in these reports and in these developments. It is true that Indian trade within Ladakh has suffered very considerably in the last few months, more especially since these disturbances in Tibet. I will give some figures. In February last our trade with Central Tibet was Rs. 15 lakhs imports, and. Rs. 10 lakhs exports. By June the corresponding values declined to Rs. 2 lakhs imports and Rs. 3 lakhs exports. So there is a big fall.

We have received many reports about the difficulties in the way of Indian traders. They cannot travel about. They cannot get transport. They cannot send their goods. All these difficulties have arisen. About another thing, I do not know how far it is true, that is, as stated in this adjournment motion, about the goods of Indian traders having been frozen, but the fact is that they cannot easily be moved for lack of transport.

Also, there has been a recent order-so we are told-declaring Indian currency as well as Tibetan currency in Tibet I as illegal. But although the order has been passed, it is not quite clear to us whether it has been enforced or not fully. Anyhow, such an order would not be in keeping with the agreement-at any rate with the spirit of the 1954 Agreement.

There is no doubt that there are these difficulties. In fact, we had many other difficulties too in regard to other matters in Tibet, for example, regarding the functioning of our trade agencies. We have been communicating with the Chinese Government on this subject quite fully and repeatedly.

An Hon. Member : What has been the result of those communications? What is the reaction of the Chinese Government?

The Prime Minister : We have received in regard to some minor matters some replies, etc. Of course, there have been local references by our Counsul-General in Lhasa. The results of those local references have not been satisfactory, and some little time ago we sent a full memorandum to the Chinese Government in Peking about it. To that we have had no formal reply, except that they are considering it.

Replying to a question whether India's Trade Agents are free to move in those areas, or whether certain restrictions have been placed on their

204

movement, Prime Minister Nehru said: I think that normally there is some restriction about the distance-that is, about two or three miles or beyond-some restrictions-without a permit they cannot go. Also, there is a difficulty sometimes of transport not being available.

In reply to another question whether there is any discrimination between the Nepalese traders and the Indian traders, as is reported in the Press, the Prime Minister said : I would not be able to say that, because there are relatively few Nepalese traders. Maybe, occasionally they might have been shown somewhat different treatment, but I do not think there is any marked difference.

An Hon. Member : Is it true that our Trade Agent had to change his route on account of a direction from the Chinese Government? Originally be was to go by a different route, but he had to, take a longer route which meant more delay.

The Prime Minister : That is so. Our Trade Agent in West Tibet in Gartok had actually gone almost to the pass through which he could enter Tibet, but then he was told to go across another pass, which meant several weeks journey backwards and forwards.

INDIA USA CHINA NEPAL

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on Status of Indiansin Tibet

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 11, 1959 :

According to our latest information, there are 97 registered Indian traders in Yatung, Phari and Gyantse and about 2,000 seasonal traders who are currently visiting Western Tibet. The Government of India, however, have no exact information about the number of Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhi Lamas in Tibet. As far as we have been able to ascertain, there are 124 families of Kashmiri Muslims with a total number of 583 persons in the Lhasa-Shigatse area. We are also informed by Shri Kushak Bakula that before the recent disturbances nearly 400 Lama students from Ladakh were studying in various monasteries in Tibet. There were approximately 40 Ladakhi Lamas among the refugees who came to India from Tibet. The rest are presumed to be still there.

The reason for lack of precise information about the number of Kashmiri Muslims and Ladakhi Lamas in Tibet is that previous to 1954 travel between the Ladakh region and the Tibet region of China was practically free. Traditionally hundreds of Ladakhi Buddhists used to visit the Tibetan region and join the monasteries there for their religious education. Similarly, Muslims from Ladakh also visited Tibet for trade in Shigatse, Lhasa and elsewhere. Some of these Muslim families have been resident in Tibet for more than one generation The 1954 Agreement for the first time provided that traders travelling between India and Tibet should possess certificates issued by the local Government of the country of origin. Pilgrims were not required to carry documents of certification but were to be registered at the border check-post by the other party and receive permits for pilgrimage. Such checkposts however existed at only a number of specified passes. People from Ladakh who travelled to Tibet by the other passes in the Western Tibet area even after 1954 did not therefore possess either traders' certificates or pilgrims' permits. There is also no question of those who had been residing in the Tibet region before 1954 and have not since come to India possessing any certificate of identification.

Instructions were issued by us after the conclusion of the 1954 Agreement that Kashmiri Muslims and other persons of Indian origin must be registered as Indian citizens under Article 8 of the Constitution. Registration under this article was, however, not obligatory and most of the traders and Lamas who were accustomed to traditional freedom of movement and privilege of study in the Tibetan monasteries did not take the trouble of registering themselves as Indian nationals. In fact only 21 persons in Lhasa and Shigatse have registered their names with the Indian Consulate General. The result is that the majority of the people of these categories did not possess any valid travel documents or any other document of identification.

When the recent disturbances began, a large number of persons of Indian origin expressed their desire to register themselves with the Indian Consulate General as Indian citizens. Certain difficulties were placed in their way by the local Tibetan authorities. We, therefore, took up the matter informally with the Chinese authorities in Lhasa and followed up our representation with a request in writing both in Lhasa and through our Embassy in Peking. We explained to the Chinese authorities that since these persons came to Tibet when there was no obligation on them to take out any travels paper or document of nationality it would not be fair to draw an adverse

205

conclusion against-them that they are not Indian citizens. We also pointed out that there was no obligation on these- persons to register themselves as Indian nationals with our Consulate General in Lhasa.

In a-note dated July 17, 1959, the Chinese Government suggested to us that these persons who had been residing in Tibet for long periods were to all intents and purposes Chinese nationals. We: have instructed our Embassy in Peking to take up the matter again with the Chinese authorities and urge that persons of Indian origin from Ladakh and other parts of India, who consider themselves Indian nationals and wish to seek- theadvice and protection of our Consul-General, should be permitted to do so, or in the alternative they should be allowed to return to India. We have not yet had any final reply. Meantime, according to our information, two Indians were registered with our Consulate General and three other Indians who were not registered are held, in custody by the Chinese authorities.

The Government of India will continue to press their view on the Chinese Government.

INDIA USA CHINA AZERBAIJAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement In Lok Sabha on Tibetan Refugees

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on August 11, 1959, in reply to questions by several Hon. Members of the House.

The following is the text of the statement

The total number of Tibetan refugees who have come to India is 12,396.

Arrangements have been made for the employment of unskilled refugees on road works in Sikkim and NEFA. Those who are old and infirm have been sent to Dalhousie and will be maintained at the expense of the Government. A number of refugees with relations in India have been permitted to join their families in the Darjeeling district.

Student Lamas are being accommodated at Buxa, where they will pursue their religious Studies. Children below the age of 16 years will be sent to schools.

Refugees who are not being maintained by Government and who are being dispersed for road works are being given a resettlement grant of Rs. 50/- in addition to the cost of transportation and shelter at the worksites. Arrangements have also been made to give instruction in Hindi in Camps and on the worksites so that refugees can adjust themselves to the conditions in India. It is also intended to select some refugees for training in crafts and vocations after careful appraisal has been made of their aptitudes.

Since dispersal from Camps has begun recently, it is not possible to indicate monthly expenditure on the rehabilitation of refugees.

All voluntary relief activities are being co-ordinated by the Central Relief Committee for Tibetan Refugees presided over by Acharya J. B. Kripalani. The Indian Red Cross Society has associated itself with the Central Committee.

All contributions coming from India or foreign voluntary agencies are received by the Central Committee. It is understood that contributions have been received from the American Tibetan Relief Committee, the Catholic Relief Committee, the Indian National Christian Council and the Co-operative for American Relief everywhere. As most of the contributions are in kind, it has not been possible to estimate their value.

The Government have received no communication regarding the return of these refugees to Tibet.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Agreement on Payment Arrangements Signed

Letters embodying an agreement between India and the United- Arab Republic on payment arrangements were exchanged in New Delhi on August 1, 1959

Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce & Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. T. Labib, Deputy Superintendent of the Central

206

Exchange Control Department of the Government of UAR, and Mr. Y. S. Abady, Commercial Counsellor in the UAR Embassy in New Delhi, signed on behalf of the UAR Government.

It is expected that as a result of thew new arrangements the stalemate in Indo-UAR trade which had developed over the last few weeks would be ended and the tempo of trade between the two countries would increase.

According to the terms of the agreement, the proceeds of Egyptian cotton imports into India would be utilised for payment for Egypt's imports of tea and jute goods and such other commodities as may be further agreed to between the two Governments and also for repayment of loan. For this purpose, a Special Account will be immediately opened in Indian rupees with the State Bank of India in the name of the National Bank of Egypt. Funds in this Account will be fully utilised for purchases in India or payments in respect of loans in India. In view of the new Account being opened, the Egyptian Pound Realization Account would be closed and all the rights and liabilities of that Account transferred to the new Account.

Invoices for cotton will be in Indian rupees and prices will be those ruling in Alexandria market, after being adjusted according to the discount ruling on the date of contract and converted into Indian rupees according to the official rates.

Regarding exports other than tea and jute goods from India under the arrangement the list of commodities would be settled from time to time by mutual agreement In respect of these commodities purchased from this Account, if Egyptian Government desires to charge any premium for rupees, it will be subject to mutual agreement.

The present 'H' Account would be continued on the same terms as before. The proceeds of Egyptian goods other than cotton could be utilized for the purchase of such goods other than tea and jute goods as may be determined by mutual agreement from time to time for governmental and non-governmental purchases and Egyptian Government will continue to issue licences to persons or Government according to the funds available in 'H' Account without any delay.

In respect of such licences and purchases no premiums shall be chargeable for getting Indian currency permits for imports. The commodities thus agreed to so far are pepper, tobacco, electric fans, diesel engines, dry batteries, centrifugal pumps, other engineering items, spare parts for Indian machines, artificial dentures, chemical and pharmaceutical products, mica, coir hair, coir rope, medicines, medical instruments, surgical instruments, sewing machines, sandalwood chips, tamarind, perfume oils, sports goods and turmeric.

Goods entering into trade between both the countries would not be re-exported by either country. Egyptian importers. who are given sterling licences valid for import on payment of sterling would be permitted to utilise such licences for purchases of goods from India against payment in sterling, provided India could offer such goods competitively.

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on Aviation Agreement

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Union 'Minister of Defence, affirmed in Parliament on August 10, 1959 that an agreement had been signed with M/s. Hawker Siddley Group of the United Kingdom for the manufacture of "Avro 748" in India to replace the Dakotas in the Indian Air Force. This statement was made in reply to a question put on the subject in the Lok Sabha by several Hon. Members of the House.

Regarding the principal terms of the agreement the Minister added : "It is not in the public interest to disclose details of the agreement; but the terms are the most favourable which we could get from any aircraft manufacturer. The broad terms of the agreement, however, are that we pay a licence fee spread over eight annual instalments. The first instalment is payable only after the aircraft is certified and we are satisfied that it meets the IAF's requirements. No royalty is payable on the first 100 aircraft manufactured. The Government of India will also have the right to sell this aircraft. to other countries subject to agreed conditions.

The maximum all-up weight of the aircraft will be 33,000 lbs; the weight of the aircraft and fittings is 19,360 lbs; its payload is 9,750 lbs; and

207

its maximum fuel capacity is 3,890 lbs. It can carry 36 passengers. It will be powered by two Rolls Royce Dart Rda 6 engines."

To another question whether the Lockheed Company of the U.S. had also offered to manu-

facture aircrafts in India, the Minister stated: "The Lockheed Aircraft Company have not made any specific offer for the manufacture of any particular aircraft. They, however, at a rather latest age in our plans for the manufacture of aircraft to replace Dakotas, made a general offer to design an aircraft to suit Indian requirements, powered by Rolls Royce Dart 6 engines. They wanted 90 days' time to submit any report which we would then be free to examine. Since the question of manufacture in India of an aircraft to replace Dakotas had been under consideration for a long time and an early decision had to be taken, the Government could not wait another three months for new proposals, as it would mean postponing a decision by about 6 months, which would be the time required to get the Lockheeds' proposals and have them properly studied and evaluated. From their preliminary offer, however, it was apparent that the offers before us were more suitable to us.

USA RUSSIA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Loan, Assistance

Replying to a question on the utilisation of the West German loans of DM 168 million, the Deputy Finance Minister, Shri B. R. Bhagat, said in the Lok Sabha on August 13, 1959 that a sum of DM 96 million had so far been drawn from the loan. Further sums would continue to be drawn in coming weeks.

Shri Bhagat added that the object of the loan was to enable the Government of India to obtain the funds for meeting the payments due on imports from West Germany. The actual imports from West Germany after the relevant date had been in fact more than the total value of the loan. Under the agreement, the loan however, could be drawn upon only for reimbursement to the Government of India of 80% of payments for Indian imports made to German suppliers after 31 August, 1958 and that too, only of those payments that were under contracts covered by the German Federal Government guarantees of insurance. The rate of drawal of the loan was governed by these limitations in regard to its availability, principally by the condition that only imports covered by German Federal Government guarantees were eligible to be considered.

208

GERMANY USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

AFGHANISTAN

Nehru - Daud Joint Statement

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, paid a visit to Afghanistan from September 14 to 18, 1959. During his stay there Shri Nehru had talks with the Afghan Prime Minister, Sardar Mohammad Daud on matters of mutual interest. At the conclusion of their talks the Prime Ministers of India and Afghanistan issued a joint statement in Kabul on September 18, 1959.

The following is the text of the statement

At the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan the Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, paid a visit to Afghanistan lasting from September 14 to 18. During his stay in Kabul he was received by His Majesty the King and called on the Prime Minister, Sardar Mohammad Daud. The King had visited India in February 1958 and the Prime Minister a year later. The present visit of the Prime Minister of India to Afghanistan thus afforded welcome opportunity for strengthening the friendly associations earlier made and further exchange of views and impressions on current developments in the international situation as well as on matters of mutual interest. These talks at which the Deputy Prime Minister and acting Foreign Minister of Afghanistan also took part, were held in an atmosphere of complete cordiality and understanding reflecting the traditional friendship and affinities between the two countries.

In a joint statement issued at the conclusion of the visit of the King of Afghanistan to India in February 1958, hope was expressed that a meeting at a high level in which would participate more particularly the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. would be held to consider international tensions and the problems of war and peace. It must be a matter of universal gratification that events are moving towards the realization of that hope. The recent announcement of an exchange of visits between Mr. Eisenhower and of Mr. Khrushchev is a happy augury, and at this moment when Mr. Khrushchev has begun his visit to the United States the two Prime Ministers take pleasure in expressing the wish that this far-sighted action of the leaders of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. will promote mutual understanding between these countries as well as assist in lessening world tensions and pave the way for a progressive solution of the grave problems that continue to pose a threat to the future of the world and mankind.

While reaffirming the responsibility of the Disarmament Commission the Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the step which had been taken to break the deadlock in disarmament discussions by the appointment of a ten Power Disarmament Committee. They also noted with satisfaction the announcement of early resumption of the work of the Conference on discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests. While welcoming these and other favourable trends that were manifesting themselves in the international scene the Prime Ministers could not but be conscious of the existence of some international disputes and tensions and they reiterated their firm conviction that all international disputes should in the interest of world peace and humanity be settled by peaceful means alone and not through resort to arms.

The Prime Ministers declared their full sympathy and continued support for the aspirations of peoples still under colonial rule and for their efforts to attain their independence. Independence alone can ensure for these peoples opportunities for self-development and progress as well as conditions of national equality which provide the fundamental basis for the promotion of peace among nations. It is a matter of continuing satisfaction to the Prime Ministers that the relations between their two countries remain of the friendliest character. The policy of nonalignment which the two countries have adopted and actively pursued and their similarity of outlook on many matters of world importance have strengthened and given further content and reality to the relationship forged by history and traditional contacts through the centuries. The Prime Ministers agreed that these cordial relations should be sustained and enlarged by increased cultural co-operation and promotion of mutual trade.

The Prime Minister of India expressed his appreciation and gratitude for the warm and cordial reception which the Government and the people of Afghanistan alike had accorded him. The goodwill that exists between the peoples of the two countries of which the welcome given to the Prime Minister of India was a clear demonstration, is the surest guarantee of enduring relations between the two countries.

209

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Chinese Representation

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement at the United Nations General Assembly on September 22, 1959 on the question of Chinese representation.

The following is the text of his statement

Mr. President, the debate on this item at this time in the Assembly gives us the opportunity of offering the felicitations of my delegation on your unanimous election to this high office. It would be preposterous for me to recount your qualities which fit you to be President of the United Nations because there is hardly a representative in this Assembly who has not had personal experience of your kindness and courtesy and your great wisdom. The Assembly indeed is to be congratulated, as well as yourself, on your election to this high office.

My delegation has put down an item on the provisional agenda on the question of Chinese representation. I believe there have been some twenty-six or twenty-seven speakers engaging the attention of the Assembly for the last eight hours on a question which has continually engaged the attention of the Assembly at, I believe, some ten succeeding sessions and, what is more, in the debates of every one of its organs. While the question is old, the situation cannot be called old but still subsisting. This has been among the considerations which have moved some of the speakers to inquire why India has put down this item once again, from two points of view, one, the fact that it has been so many times brought forward and not been carried: and the other, the reference to particular developments within the last few weeks or months, or in recent times.

I come to this rostrum at a very late stage in this debate, not because of any hesitation on the part of my delegation to put forward its point of view; nor do we think it can be taken leisurely. But fortunately for us, our friend from Nepal put down an amendment to the recommendation in the report of the General Committee, which is the form in which this matter comes here. That amendment, whatever may be its procedural structure, in effect asks for the rejection of the recommendation of the General Committee. The presence of my delegation here at a late hour only serves to indicate, if anything, that we are anxious to place before the Assembly our position as fully as we can. The Government of India has never lacked candour as far as the Assembly is concerned. We have never refrained from putting forward our point of view, even if it is unpopular, as it often is. We have placed the item of China on the provisional agenda for the same reason as we have done so year after year or participated in it from 1949 onwards.

Before I go into the history of this question, I should like first of all to deal with the constitutional aspects of this matter which concerns us as a Government and as a delegation, not only in regard to this item but to anything else. One of the speakers, in quite another context in the course of this debate, referred to the standards of the United Nations. We are concerned that the rules and the law of the United Nations should not be tortured, should not be contaminated, or in any way adversely affected by particular political considerations.

Last year we raised this point, somewhat briefly. Under your presidency, Mr. President, once again an unhealthy precedent has been followed. An item is proposed on the provisional agenda. The General Committee is strictly enjoined not to enter political considerations. The only function the General Committee has in this context is either to accept or to reject an item. It, may be argued that the first part of the draft resolution of the General Committee probably does it. The only thing that might be said against it is that it is unnecessary; that a contrary vote is sufficient, instead of having a draft resolution. But that is a matter of taste. However, the Second part is not covered by the item at all, because the item simply says "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations". On that there is a draft resolution on a political question, which is strictly barred by rule 41 of the rules of procedure, which states:

"It shall assist the President in the general conduct of the work of the General Assembly which falls within the competence of the President. It shall not, however, decide any political question".

It may be said that this is not deciding a political question but is solely making a recommendation, that is merely a decision to recommend rather than making a political decision. Therefore I submit-though I know it is not going to carry me any further that the whole posture adopted by the General Committee in regard to this is

210

ultra vires as regards the rules and the purpose of the General Committee. This Committee, which is also called a steering committee, is a business committee to deal with some of the problems of the Assembly beforehand in order that our work may be facilitated. Instead of that, like many other organs of the Assembly-and I will not specify any-it tries to usurp all the sovereign functions of this body, and I submit that no such committee,' least of all a steering committee, is qualified to pronounce politically.

Having said that, I should now like to refer to the fact of our repetitive appearances on this rostrum on this subject. It has now become an annual subject but it is by no means a hardy annual in the sense that a hardy annual means that there is no flexibility about it and nothing has changed, that it is merely a kind of habit of ours to bring it up. That is not the position.

However, in this connexion, may I refer to the history of this matter, which directly leads to the reasons why we are here. When I say "the history of this matter" I do not intend to cover the events in chronological order or even the whole history of it. All I say is this. As soon as the present Government and regime of China established itself-and I believe that is what was expected-they applied to be recognized as representing the Chinese people. That was about ten years ago. They came here then before the Security Council, and in no time their application was rejected out of hand. Committees were appointed and, what is more, as a result of this, the Assembly deliberated and came to a decision at the fifth session to the effect that, where there is a dispute as to who should represent a people and two parties are claiming the same seat, the matter must be discussed in the Assembly. However, at no time has any decision been reached on this matter.

The second aspect of it is that year after year for the last two years anyway--a resolution has come here from the General Committee, not from a delegation but from the General Committee, asking that there should be no consideration of this matter for the duration of the session. I submit that many errors are being committed here. First of all, we are putting the Credentials Committee out of court. That is to say, by a resolution we decide that the credentials of a delegation should not be looked into. I think that is not only ultra vires ; it is an affront to the dignity of this Assembly. No one has the right to say beforehand who shall represent any of us. We shall not be removed from here, because our credentials are good, but, legally speaking, we are not here until the Credentials Committee has pronounced upon us.

Secondly, by this draft resolution recommending postponement, those who are the initial authors and the General Committee itself must not simply say that the matter will be postponed. That is a matter of discretion. There have been no final decisions, as far as the Assembly is concerned, on this question.

Now reference has been made to recent incidents-and I do not want to mince my wordsthese recent incidents refer to the rebellion in Tibet and the handling of it by the Chinese Government in ways that have shaken public opinion in our country and has also stirred people elsewhere. This is not the occasion either to go into the constitutionality or anything of it. I want to say that there is considerable public feeling in our land on this matter and therefore we are not speaking without emotion or on strictly legalistic grounds.

The second is what? Various speakers have spoken differently as to the invasion of India, or the incursions in India, or aggression on our frontiers, on this or that and the other. We certainly appreciate the concern of people about the integrity of India. I wish this concern had been expressed when other violations took place. when year after year we voted in the Security Council and sat there, ten out of the eleven members supporting the aggression. Therefore, it is not merely the concern in that way. But I will put that on one side. Let us look at it this way : the Government of India cannot accept the position that the delegations here, all eighty-one of you barring us, are more concerned about the integrity of our soil than we are. I think it is doing us a disfavour

in suggesting that anyone else could be more concerned about the integrity of our country than we are. So far as the Chinese are concerned, we have told them in plain words that while we were prepared to discuss any question, however difficult it is, while we were prepared to make adjustments and compromises and while our policy remains one of continuing friendship and settling matters by negotiation, we shall not be intimidated, we shall not yield a square inch of territory, and what is more, we shall not permit unilateral action with regard to unsettled disputes. That is our position. Therefore, as far as China is concerned, we tell them that if there are disputes, "you will sit down and talk like civilized people and friendly Governments and these matters are not to be settled unilaterally."

So, on the one hand the Government of India

211

is firm in the policy of the maintenance of its sovereignty. What is more, the 2,000 miles of our frontier-it is our frontier, and we know more about it than anyone else. What is more, if there is a strong country on the other side and it represents a menace or a matter of concern for us, I think the Government of India must be regarded as having a sufficient sense of maturity and political judgement to know its consequences. At the same time, we are sufficiently mature and sufficiently devoted to the purposes of the Charter and the general orientation of the United Nations not to create a war psychosis. We have no desire to exaggerate events any more than to minimize them. As my Prime Minister said, it is not a question of two mountain tops or some grazing rights of anything of that kind. When people feel that their country has been torn over, there is an emotional uprising among the people, and therefore we shall resist it. But at the same time we shall not permit the situation either in our country or elsewhere to be used to become one in which the peace of the world is affected more than otherwise. In other words, the reason why we bring this item here is largely not in our selfish interests.

We are asked, "In view of your disillusion about China, then why do you bring this item here?" There again, I submit, that it is not, shall I say, a very generous way of looking at us. We do not bring the question of China here because China was our neighbour or because China was on friendly relations with us. We asked countries like the United States, for example, or various other countries who have hostile feelings, if you like, quite legitimately perhaps, who are unfriendly who do not regard China as trustworthy, who regard China as having committed aggression, we have asked them in the past, "This may be so, but we do not want to change your opinion; but you must allow them to come here." Now, if that is soft, it must be equally soft for us.

We could not come here this year and say, "We have had a little bit of trouble on the frontier, so the whole basis of our approach to the United Nations on a particular question has changed." If that is the attitude Governments take in this Assembly, then this Assembly cannot afford to make progress. Therefore, I think, if anything we deserve a decree of appreciation from a large number of people, that even when we were hurt we were willing to bring up this question of principle in the interests of the United Nations and in the interests of world peace and co-operation. That is our position.

If we thought that we should not bring up this matter here this year, it could be only because there was a change in our foreign policy, in its fundamentals, I mean, or because we think principles are so elastic that they can be forgotten when one's own interests are concerned. That is not the position so far as we are concerned.

Now, on this matter being a serious one of consequences not only in the debates here but everywhere else, I would like to deal with them from the point of view of my Government. It is not as though, as someone suggested, that we have put down this item before the troubles, that there may be, occurred, and if otherwise, it would not have been so. Actually, this item was submitted to this Assembly in June, long after the troubles in Tibet took place-these recent ones, not the older ones-and after deliberate and due consideration we put down this item. So, there is no question of our having made a mistake in this matter, and our explanatory memorandum which is document A/4139, dated 14 July-not long ago, makes it very clear. I quote :

"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 no doubt that only the People's Government of China is in a position to comply with those decisions and recommendations of the United Nations which affect the Chinese specifically or which are addressed to all Member States."

The fact that China has behaved towards us ungenerously, unfairly, if you like, the fact that its action, as we see it, has not been to their benefit or to ours or to that of the world, would not alter our position. The Prime Minister of India when speaking on this matter, when he was specifically questioned in the Legislature said :

"Our policy in regard to the entry of China into the United Nations remains as it was. It is not that it is based on certain facts by these things; it is not because we get angry with something that happens in China that we change our policy. That would mean that we have no firm policies, that we are deflected by temporary happenings in the world."

A few days later he said ... we have earnestly striven to stand by

212

these principles and I do not think we have offended them ... we have tried to do that not because of some temporary reasons, not because these so-called five principles have been declared in some agreement ... but because we have felt that that is the only way to function in this world."

"We have repeatedly come to this rostrum, we have repeatedly gone to conferences and said that if these principles are right, we hold by them and we should hold by them, even though nobody in the wide world is willing to adopt them. Naturally, we have to adapt our policies to what happens in the world; we cannot live in isolation. But a principle should be acted upon even though somebody else has not acted upon it."

That is to say, even violations by the other party to the original statement of the five principles, namely China, would not justify our going away from it without a great deal of consideration.

"...we hold by them and we shall endeavour to act up to them whatever other countries may or may not do."

That is our position in regard to this matter and therefore the Assembly should not be lea into some wrong view of things, thinking they are acting in sympathy with us ; because we are the people who brought this here and we make no apologies for it.

"The basic reasons for our foreign policy" -said the Prime Minister-"were not based on merely being friendly to China or to some other country. It is not merely a matter of sentiment or relationship. We wanted to be friendly with other countries-but our approach to it is basic." "These principles" we think "are right, and they do not become unright," as he says, "because somebody does not agree with it. I do not understand what the present situation which has developed, serious as it is, has got to do with putting our foreign policy in what is called a melting pot. So far as I am concerned" -says the Prime Minister-"and so far as our Government is concerned, our foreign policy is firm ... and the present Government will hold to non-alignment because it is a matter of principle, not of opportunism or the convenience of the day."

I think it is necessary to declare on this rostrum that our misfortunes or whatever may happen one way or another will not induce our Government to be drawn into "cold war" attitudes or into war blocs. In maintaining our rights, our dignity and our self-respect, in not allowing ourselves to drift into wrong and hostile attitudes and in trying to help in removing or solving each problem as it arises, we may help a little. That is the line we propose to take. That is the utmost we can do in the circumstances and in the creation of this atmosphere we have to play our part. So that is the position so far as we are concerned.

The second is the general atmosphere that has sought to be created as though there is a major war developing in our frontiers. While I have no intention of speaking about the principalities or the territories of Bhutan or Sikkim, references were made on this rostrum about the invasion of these areas by hostile armies, by foreign elements and so on. Now you may say: Why do you go into this'? It is not in defence of Chinese policy. That is their business. But it is our concern that the world should know the extent of it both ways, large or small.

The Maharajah of Sikkim, who is one of the most active political personalities in that territory, spoke publicly and to the press only a few days before I left India. There were no foreign elements who had entered the country. There were no concentrations on that side and the press stories were wrong.

A telegram received to-day said

"Prime Minister of Bhutan Jigme Dorji has said (in Calcutta) there has been no intrusion into Bhutan territory by Chinese troops. Nor does he apprehend any. Dorji was speaking to newsmen."

I say this not in order to minimize the nature of unfriendly actions that you have spoken about all day. We shall defend our territory if it becomes necessary to the best of our ability. But the main problems we shall seek to solve in the usual way by negotiation. Negotiation does not mean that we shall negotiate on the basis of giving up what is our sovereign homeland but by adjustments that are required in what is called the MacMahon Line.

Friendship with China is something that we regard as necessary for them and for us. The Prime Minister said

213

... we were right in working for their

friendship and, may I repeat and say, we shall continue to work for it. Any person who has the least responsibility for India's future cannot allow himself to be frightened and angered and behave in fright and anger. No country should do that, more especially in a crisis.... we have to think of the future of these two great countries. This idea of setting things by this kind of compulsion and force or by threats and bullying is all wrong and we must accept things as they are.

"I have always thought that it is important even essential if you like, that these two countries of Asia, India and China, should have friendly and, as far as possible, co-operative relations.. It would be a tragedy not only for India, and possibly for China, but for Asia and the world if we develop some kind of permanent hostility ... May I say that in spite of all that has happened and is happening today, that it (friendship of China and India) is still our objective, and we shall continue to work for it."

These are the observations made to the Indian Parliament, and therefore they are very political statements. We shall, therefore, on the one hand, not have a policy of appeasement. Nor, on the other hand, shall we be the victim of war psychoses of any kind. Nor do we want to exaggerate matters.

But all this does not change the character of the situation so far as Chinese representation is concerned. One may ask : What has happened ? It is quite true that there have been certain happenings which changed the position of the world. The main thing is the development of the world in the matter of atomic weapons. While China may not be a relevant subject, it is wellknown that other Powers have the prospect of the explosion of these weapons in different parts of the world. It is also known that scientific advances have reached the position that most nations can make use of them. Therefore, if there is to be disarmament and suspension or prohibition of nuclear weapons, that can be done only if the great nations and the small nations of the world are here. My Government is not particularly concerned either with going into the statistics of Chinese industrial or agricultural production or otherwise or the nature of the communes or what not. For one thing, they are internal matters.

Secondly, I say with all respect that is not the gigantic size of China or its production that makes us think it should be here. It is the fact of sovereignty, to have as much respect for the smallest of our members, Iceland, over here, with a population of some 200.000 as for China with a population of some 650 million because they are countries large and small and for the peoples therein they are their homelands. Therefore, we are not particularly anxious to reiterate the amount of steel they produce or the amount of food with regard to which they have increased production and so on. That, of course, is a matter of interest and is a matter for the general production of wealth in the world. In our neighbour we have an interest, but that is not the argument.

We are not saying that because China is big and mighty it is therefore dangerous to keep her out. What we are saying is this. If we are to have a general world settlement, if we are to settle the affairs of the world, we cannot have a great part of the world out of it. Here is a country which is now in diplomatic relationsnot necessarily in friendly relations-with some thirty-four countries of the world, carrying on trade all around. It would be impossible to keep her out of international context.

Now I ask : who would be the greater loser ? China is certainly a loser. It would be idle to pretend that she is not because any country that cannot be here is a loser thereby. But the world is a loser because it is possible for China to reap the awards of relationship without having to conform to obligations. It is impossible to think of any scheme of disarmament, let alone atomic weapons, where a country reputed to have a standing army of 5 million people and probably another 5 or 10 million in reserve is outside the ambit of the discussions. I would say that it does not seem sound and reasonable, to put it very mildly. Therefore it is we in the United Nations, the world as a whole, that stand to lose by the exclusion of a country. I have said before that we cannot just wish away a people or a nation, great or small. Just because we shut our eyes the world does not become dark. We remain ignorant. Therefore, we have to recognize these facts as they stand.

While the voting in this Assembly may follow the traditional patterns, opinions seem to have changed. I do not like quoting statesmen of other countries except when absolutely necessary. Probably it is not fair. But even after the beginning of all these troubles we have statements by countries which in the past have voted against

214

the discussion of this item or abstained from doing so, like, for example, our good friends the Canadians where two former foreign ministers came out and said that this cannot go on for long; we must do something about it. I could give many, many instances which have already been quoted on this platform, but that only goes to show that people are concerned. They are also concerned about keeping to one's own side, so to say, and not let their side down. But to what extent can this go on. I think it was Lester Pearson who said somewhere that we cannot carry this business for a long time. Only in February of this year, Lester Pearson, a former President of the Assembly, said:

"...how long are we going to be able to support the United States position, because it is a United States position, that this question, cannot even be talked about at the United Nations. ...How could Peking be asked to accept and carry out any such obligations, take part in control and inspection, which we rightly claim to be essential, and yet be considered as unrecognizable. It does, to say, the least, present a dilemma."

The same applies to the successor, and I quote this merely to show that there is considerable development of opinion in this way.

We have therefore brought this item here not at the present moment so far as procedures are concerned to discuss the merits of this matter. Mr. President, you have been sitting here for so many hours in succession listening to these debates. Does it sound to you that this matter is so unimportant? If it is so unimportant, would twenty-eight people come to speak and speak at great length on it, going into the merits of the matter ? So when this subject is mentioned and it is said that the matter should be discussed, people feel concerned. If it is the concern of the Assembly, then is it not right that the matter should be discussed in full rather than piecemeal?

What happens? Each time we say, "Let this item be put on the agenda", and you rule that procedurally you may not discuss the merits of the question. Certainly some representatives do discuss the question and therefore what we get is a very incomplete discussion.

We have not at the present moment suggested either that anybody should be seated or that anybody should be removed. We have asked for an examination of this question. We have asked for going away from the attitude that just because we prefer to ignore it, therefore it ceases to exist.

Then we are told that there have been sins committed which makes it impossible for us to consider this matter. I have no doubt that sins have been committed. There are many things in China of which we disapprove. There have been actions in regard to us which we have protested and with regard to which we propose to remain very firm, and we act to the best of our ability. But I would suggest that there are other countries, other States, who also have deviated, including ours, from the principles of the Charter. There is not one of the eighty-two nations here who could stand up and say that they have not violated, consciously or unconsciously, any provisions of the Charter.

When the United Nations was founded, it was laid down, even before the conclusion of the war, that those who were on the other side fighting the allies should also come into the United Nations at the proper time. So the founders thought in terms not merely of having some nice people here, but of having the world as it is. It was the basic idea of the United Nations that even those who were engaged in the overthrow of liberty in World War 11, should, after the conclusion of peace, the termination of hostilities and a passage of time, join the comity of nations in order that the world may develop towards a more peaceful and a more whole family.

Therefore, how can we justify keeping some one else out? It is said that while governments may change, States do not die. China is a primary Member of the United Nations. Some of the signatories of the Charter are now members of the Peking Government, just as some are members of the authorities in, Formosa. Secondly, if there are resolutions condemning aggression in regard to China, there are resolutions also condemning other people, very firm ones, and repeated not on some occasion when there was an excitement but deliberately thought out, that it was part of the constitution that certain countries should not be admitted. We rescinded and we disregarded those resolutions. My country was in the forefront in trying to enlarge the membership of this Organization. Even now there are some countries standing outside, like Outer Mongolia or the countries that have been divided through no fault of their own, who are not here.

What is more, this is an Organization, with its vast economic, social and other national and international functions, from which a large tract of territory like the Chinese continent cannot be

215

excluded. Now under our decisions, not even specialized agencies can touch the country of China.

Therefore, we really, apart from all political theory and legal subtleties, are excluding the 650 million people of China from such healthy influence or from such impacts that this Organization can make. It has been said of us here that what we are asking the General Assembly to do is something very bad. We are told :

"And I must add in all candor that the representative of India, whose Governmerit admits many of the indisputable facts of Red China's record, when he insists on this item, is in effect insisting that the United Nations modify its standards in order to accommodate the power of lawlessness."

I hope that this was not so meant. I want to plead not guilty. We do not want the United Nations to be lawless. We ask it to conform to law, and the law should be equal to everybody. Then reference has been made to another matter. I do not want to refer to this matter because it will come up in the United Nations in some other form. But as the Government of India happens to be the Chairman of the International Commission for the Supervision and Control of Indo-China, it has been stated that there are incursions into Indo-China and therefore there is a further element of aggression taking place. This subject is not under discussion and I have no wish to go into it in detail. But I think we would be failing in our duty, both to ourselves and to our two colleagues on the Commission, if we did not point out that there is no evidence whatsoever, in the reports of the Commission, or in such knowledge as we have, that there has been penetration of this character. I do not say it will not take place in the future, but there is no evidence of this kind and we think that if international authority had been maintained in that part of the world, perhaps conditions might have been different. Anyway, I have no desire to go into the details of it. All I am saying is that we should not create a mentality which would allow an impression to get around that there is a largescale war brewing somewhere, because Bhutan is invaded, and Sikkim is invaded, and Laos is invaded, and somebody else is invaded, and so on. I say, with equal candor, that the Chinese Government has behaved in a way, so far as we are concerned, that is both unwise and of no profit to themselves or to us or to the world.

What is more, so far as our territory is concerned, we are as much concerned about it as anybody else at least, and no one can say that we will be oblivious to whatever dangers there are. But from there to go on and say that in the foothills of the Himalayas a large war is waging in inaccessible regions, that is fantastic. I have some responsibilities in this matter. It is not so much for the Assembly, but for all those who desire to know, that I say that we shall not permit unilateral action so far as we are concerned. We may be a weak country, we may be economically backward, we may have different ideologies, but we certainly have sufficient sense of our own homeland to protect it whatever may be the sacrifices. But we believe that, like all difficult questions, this is a trying time for us. Instead of this being the occasion where we are inviting the United Nations to adopt a lawless attitude, I submit that if we had, on the occasion of the

first difficulty that came across us, departed from what we have been advocating from this rostrum year after year, we would have not well deserved from the Members of the United Nations either their consideration or their respect.

Since we have put down this item, it is not necessary for me to say that I support the amendment moved by the representative of Nepal. I hope the Assembly will reject the recommendation of the General Committee and therefore agree to the amendment as proposed by the representative of Nepal, and agree to the request of India for this item to be placed on the agenda. Then everybody will have an opportunity to discuss it.

I say quite frankly that those who will vote for the placing of this item on the agenda may be against any change in the present position. That is a different matter. All that we are saying is that we should not adopt this ostrich attitude. I am not saying that it has no political implication. It is not a procedural position. But once a discussion takes place, then we are in the merits of a question, and this great body, this world Assembly cannot just afford to ignore realities. We cannot ignore the realities either of the poverty or the richness of China, or its army of five or ten million, or its great scientific advance, or, what is more, the fact that it particularly lies in that part of the world where stability can only be maintained by co-operation of the great and small country in that area.

The last few years have shown that whenever a problem of some importance, as some of the representatives have said, has arisen, then another forum, another universe of discourse is to be found somewhere and other platforms are to be created. The United Nations will be reduced to a position

216

that whenever any important matter comes up, it must be discussed somewhere else. I am sure that this is not your desire and therefore I commend the admission of this item to the Assembly.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEPAL CHINA TUNISIA BHUTAN ICELAND MONGOLIA LAOS

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Disarmament Commission

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Disarmament Commission on September 10, 1959.

The following is the full text of the statement

Mr. Chairman :

May I join with other Representatives in offering you our heartiest felicitations on your election as Chairman of this very important Commission ? I need hardly say that by the contributions you have personally made to the work of the United Nations and by your dedication to the cause of peace and by your able advocacy and exposition of your country's policies, with which, if I may say so, my country has been in agreement, you have deserved richly the post to which we have unanimously elected you.

I wish you success and I am sure, speaking for my own delegation and for everybody else here, that under your able guidance our work will progress satisfactorily.

This Disarmament Commission was created by General Assembly resolution 1252 (XIII) adopted unanimously at the thirteenth session. The Commission composed of all Members of the United Nations had thus universal support and the strength derived from such universality. The tasks entrusted to the Commission were indeed onerous and of high significance ; the Commission was asked to submit constructive proposals and recommendations in the field of disarmament; and disarmament is, from the very preamble of the Charter and the provisions of Articles-11 and 46, at the very root of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Resolution 1252 itself was, in many respects, the crystallization though on the procedural rather than on the substantive aspect, of the discussions and efforts, and of the hopes and frustrations of the United Nations ever since its inception. The problem of disarmament has come in one form or another before the General Assembly ever since 1946. The various efforts made to tackle the problem, the many proposals discussed, the various kinds of machinery devised to discuss the different aspects of disarmament, and the lack of success of such efforts in the United Nations are a matter of history, and it is not my intention to recapitulate them here; indeed, I would not wish to recount our failures because that would only be starting our fresh efforts on a note of pessimism and defeatism. We should look more to the future. and now that there appear to be some hopeful signs on the horizon of international relations, we may permit ourselves, without being over optimistic, to hope and believe that the efforts of the United Nations will be made in more promising circumstances; and with a greater possibility of harmonizing differing outlooks and views, particularly among the big Powers, which have hitherto been lacking. Nevertheless, we should not forget that during the last thirteen or fourteen years, the sole forum in which world opinion on disarmament has found expression is the United Nations and its various organs and subsidiary bodies, and the discussions in the United Nations have not merely reflected the ardent desires and grave anxieties of the peoples of the world everywhere for peace through the reduction of armaments, elimination of weapons of mass destruction including of course nuclear weapons, and the diversion of human and economic resources of nations to co-operative international efforts towards the social and economic betterment of the peoples of the world. They have, in turn, educated and stimulated world public opinion and-though rather imperceptibly-have had an impact on the thinking of the big Powers themselves. It is essential for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of our Charter that the United Nations should remain continuously seized of the problem of disarmament through such organs and subsidiary bodies as it may think fit to create. Not only is there no question that the ultimate responsibility for disarmament rests on the United Nations but also that continuous efforts should be made by the United Nations to this end.

The Disarmament Commission reconstituted

last year and composed of all Members of the United Nations, was the unanimous expression of the concern and overriding interest of the United Nations in the problem of disarmament. It is recognition that all nations-big and smallshould have the opportunity and the privilege to make a contribution to this problem of problems of our time, on the wise and successful solution of which may depend the future of civilization and of humanity itself.

It will be recalled that such a Commission was constituted last year partially on the initiative

217

of my delegation. We have, however, always recognized that while the United Nations has the primary responsibility for peace and for disarmament, which is an essential prerequisite to peace, for practical results to be achieved, it is important that agreement should be reached among the Powers which are at present involved in an arms race. Parallel efforts by these Powers towards disarmament, in so far as they have the same purposes as those embodied in the Charter, are always welcome. But these efforts should not and cannot have the effect of taking away or in any way whittling down the responsibilities and initiatives that properly and rightfully belong to the United Nations as a whole. May I, Mr. Chairman, be permitted to quote from the statement of the Chairman of the Indian delegation in the First Committee last year in reference to the Conference agreed to by the big Powers in Geneva on the suspension of nuclear tests and the negotiations concerning the prevention of surprise attacks :

"As soon as possible, we want to see substantive discussions on Disarmament brought back into the United Nations, so that the Organisation may be entitled to begin to discharge its responsibility. I think that any arrangements which 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 or anyone else who would make a contribution". (A/C. 1/PV. 952 p. 46)

We have seen the communique issued by the four big Powers who have constituted a tennation group to consider disarmament matters. As sovereign States, the countries concerned have it within their right to form any such group. It is not for us to either approve or disapprove of the creation or composition of such a group, but speaking for my own delegation, we welcome genuine and sincere efforts by any group of Powers, particularly the big Powers and we therefore welcome the initiative embodied in the Four-Power communique. The communique which has been spelt out in the statements by the representatives of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States, itself states that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be kept appropriately informed of the progress of the deliberations of this Committee and for this purpose the four Governments have agreed that the Committee will present reports on its work to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and through it to the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. We take this to mean that the so-called Disarmament Committee established by the four big Powers will submit progress reports from time to time to the Disarmament Commission. We hope that negotiations in this body will make speedy progress and that such reports will be frequent. My delegation shares the hope that the reports will provide useful basis and preparatory work for the consideration of disarmament in the United Nations.

The Disarmament Commission, as at present constituted, was formed nearly a year ago. For various reasons, which it is unnecessary to detail here, the appropriate time for convening it did not arrive until to-day. The formation of the group mentioned in the four-Power communique is an earnest of the serious intentions of the big Powers to reach an understanding on the various problems involved in disarmament. It is our belief that a turning point has now been reached in the whole process of discussion and consideration of the disarmament question ; and that from this point the Disarmament Commission itself can go ahead with greater earnestness and seriousness and greater possibility of attaining results. in our view, it is not necessary for the Commission to confine itself solely and entirely to examining reports from the Committee established by the four Powers, when such reports are received ; it

would be open to the Disarmament Commission itself also to take initiative for studies in various fields of disarmament. While the Committee's efforts will no doubt provide an invaluable basis for the work of the Disarmament Commission, it should also be the aim to help and strengthen the efforts that are being made outside by discussions, deliberations and studies in the Commission.

It is the view of our delegation that the Disarmament Commission, as at present constituted, should be continued under the authority of the General Assembly, so that it may address itself seriously to the task entrusted to it under operative paragraph 3 of the General Assembly resolution 1252 (XIII). What we envisage is that the Disarmament Commission, after its term has been extended, should without delay be convened for the purpose of electing office bearers and for adopting its rule of procedure and for ordering its future plan of work.

A draft resolution has just been circulated in the name of Ceylon, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Ireland, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia. This draft resolution, which I have the honour

218

and previlege-and, if I may say so, the pleasureof moving on behalf of the sponsors, is the result of informal consultation with a veiw to finding the greatest common measure of agreement in this Commission, and we hope that it will prove acceptable to the Commission as a whole.

We are gratified to learn of the support that was promised for this draft resolution by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. I have the honour to formally move this hraft resolution on behalf of the countries which I mentioned a little while ago.

INDIA USA SWITZERLAND FRANCE ECUADOR INDONESIA IRELAND YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

IRAN

Prime Minister Nehru's Banquet Speech

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, paid a visit to Iran from September 18 to 22, 1959. On September 18, a Banquet was given in honour of Shri Nehru by the Iranian Prime Minister, Dr. Manuchehr Eghbal.

Speaking on the occasion, Prime Minister Nehru said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very grateful to you, Mr Prime Minister for your kind words and to your warm walcome and hospitality. I do not know how long ago it was since when I wanted to come to Iran but some kind of an evil fate pursued me in this matter and I could not come; and now that I am here I feel as one feels when a long-expressed desire, long-felt wish is fulfilled.

You have referred to the old historical associations of Iran and India. I doubt if there are any two countries in the wide world which have that close and long past historical contact such as Iran and India. It goes back to the remote past. Often languages are symbols of contacts of people and it is well-known that the ancient form of the Persian language, Pahalvi and the ancient form of Sanskrit which is our classical language are very nearly the same. In fact our classical Sanskrit is more different from the earlier Sanskrit than that Sanskrit from Pahlavi. That itself indicates the common stock out of which the two languages arose and the common stock out of which the two peoples arose and there could have been no closer contact than that common origin. This was maintained in later years in spite of troubles, wars and invasions. For many hundreds of years in India the Persian language was the court language besides other contacts between Iran and India. So, it is perfectly true to say that no two countries in long terms of years could have had. closer contacts, closer origin, than the people of India and the people of Iran.

It is true that during later years fate put us apart, as many other countries of Asia. When our country was under foreign rule and foreign domination in some form or other came to the other countries of Asia or most of them, the old contacts that we had with each other broke or fell into disuse. It is add that our contacts then were more, if I may say so, through Europe than direct. But ever since we have attained independence in India, and many other countries of Asia have also done so, almost the first urge was to rebuild those old contacts to find again the old ties. And so naturally we in India look towards Iran as we also look towards other neighbour countries. I am therefore happy to be here.

It is well to remember these old contacts and to look at our history in some perspective because perhaps that gives us a little clearer picture than if we were swept away by momentary feelings and reactions due to present events. Nevertheless it is true that traditional civilisation, such as that of India, such as that of Iran, have had to face and are facing today very grave problems, problems which are not often mentioned in the newspaper or even in public speeches. The newspapers discuss some crisis of the day which may be important for the moment no doubt ; but the basic crisis of the day, I should imagine, for a country with its traditional outlook and civilisation and contacts with the long past is its reaction to the present. How does it react to the present, the non-traditional present, the present largely based on science and technology which is creating a new world different from the old, in other countries of Europe? That is the real challenge.

The other countries of Europe have passed through one revolution; I am referring to the industrial revolution, which is a bigger revolution than a political revolution can ever be ; and because of the past industrial revolution some of the countries of Europe have built up a fairly high standard of living, wealth, production and all that and think in terms of what they call a welfare

219

state. They define it in various ways. But there is a common feature and the most important feature that they accept i.e. the industrial revolution. Now broadly speaking the countries that have not gone through the industrial revolution are under-developed and poverty-stricken. Nobody in the world wants to be poor today (thouth men have wanted it in the past) because today people feel that it is not necessary to be poor (previously it was perhaps inevitable) because of science and technology and with all the means to create a welfare state for all people. So this is the problem for all our countries : We think in terms of our industrial revolution that is producing something in our country which took place in Europe a 100 years ago or more. Another begger revolution has come to Europe and America that is the revolution of the nuclear age. I am not for the moment talking in terms of war, I am merely talking in terms of energy and power which has been placed in the hands of humanity for good of for evil. So that we countries of Asia desiring to better our lot have to face this double challenge of a double revolution and there is no getting away from it. It is not really a choice that is offered, there is no choice in such matters in the world. People may imagine that they choose but we are conditioned to go a certain way or we fail.

So when thinking of the yesterdays of our past, Mr. Prime Minister, and taking pride for that great past which is that of your country and of mine, when we had close contacts, we have inevitably to come to the present and peep into the future for which we work and labour and I trust that in that present and in that future we shall also work together for the good of our countries, for the good of our peoples and thus the contacts of the past will have to be renewed and freshened and new contacts built for the present and the future.

I thank you again, Mr. Prime Minister, for your warm words of welcome. May I ask you, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to drink to the good health of His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah and His Excellency the Prime Minister and the prosperity of the people of Iran.

IRAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

IRAN

Dr. Eghbal's Welcome Speech

Welcoming Prime Minister Nehru, Dr. Eghbal said :

It is indeed a great honour for me to convey to Your, Excellencey, on behalf of the Government of Iran and the people of Iran, our most hearty welcome on your arrival in our country. Friends of Iran and India in their millions, who will hear of this happy occasion from afar, will, I am sure like those who are present here to-night-recognise this occasion as a symbol of the very cordial relations which have existed between our two countries for the last 1,000 years and more.

In the course of their long histories, Iran and India have experienced the vicissitudes of glory and adversity, but happy relations between the two nations have remained constant throughout based as they are on the solid ground of mutual respect and spiritual and cultural affinity.

Our two neighbour nations are of the same ethnic origin, cherished the same ideals of justice and peace and share the same convictions concerning mans's dignity and his moral principles. They are thus destioned to understand and appreciate one another's way of life.

In most recent times we have witnessed with admiration the struggle of your people to attain independence under the inspired and farsighted leadership of the great Mahatma Gandhi. The contribution of Your Excellency and the sacrifices you yourself made in the attainment of the objective are well-known to us all. We know fully well how much you are attached to the cause of peace and we are well aware of your efforts and indefatigable labour -- in the midst of grave problems of today to secure progress and prosperity for your people. We, therefore salute you not only as the successor of the spiritual and illustrious leader, who laid the foundation of modern India, but also as the statesman who is directing the destiny of this great nation.

1995

We are glad and proud to say that although there is no grave problem between Iran and India, I am sure, your journey to Iran just as the visit of his Imperial Majesty, the Shahin-Shah of Iran to your country, a few years ago, will contribute to better understanding and still closer relationship between our Governments and our peoples.

We pray to Almighty God that the great nation whose destiny you direct shall continue to flourish and shall take long strides on the road to progress and prosperity under Your Excellency's able and enlightened leadership and you clear understanding of the problems of to-day and that your great influence will contribute to the maintenance and safeguarding of peace.

220

It is with these hopes that I raise my glass to the health of H.E. the President of the Republic of India, to the great and ancient Indian nation, our friends for thousands of years and to the health of Your Excellency and once again heartily wish you a happy sojourn in Iran.

IRAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

IRAN

Prime Minister Nehru's Reply

Prime Minister Nehru made the following reply to the toast proposed by the Foreign Minister of Iran to the health of President Rajendra Prasad and the progress and prosperity of the people of India at a banquet given in honour of Shri Nehru in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on September 19, 1959 : Mr. Minister, Madame Sadr, Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I confess I have been taken by surprise. I did not know that our host was going to make a speech and propose a toast--so I have had to do some rapid thinking in the last minute and a half.

It would be easy to speak about a subject near to our hearts and minds, namely, the old and intimate relations between India and Iran, specially our cultural contacts, but many of you may feel that this subject is being overdone, necessary and important as it is for us to remember it. A very eminent art critic once described the Taj Mahal of Agra as "the soul of Iran incarnate in the body of India". It shows how the two culture intermingled. But my mind is more taken up with the present and the future because I am still, like most of you, living a life of action. The time may come when I may retire and become a Professor at a University-I doubt it-but even then I would not be concerned about the visions of the past. The Professor's view is unaffected by what is happening or might happen unlike the politicians. I have to think very much of the present and the future.

Already I realise that I am somewhat advanced in age. It surprises me, but it is true and in this period of my life I have seen many changes in India, Asia, Europe and the world. And I wonder what the next 25 or 30 years might bring, because the pace of change is becoming quicker and quicker. No one is forcing the pace, but the conditions and circumstances themselves change. Europe was changed most by the industrial age. Now Asia is undergoing that process. More than that, in the next 20 or 30 years, nuclear energy will produce greater changes-for the moment I forget the war like effect of nuclear energy and remember only its peaceful purposes. We must therefore see that my country, and if I may say so, your country, are not left behind again like we were left behind in the past. Therefore, we have to think more and more of the present and the future. Sometimes I indulge in reveries of the past because I have no responsibility for it. The thought of the present and the future, sometimes brings feelings of pleasure as well as pain; but when we think of Iran and India, let us hope that our future relations will be as

pleasant and even pleasanter as those of the past and the present. I request you, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to raise your glasses to the health of His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah and to the peace and prosperity of the people of Iran.

IRAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

IRAN

Nehru-Shah Joint Statement

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to Iran from September 18 to 22,1959. During his stay there, Shri Nehru had friendly talks with this Imperial Majesty and the Prime Minister of Iran on problems of mutual interest. On the conclusion of their talks Prime Minister Nehru and his Imperial Majesty, the Shahinshah of Iran issued the following joint statement in Tehran on September 22, 1959:

The Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, was the guest of the Imperial Government of Iran for four days from the 18th to the 22nd September, 1959. During these four days, he visited various sites of historical, cultural, social and economic importance in the country, such as the Razi Institute, the Karaj Dam, the Karaj Agricultural College, the Iran Bastan Museum, beautiful Shiraz, Nemazi Hospital and Persepolis. He witnessed the progress being made in Iran in the social, educational and economic fields under the inspiring and able guidance of His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah.

The Prime Minister of India had cordial and friendly discussions with His Imperial Majesty as well as the Prime Minister of Iran about problems of mutual interest to the two countries and, in particular, cooperation in the economic and cultural fields. They noted with satisfaction the existence

221

of close ancient ties of race, culture and friendship between the two countries and peoples. They also noted with satisfaction the revival and strengthening of these contacts since the independence of India and agreed to further strengthen them in the future.

India and Iran are both in need of peace in order to reconstruct their economy and provide a better standard of living for the masses. The policy of both Governments is based on respect for the principles of the UN Charter, non-aggression, and non-interference in the internal affairs of any country and good neighbourly relations between all countries in the world. The two Governments note with satisfaction the efforts being made by the leaders of the world, and especially by the leaders of big Powers to case tension in the international atmosphere. They hope that these efforts will continue and lead to greater friendship, understanding and cooperation between the various Governments and peoples.

IRAN USA INDIA **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Nehru-Ayub Talks at Palam-Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on September 4, 1959 on his talks with the President of Pakistan :

The President of Pakistan reached Palam airport on the 1st September, 1959, soon after 11 o' clock in the morning. He was received by the Prime Minister and stayed at Palam about an hour and a half. For the greater part of this time, the President and the Prime Minister met by themselves and discussed various matters. Towards the end of this meeting, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the High Commissioner of Pakistan in India, the High Commissioner of India in Pakistan and the Commonwealth Secretary of India were also invited to join in these talks. At the conclusion of this meeting, a joint statement was issued.

The talks between the President and the Prime Minister were informal in nature and were very friendly throughout. The President of Pakistan expressed his strong desire for neighbourly relations between the two countries and said that there was no problem between them which could not be solved in a friendly way. The Prime Minister entirely agreed. No particular subject was discussed in detail. Casual reference was made to some of the problems between the two countries and the President pointed out that- if friendly relations could be established between the two countries and fears and apprehensions of both of them removed, this could result in a reduction, on both sides, of expenditure on armament and thus help in releasing monies for economic development. The Prime Minister agreed and added that in India the primary objective that they had before them was social and economic development and they have embodied their programmes in their Five Year Plans. They felt that from every point of view this social and economic development, resulting in the betterment of the people of the country as a whole, was an essential and urgent task. This involved necessarily a very heavy burden and any saving on Defence expenditure would be welcome indeed.

Some reference was made to the discussions going on on the Canal Waters issue with the assistance of the representatives of the World Bank and the hope was expressed that these would lead to a satisfactory settlement.

Both the President and the Prime Minister expressed their great concern at the continuation of disputes and incidents on the eastern border. These incidents, often resulting in firing, had absolutely no justification and could do no good to anyone. They only harassed the local people concerned and vitiated the atmosphere between the two countries. It was agreed that everything should be done to put an end to these disputes and a procedure should be evolved for this purpose. Recently a Chief Secretaries' Conference had been held and the statement issued after this conference was a good one. The difficulty was not so much in laying down good principles, but in implementing them. The President suggested that a high level conference should be held for this purpose. This conference should be at Ministerial level and senior Army Commanders and Chief Secretaries as well as representatives of the State Governments concerned should attend this conference. Attempt should be made to remove the causes of disputes wherever possible and demarcation of boundaries should be expedited. A procedure should also be evolved to deal immediately with any incident

222

that might arise on the borders in the eastern region. The Prime Minister entirely agreed with this proposal and it was decided that steps should be taken to have such a conference.

Reference was also made to the India Office Library in London and it was agreed that a joint approach should be made on behalf of India and Pakistan in regard to this Library.

A similar approach should be made about the old Embassy and Consulate buildings which had been financed from the revenues of the undivided Government of India, but which are still in the possession of the United Kingdom Government.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Statement on Nehru-Ayub Talks at Palam

The following is the text of a joint statement issued on conclusion of the talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India at Palam airport on September 1, 1959 :-

The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India met informally in a very cordial atmosphere at' Palam airport this morning (September 1).

Matters of mutual interest were discussed. They agreed that there was need to conduct their relations with each other on a rational and planned basis, and not according to the day to day exigencies as they arose, and that their outstanding issues and other problems should, in mutual interest, be settled in accordance with justice and fairplay in a spirit of friendliness, co-operation and good neighbourliness.

They were glad to have had this opportunity of an informal exchange of views and they agreed to keep in touch with each other to further their common objectives.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Chief Secretaries' Conference

At the conclusion of the conference of the Chief Secretaries of East Pakistan, West Bengal and Assam and the Chief Commissioner of Tripura, in Calcutta, the following joint communique as issued on August 19, 1959 :-

The 33rd Chief Secretaries' Conference was

held at Calcutta on the 17th and 18th August, 1959. The Chief Secretaries of East Pakistan, West Bengal and Assam and the Chief Commissioner of Tripura, assisted by their advisers, attended the Conference. The Deputy High Commissioner for Pakistan in Calcutta and the Deputy High Commissioner for India in East Pakistan were present at the Conference.

There were full and frank discussions in a spirit of cordiality and on certain points satisfactory agreements were reached.

Prevention of border incidents was one of the important topics discussed at the Conference. it was decided that where the International Boundary had been demarcated on firm land by boundary pillars, the Governments concerned would take adequate steps to prevent violations of the border for the purpose of commission of crimes, such as, kidnapping, arson, dacoity and cattle lifting. Attempts by nationals of one country to cross the border to commit such crimes should not have the support of the police force of their country. The Conference decided that the Superintendents of Police of border districts should meet their opposite numbers once a month to discuss the crime situation and to help each other in investigating and preventing crimes committed across the border. Where the International Boundary had not vet been demarcated on firm land by placement of boundary pillars, the Governments concerned would endeavour to see that peaceful de facto possession was not disturbed. Where temporary demarcation marks of land boundaries over river beds became covered by water during the rainy season and new chars formed when the water level went down with the advent of winter, it was decided that all the Governments concerned would provide adequate number of survey parties for joint seasonal demarcation of the International Boundary at the earliest possible moment after such chars appeared. Attempts by Indian or Pakistani cultivators to cultivate the chars before the seasonal demarcation was completed should be discouraged and should not be supported by the police force of either country. Once the temporary seasonal demarcation was complete, no one should have the claim to reap any crops that might have been grown on his own initiative on portions of the char failing within the other country. Where the

International Boundary was a fluid boundary, e.g. mid-stream of a river or where, although the

223

boundary was a fixed line, it got covered by water during the rainy season, disputes arose because of boats transgressing the boundary. A suggestion that nationals of both countries should have the right to navigate the entire width of the river without touching the banks belonging to the other country was discussed but left over for decision by the Central Governments who were believed to be in correspondence with each other on this subject.

The Conference decided that whenever border incidents did occur District Magistrates concerned on either side of the boundary should meet promptly for joint inspection of the locality. It was also decided that District Magistrates and Sub-Divisional Officers of border districts should meet their opposite numbers once every three months to discuss administrative difficulties over border matters. It was also decided that since absence of clearly defined borders with boundary pillars led to border incidents, the work 'of demarcation and construction of pillars should be expedited as much as possible and that if any difficulties arose they should be referred to the respective Chief Secretaries at the earliest possible time.

The difficulties experienced by travellers in regard to Customs and Currency Regulations were discussed. As both these matters could be settled only by the two Central Governments, the discussions remained inconclusive but it was decided that complaints of harassment of travellers by unnecessary searches and difficulties created by minor defects in visa papers would be dealt with promptly so that nothing was done by the staff at the border outposts which was not required by authorised regulations.

It was decided that West Bengal would send full details of a scheme for increasing the trade in fish, poultry, eggs and vegetables between the two countries to the Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, for consideration. As this also involved expenditure of foreign exchange, the matter would have to be ultimately taken up at the central level. The difficulties felt by migrants in regard to remittance of their Provident Fund dues, security deposits, etc. were also discussed. It was noted 'that the recent Conference of the Finance Ministers of India and Pakistan had already reached decisions to allow such remittances.

Detailed discussions took place between the Chief Secretary, East Pakistan and Chief Secretary, Assam, in regard to special problems arising out of the last meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan at Delhi.

The items discussed regarding the Assam-East Pakistan border included the question of handing over possession to Assam of Boroibari village of Goalpara district which was in the adverse possession of Pakistan although demarcation in this sector had already been completed. The Chief Secretary, East Pakistan, promised to refer this matter to his Government and send an early reply.

In the Dawki area it was agreed that the border forces would withdraw from the forward positions back to their original border outposts and forward trenches and bunkers would be filled up.

The provisional demarcation in the Patharia Reserve Forest and evacuation of Tukergram were also discussed but no conclusions were reached. It was decided to examine the matter further by exchange of information between the two governments.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on India-China Relations

In reply to a debate on India-China relations in the Lok Sabha on September 12, 1959, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :_

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate has brought out a large number of points and I should like to deal with many of them, but I feel that it would perhaps be better to lay stress on the highlights of this debate, if I may say so, rather than lose myself in a lot of detail.

The recent letter which I received from Premier Chou En-lai raises many points and naturally we shall have to reply to it after full consideration and not in a hurry, and that consideration is being given to it. I do not propose to deal with that letter here in this discussion, partly because this House does not require to be convinced of

224

many of the things that perhaps Premier Chou En-lai might require to be told, and partly also because that would mean losing myself in a great deal of detail.

Now, first of all, let me take up one simple but very basic point that Shri Karni Singhji has raised. He made a rather remarkable statemerit that he believed in Panch sheel provided that it was with people whom you agreed with. That is really, if I may say so, a perfectly remarkable statement. "I believe in being tolerant provided you agree with me. Otherwise, I will knock your head" - This is his idea of toleration and tolerance. This is his idea of Panch sheel. Some Hon. Members said "We must stand on our own feet." Some other Hon. Members said : "You must seek the help of others." Well, people who say this seem to be, in spite of all their gallant language and, brave behaviour, weak, timid, panicky and alarmist. That is not how a nation. meets the challenge : looking around, seeing "How can any body help me? Who is going to help me? How is anybody going to help you, if you are not strong enough to face the challenge ? I say, let this be clearly understood. 1, as Prime Minister, and my Government, stand on it-that we will stick to our policy of non-alignment. We will stick to our policy, call it what you like. It is not my policy, it is an axiomatic truth-the Panch sheel -whether we agree, or Chinese do not agree, it is immaterial, it is an axiomatic position, I say. And

I challenge anyone to show it is a wrong position. You may say, "If somebody lies, you break his head." That is a different matter. You may say "Oh, dont't tell the truth because the other fellow lies. Is that your position ?

Some of the observations made this afternoon here, I venture to say, were quite extraordinary, even in excitement. I can understand a measure of excitement, even warm feeling and a desire that no one should touch or sully the honour of India, the integrity of India, the self-respect of India-I can understand all that. But Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's talk about bombing hillsmen in the mountains seems to show that he has lost his balance and there is no balance left. He neither understands bombing, nor mountains, nor human beings nor anything. It is only an exhibition of petulant excitement and anger. And if this country is going to behave in petulant excitement and anger, how would it face a crisis ? Is this Parliament going to behave in this way? It is a most extraordinary thing and I am wondering what would happen if we took some of the suggestions made here. Exactly where would we land ourselves if everybody is to break the other's head? And many Hon. Members said : "Not an inch of our territory, not an inch of our territory." All these brave gestures, if you would permit me to say so, have very little meaning. Certainly, not an inch of our territory or anything, if somebody forces or compels me, because we must never submit to compulsion or force in a matter of this kind. It is not a question of an inch or a yard or a mile; 'it is a question of submitting to compulsion, submitting to force, and we will never submit to force, whatever happens to our country.

But what do these gestures mean ? I dislike this flamboyant language of an inch of territory and all that, sitting here in Parliament, not realising what it means. I dislike this business of going about bombing everybody, because you dislike his face or what he has said or done. There are many things said or done which one dislikes. Acharya Kripalani has accused me of some things. He maybe right in his accusation. But I do hope he is not right when he accuses me of overpoliteness. I am not normally accused of that I He talked about Gandhiji. Whatever Gandhiji might have said, he did not shout, as some of us do. His action was strong undoubtedly and firm, but his voice was gentle, gentle to the opponent, gentle to the enemy, gentle to everybody, always trying to win over the other person. We do not pretend to be Gandhis, because we are hardly fit to be even distant followers of his. But I do believe that at any time, in international affairs, it is the gentle and firm voice that should be raised, not this shouting voice that we have got accustomed to, this cold war voice, this just cursing each other, closing everybody's mind, where nothing counts but the bomb of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. Dr. Ram Subhag forgets

It is a small matter. But I would submit that we are dealing with very serious issues, and such issues are not solved by mere exhibition of excitement. Certainly and obviously, at any time, more especially in such moments, we have to be firm. And we have to be firm, realising where one has to be firm. It is not being firm in the air or being firm about everything, good, bad or indifferent. There are important things and unimportant 'things. One has to be firm about important things and one sticks to them, come what may.

But if one tries to be firm about everything it means, one is not firm at all. That is only talking firmly which is not acting firmly, because there are certain physical and actual disabilities, which you cannot survive. Nobody can. A great country, the United States of America, a great country like the Soviet Union-they are

225

the super-powers-know the limitations of firmness. They are very firm countries but they know the limitations of firmness and they step at a certain limit ; otherwise they would have gone in for a war by this time and would have destroyed the world. We talk loosely. This kind of talk, namely, let us be firm, let us do this, let us fight and let us shed every drop of blood-this kind of thing, may I say, rather takes us away from the main questions that we are discussing, which are difficult. The position is a serious one.

Now I say that Premier Chou En-lai's last letter in some parts is worded in relatively soft language and in some parts he talks about the status quo being kept, talks, negotiations etc. But basically that letter arises some issues which are very serious and which have been raised in that form officially almost for the first time.

As I was sitting here, I was reading certain reports of discussions in Peking in some Congress that is being held there where Premier Chou En-lai spoke more or less on the lines of this letter and where other people spoke. Of course, it does not require any particular brilliance to know that everyone spoke on those same lines supporting Premier Chou En-lai, namely,-

"express their great surprise to find Mr. Nehru defending British Imperialism." So-and-so asked, Mr. Nehru : On whose behalf was he speaking in defending British imperialism? Now Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government treat the aggressive plot of British Imperialism against China in the last century as an accomplished fact. Does this accord with the five principles advocated by Mr. Nehru..."

and so on and so forth. There is plenty of it. Just as many Hon. Members have said something about the McMahon Line strongly saying : stick to it; do not budge an inch etc.-I forget who said it, but I seem to have read it somewherethey were equally strong against the McMahon Line there. So, here we are.

Obviously a question like this cannot be solved by resolutions in Delhi and in Peking or by strong language hurled at each other. Other ways have to be found-either peaceful or war like. Every sensible person here and elsewhere wants to avoid war in such matters or in any matter. It is quite clear. The most powerful nations in the world are trying their utmost today to find a way outside war, and for us to think and talk of war seems rather ridiculous in this context of things.

It is perfectly different for us to say and for the weakest and the smallest nation to say and for an individual to say : I will not submit to evil, come what may. It is quite a different thing. I will not submit to it. I will not submit to coercion. I will not submit to dishonour. That is quite a different thing. Even a single individual can say that, according to Gandhiji's teachings or any teaching. Any country can say that. That is different from a country in the pride- of its might saying, "Oh! we shall do this or that with or without armies and bombs etc." It is a very different thing. The two approaches are completely different.

Now, what is happening in China today? And I say so, I do not wish to use strong words, but it is the pride and arrogance of might that is showing, in their language, in their behaviour to us and in so many things that they have done. It is that.

And it is not a question of this mile on this side of the McMahon Line or that mile on that side. They are small matters, I say again. But it is not a small matter, the other thing, that they showed in their maps a large tract of Indian territory and called it Chinese territory. That is not a small matter. Because-you may say that vou will not give an inch of the MacMahon Line ; I will give it if I find that it is wrongly there ; what is the good of saying these things-the McMahon Line is a broad line between Bhutan and the Burma border and it goes on to Burma. In some places it is quite definite, it is not marked in some places. And you have to go by other indications. The broad approach of the man who drew that line was that it should be through water-sheds. It was a good approach: But we have deliberately left the water-sheds in one or two places. Therefore, when I say I stick to the McMahon Line, what I mean is that I stick to that broad approach. But if by evidence or facts whatever it is, a slight deviation in the alignment is necessary, it is not a major matter. And that has to be decided by facts and not by anybody's coercion.

And when I talked about so-called mediation and conciliation-and I even used the word arbitration-what did it mean ? I meant that in these minor alignments, etc. or in these minor questions that have arisen, whatever they may be, whatever it is-I forget the names of these places; Longju and Hoti and other places, these are the alignments; Hoti is not of course on the McMahon Line, it is on the U.P. side-these alignments can always be talked about in a peaceful way, in a friendly way,

226

and slightly altered here and there if there is enough evidence.

But that is not what we are considering today.

We have always been ready for that. We are considering something much bigger, and that is a claim the claim laid down in the Chinese maps which for the first time, mind you, now in this last letter of Premier Chou-En-lai and the speeches delivered now in their Congress is taking shape more definitely. At first, whenever the maps were referred to, it was said, "Oh, these are old maps, we will revise them". It was a totally inadequate answer. Well, it was some kind of an answer, postponement of an answer if you like. But now the thing is that this is held out as something more definite. They hold by it-not the exact line, we do not know exactly where their line is, and it is impossible to discover large tracts of Indian territory. That kind of treatment or behaviour does seem to me, if I may use the word, very improper for one nation to treat another, even much more so when the nations have been friendly. And that is the point that has arisen.

The question is, again I repeat, for the moment do not worry about these petty spots. A petty spot is important if coercively and aggressively even a yard of territory is taken from, us. Because, it is not a yard of territory that counts but the coercion. Because, it makes no difference to China or India whether a few yards of territory in the mountain are on this side or on that side. But it makes a great deal of difference if that is done in an insulting, aggressive, offensive, violent manner, by us or by them. All that counts.

Now, I have. been accused, with some jutification, that I have kept matter from Parliament, these important matters. I beg of you-you have read this White Paper, point out to me what exactly I have kept. I shall tell you what I have kept.

It is only one thing that I have kept, that is, last November, December, when we were dealing with the Aksai Chin area and the road there. That had come to our knowledge apart from our letters about Bara Hoti, about this and that. We cannot come here for every little thing. But, that certainly is an important matter: the road through the Aksai Chin area. We felt its importance. We did not come here at that time.

Hon. Members said-I forget who said-do not our Air Force take pictures and all that. I do not think there is a full realization of what this area is and where it is. The mere act of taking pictures would have endangered that plane which took it, endangered it not only from the physical features point of view, but endangered it from the point of view of action, by the other party shooting it down, whatever the risks.

I won't go into details. But, I should like this House to appreciate what these places are. This place, Aksai Chin area, is in our maps undoubtedly. But, I distinguish it completely from other areas. It is a matter for argument as to what part of it belongs to us and what part of it belongs to somebody else. It is not at all a dead clear matter. However, I have to be frank to the House. It is not clear. I cannot go about doing things in a matter which has been challenged. not today, but for a hundred years. It has been challenged as the ownership of this strip of territory. That has nothing to do with the- McMahon Line. It has nothing to do with anything else. That particular area stands by itself. It has been in challenge all the time. Our going about taking pictures of it from the air or, as somebody said, bombing it, is not a feasible proposition. We know it is not an inaccessible place. Of course, people can go there.

I cannot say what part of it may not belong to us, and what parts may. The point is, there has never been any delimitation there in that area and it has been a challenged area-bits of it. I cannot say which bit is and which not. That is a question which will have to be decided.

There is the McMahon Line. By and large, apart from minor variations, that is a fixed line, which some parts, in the Subanasiri area or somewhere there, it was not considered a good line and it was varied afterwards by us, by the Government of India. There are many factors to be seen. But, broadly, it follows the water-shed. That is the test. We hold by that. We stick to it subject to minor variations, for special reasons. A mile here or a mile there does not matter provided it is peacefully arranged. It is in regard to that that I said. let us have mediation. conciliation. There can be no mediation, conciliation or arbitration about those demands of the Chinese about large chunks of territory. It is quite fantastic and absurd basing their demand on what happened in past centuries. As I said in the other House the otherday, if this argument is applied, I wonder how

much of the great Chinese State would survive these arguments. How did the Chinese State, this huge State, mighty State, build itself up-by the Doctrine of Panch Sheel or what? In the past it built itself up by conquest obviously, all parts or it. Whether it was a few years ago, a hundred, 200 or 500 years ago, it was built up by conquest, as all great States have been built up by conquest,

227

violent conquest, and if you apply that theory, the Chinese State was not born complete itself when civilisation began. So, that argument of British imperialism can well be countered with past, if not present, Chinese imperialism which obviously functioned. One might say, as I said the other day, in the old days Asoka's empire, the Kushan empire and Chandra Gupta's empire spread over half of Central Asia and Afghanistan and all over; therefore, we should lay claim to that. It is an extraordinary argument, this kind of thing. The whole reason of that argument simply takes, you back to past ages of history upsetting everything. It really is the argument of a strong and aggressive Power. Nobody else would use it. I have A feeling that as there is a certain paranoia in individuals, sometimes there is a paranoia in nations, and one sees that, so that in this matter let us come to basic facts.

The basic facts are these. Number one, that this Chinese claim which was vaguely set down in maps etc., is becoming more definitey stated now. That is a claim which it is quite impossible for India or almost any Indian ever to admit whatever the consequences. That is quite clear. There is no question of mediation, conciliation or arbitration about that, because that is absurd. As somebody said, Shri Khadilkar I think, it involves a fundamental change in the whole geography of it, the Himalayas being handed over as a gift to them. This is an extraordinary claim. This is a thing, whether India exists or does not exist, cannot be agreed to. There the matter ends.

Now, having said that, so far as lines of delimitation etc., are concerned, these are matters always for argument provided the approach is a peaceful one. Take Longju. We have said so, you have seen the letter. We think that Longju is on our side of the line, just on our side within about half a mile of it. They say it is not. We think we have a good case, but leave that out. We have said we are prepared not to go out to Longju. You get out too, and then the matter can be considered by maps, charts, whatever it is because it is a minor rectification and it does not make much difference provided it is peacefully done. Or, any other minor point like that we are prepared to consider in this way, but not this light demand of handing over the Himalayas to them. That we are not prepared to consider.

Again, there is this McMahon Line that I referred to. There is the border of U.P., Himachal Pradesh and Punjab.

There, when we had this treaty about Tibet in 1954, a number of passes were mentioned, that is, passes meant for pilgrims and others to go over, and, traders. Those passes themselves in a sense laid down the frontier, and the claim now made here are there, as in the letter, to the Shipki La pass etc., is undoubtedly a breach of that agreement of 1954 in so far as the passes are concerned.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh vaguely said: Nobody knows in what places, what areas of India the Chinese may have occupied. I beg to inform him that everybody knows it or ought to know it. If he does not know, he should try to find out from those who know, before making such statements. Now, apart from that area in Ladakh, about which I mentioned to you about the road we know exactly who is there. There is no part of our border at the present moment occupied by the Chinese except the Longju area, that little bit about which

An Hon. Member: May I submit one thing? About Longju, it is said that it was delimited up to a length of 850 miles by Sir McMahon. Longju is on this side of the McMahon Line. So, how can they claim Longju now ?

The Prime Minister : At least, I do not know. I am merely stating the fact. I am stating the fact in so far as I know, that there are no Chinese troops on this side of McMahon Line anywhere, except three or may be, four miles of Longju, there is a small detachment there. The impression seems to have grown that there are masses and masses of Chinese armies perched on the frontier or not pouring into the frontier. That is not a correct impression; it is not an easy thing to do, and if it is done, it will be met, whether it is big or small or whatever it may be.

Let us realise this; the real danger at the present moment is not of armies pouring in; the real danger is the words that are being said in Peking.

That is the thing which is extraordinary, and these words which I have quoted, we cannot possibly accept, admit or agree to. That is the basic position. Now, all minor things one talks about, one agree to, one has conciliation, one has this or that as with any country. And our broad approach will always be a friendly approach, is according to our thinking a wrong approach. We may lose our tempers. Losing one's temper is not a good thing, but one loses it because one cannot control oneself, but a nation at least should not lose temper, when it is faced with these serious problems. And let us be firm, at the same time, restrained and controlled.

228

May I also add, to complete the whole picture, that it is not merely a question of this, but a question of the treatment given to our Missions in Tibet, our trade agencies. It has been consistently discourteous treatment by the local authorities We write, we complain, answers come, long explanations come, but it does seem that it is deliberately done, to make it more and more inconvenient and difficult for them to work there.

May I say this here ? I would just like to draw Acharya Kripalani's attention to one note in the White Paper-he might note down just the page, I would not read it now-which does indicate our approach to these questions, that is to say, a mixture of politeness and firmness. This is at page 77 of the White Paper, the statement of our Foreign Secretary in reply to the Chinese statement.

May I here say that I should like to express my regret to the Members of the Socialist Party here for a reference to them in one of these statements, and I accept entire responsibility for it ? I am sorry. But I was much disturbed by that particular incident which happened in Bombay, because, whatever may happen, the Head of a State is supposed to be above criticism ; and it rouses tremendous passions, if you bit the Head of a State. And what was done there in regard to Chairman Mao had made a tremendous difference suddenly to change the atmosphere of China against us. It was utilised by ill our enemies and I was moved by that, disturbed by that.

I should like this House to consider this matter, apart from its views about the cold war, from its views on Communism. Indirectly, Communism comes in. In the sense that China is a Communist State, in that sense, it does affect. I think it will make it more difficult for you to understand the situation if your minds are coloured by this business of the cold war, the arguments that go on between Communism and anti-Communism. What we have to face today is a great and powerful nation which is aggressive. It might be aggressive minus Communism or plus Communism. Either way it might be there. That is a fact that you have to face.

Therefore, do not confuse the issue. So far as the cold war is concerned, as the House knows, or ought to know, all wise men or most wise men in the world are trying to put an end to it, and it would be a tragedy if we, who stood up against the cold war, should surrender to its voice and technique, when the countries which started it were giving it up. Therefore, let us not have it. Cold war is an admission of defeat-mental and intellectual defeat. It is not, if I may say so with all respect to the participants of the cold war, a mature way of considering a question. Certainly, I am not speaking in terms of non-violence, although cold war is the negation of non-violence. I say if you are violent, be violent. But nobody has yet, I hope, approved of blackguardly language. That is cold war.

The Prime Minister said : In Premier Chou-En-lai's last letter, he says : "In Your Excellency's letter, you also referred to the boundary between China and Sikkim. Like the boundary between China and Bhutan, this question does not fall within the scope of our present discussion".

I beg to differ from Premier Chou En-lai. It does very much fall within the scope of our present or future discussion. If he thinks that he can deal with it as something apart from India, we are not agreeable to that. We have publicly, rightly, undertaken certain responsibilities for the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan, if they are attacked. Therefore, it is very necessary for us to understand the position there, because if some thing happens on their borders, then it is the same thing as an inteference with the border of India.

Then there was one question which was put to me-I am sorry to repeat Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's name. It was a very interesting question. In Premier Chou's letter, he had referred to a telegram which we received from Tibet-from Lhasa-in 1947. It is true. The point which Premier Chou made was that even then, 1947, that is, soon after we became independent, Tibet claimed territory from us. That was his argument. It is true that we received a telegram from the Tibetan Bureau in Lhasa, which was forwarded to us by our Mission in Lhasa, claiming the return of Tibetan territory on the boundary of India and Tibet. A reply was sent by us,-it did not say exactly what reply was sent by us in 1947-demanding the assurance that it was the intention of the Tibetan Government to continue relations on the existing basis until new agreements are reached on matters that either party may wish to take up.

Now, what that telegram means, I do not know. But this House should remember that when we discuss these small border disputes, whether it is Migyitun or this or that, all these are standing disputes with the old Tibetan Government, even in British times, certain small areas which were points of dispute between the

229

then Government of India and the Tibetan Government. There were some new disputes too. It may be that this telegram refers to those areas in dispute, relatively small areas.

Here is another instance of what we call the new approach of the Chinese Government to us, or, perhaps, an intensification of that approach. We received a complaint and a protest from them a few days ago about the' violation of their territorial waters. I was surprised because the report was that it was one small ship-a frigate I think, which was taking supplies to a ship called Magar-crocodile-(its name is Magar).- This frigate was taking supplies ; and passing nearby Hongkong, it did undoubtedly pass across the territorial waters of China, say within 12 miles or so-whatever it was. They protested and said it was challenged and it did not listen to the challenge. The Magar has not come back yet. But we have received a. report and it said that there was no challenge when they came across and they did not know and they went on. That is curious enough-petty incident of the Magar going there and being challenged.

But in this connection another incident is quoted.

"Last year your cruiser 'Mysore' also did the same thing, passed through our territorial waters."

Now the cruiser 'Mysore' had gone last year on a visit of goodwill to China among other countries. That is, it went to Hongkong, China Shanghai and it went to some other places also. I do not know. It certainly went to Shanghai. It is very surprising that it should be quoted and quoted a year after. Certainly last year it came to within six or twelve miles. The affair is rather extraordinary.

There are a multitude of questions that arise in this connection and we shall have to deal with them with all care, patience, firmness and forbearance. And I am sure that this House will show the firmness coupled with forbearance.

If I have erred in the past in some delay in placing the papers before the House, I shall not err again. It is too serious a matter. At that time one wanted the situation not to be worsened by publicity when we were dealing with them, corresponding with them and their answers come after months. This very answer from Premier Chou has come six months after my letter of March. One waits and time goes on. But, anyhow, the situation is such that we have to keep the country and especially the Parliament in full touch with the developments. I do not expect, and I do not want the House to imagine that something very serious is going to happen on our frontiers. I do not at all expect that to happen. It is not such an easy matter for it to happen either. But the basic difficulty is this apparent change in the attitude of the Chinese Government when it has come out quite clearly

with a demand which it is absolutely and wholly impossible for us to look at. But, if you will put that aside, the major demand aside,they themselves say, the House will notice, that they are not, in a sense, pressing for that or demanding it now and that they are prepared for the status quo to continue that there is the demand, just as the maps were a constant irritant and a reminder to us that something may happen and it is now much more obvious-it is only in that sense the situation has worsened and not in the sense that something is going to happen in the border or the frontier suddenly.

I would beg of you not to put this matter in the catagory of Communist or non-Communist. The House must have seen the statement issued more or less on behalf of the Soviet Government and this House knows the very close relations that the Soviet Government has naturally with the Chinese Government. The issue of that statement itself shows that the Soviet Government is taking a calm and more or less objective or dispassionate view of the situation considering everything. We welcome that. It is not for us to divert this major issue between these two great countries, China and India into wrong channels; it will be completely wrong for us to do that and we must maintain our dignity and at the same time deal with the situation as firmly as we can. It is a difficult situation, difficult in the sense, physically difficult, apart from other difficulties. Remember, if the physical difficulties are on our side, as they are, hundreds of miles of mountains and forests with the roads, the same difficulties are on the side of any person who rashly tries to come in. So you can balance the difficulties either way.

Anyhow, our Army and Defence Forces are fully seized of this matter and they are not people who get excited quickly. They are brave people, experienced people and because they have to deal with a difficult job, they deal with it in a calm and quiet way but efficiently. I am sure they will do that.

In reply to a question whether the Dalai Lama is being subsidised by the Government the Prime Minister said : I have not referred to the qestion

230

of Tibet or the Dalai Lama, partly because,

although it slightly touches these issues and it has affected them, it is a separate issue. So far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, I do not know what is meant by 'subsidy'. We have spent some money over his remaining there but certainly we have given him no special subsidy. But some money has been spent naturally on his stay at Mussoorie and we are spending money on the other refugees. Again, as the House knows, we have expressed our views in regard to some statements of the Dalai Lama. We have disagreed with them.

I am merely telling you the fact. He is given no subsidy of any kind but some money has been spent by us on arrangements for his stay in Mussoorie. That is the position. There was a little controversy as to the freedom to be given to a person who has sought asylum here, and that is quite apart from the respect we have for him. Of course, it is a constitutional question. We have great respect, and as the people of India have great respect for the Dalai Lama. At 'the same time, we did tell him many times that he should not make India the seat of activities against a country which is a friendly country. I wish to say this : by and large, for a considerable time, he has observed a good deal of restraint considering the stresses and strains he suffered from. But sometimes, he has gone beyond that and we had to contradict some of his statements. We did not wish to enter into trouble about it, but because some of his statements did appear to us to go much too far that we had to contradict them.

CHINA INDIA USA BHUTAN BURMA AFGHANISTAN LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on India-ChinaRelations

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on September 10, 1949 while replying to a debate on India-China relations.

The following is the full text of the statement :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the speakers who have preceded me, even though I do not agree with everything they have said. When we decided to have this debate to-day, it was because the House considered that a serious situation had arisen on our borders and in regard to the relations between India and China. Since that time, two days ago, something else has happened which had added to the gravity of the situation and high-lighted certain aspects which were perhaps under a shadow then. Therefore, in a sense, this debate becomes all the more important, although perhaps it is being held a little too soon after these developments to permit all of us to consider this new aspect carefully and fully. Speaking for myself, as Foreign Minister, it is my business not merely to read the new reply from Premier Chou-En-lai once, but many times, carefully, trying to understand what exactly it might mean. Therefore it would not be proper for me at present to deal with that reply at all fully or to refer to many of the points raised in it. It will no doubt have to be dealt with. As we have now taken Parliament and indeed the public into our confidence by publishing this White Paper, whenever our reply goes, that also would be published. As a matter of fact, only yesterday morning we sent a massage to the Chinese Government in continuation of this correspondence and a copy of that massage, I believe, has been placed on the Table of the House today. I do not know if Hon. Members have read it or seen it. Yes, it is there. It was soon after we had sent this massage that we began getting bits of Premier Chou En-lai's reply. It took a considerable time to come through. Therefore I shall venture only to deal with certain aspects of it referred to by Hon. Members which I consider important and not deal with Premier Chou En-lai's reply. One thing, however, I would like to say is, I often wonder if we, meaning the Government of India and the Government of China, speak quite the same language, if using the words or similar

words we mean the same thing. Because often enough I do not follow the course or line of thought. I hope I could follow a line of thought that is opposite to mine but I just do not follow ; whether the basic way of thinking is different, I do not know. Secondly, and I know this from experience, the problem of translating Chinese into any other language is a terrific problem. I remember when Premier Chou En-lai came here for the first time five years ago and we sat down to draft a simple joint communique, it was originally drafted at his instance, on his suggestion, by me. He looked at it and he approved of it. He knows some English and then his translator told him. Then it was translated into Chinese and then I was asked by him to change some of the words in the English draft because in the Chinese language he did not like them in the Chinese translation. I told him that I had no objection to changing them because they had no significance but I did not like what he told me in the Chinese draft. The matter was of no

231

great principle or significance but it struck me then how immensely difficult it was to translate an idea from English or any such language into Chinese or vice versa. It struck me also then, and I have never been able to find a complete answer to this question which is troubling my mind, how Marx appeared in the Chinese language I am quite sure that Marx or others must be different in Chinese from what it was in the original German or their translations in English or any other language.

So there are these difficulties that one grapples with. One grapples with another difficulty. It is all very well for Members here or for me to criticise something that has happened in China as we do and rightly do but I have not forgotten -and I hope nobody will forget-that before I understand what is happening in China or in relation to China, a big fact stares me in the face and that is a tremendous human upheaval in China which was going on there, the Chinese Revolution. My friend, Mr. Sapru said something about the failure of the West to recognise the Chinese Revolution. It is not a question of your liking the Chinese Revolution or not liking it. It is a fact, a fact of tremendous . significance to the world, by the size of it and by the content of it. Part of it may be good, part of it may be

bad according to your thinking or way of thinking. It is neither here nor there but unless one recognizes these major facts of history, your appraisal of the situation may be wrong, utterly wrong. So it has been that many of the troubles we have had in the international sphere have been due to the fact of a deliberate attempt not to recognize one of the major things in human history. That is so.

Having said that, I would venture to say that there appears to me to be a lack of understanding or recognition in China of the revolution in India and to that perhaps is due not only some of their misunderstandings but many of their approaches to India and the matters connected with India. It is true that we have been brought up-I am talking about recent history, not the long past-in a different tradition. We have been conditioned by different factors, we in India and they in China. True. Nevertheless, we ought to be wise enough to understand what has happened there, if not agree with it. And they ought to be wise enough to understand what is happening and what has happened here in India even though they do not agree with it. I find this lack of understanding and appreciation. We have tried I hope, to understand them and to understand what has happened there. May be, we have not fully succeeded but I believe we have to a large extent; at any rate there was this great attempt. I am not at all sure that there was even any attempt on the other side and I feel that just like certain Western nations, not now but throughout the 19th and half of the 20th century, in their pride and arrogance, ignored the rest of the world -they thought they were the leaders of the world and the rest of the world should follow themso also there is a tendency in some of these Far Eastern countries to forget that there are other parts of the world which count. They forget that India is not a country which can be ignored even though she may speak in gentler language, as she has been accustomed to do not only recently but even in the past ages. The other day, some time back-I forget when-in one of our notes to the Chinese Government we said this. It is included in the White Paper and I shall read it out. It is on page 77 here, in the note embodying the conversation with our Foreign Secretary. It was amazing to get the note from- China to which this is the answer : The Statement says :

1. The Government of India have learned of this statement with regret and surprise. It is not only not in consonance with certain facts, but is also wholly out of keeping with diplomatic usage and the courtesies due to friendly countries. It is a matter of particular surprise and disappointment to them that a Government and people noted for their high culture and politeness should have committed this serious lapse and should have addressed the Government of India in a language which is discourteous and unbecoming even if it were addressed to a hostile country. Since it is addressed to a country which is referred to as friendly, this can only be considered as an act of forgetfulness.

2. We have no desire to enter into a lengthy argument about facts or opinions, much less about the discourteous language used in the statement made on behalf of the Chinese Government. It has been the consistent practice of the Government of India to treat other countries with courtesy and friendliness, even though any country might express opinions opposed to theirs. With China they have endeavoured to maintain and develop friendly relations, and they propose to continue to do so in spite of the discourtesy shown to them by the Chinese Government. This is in consonance with India's past culture and background and Mahatma Gandhi's teachings."

And this is because of what seems to us a complete failure of the Chinese Government to appreciate that we have what are called certain civil and democratic liberties here.

232

This is in relation to Tibet and what ha happened here, as if we could go and throttle everybody who disagreed with us or disagree with the Chinese Government. Then the not says :

"The Government of India realise that the system of Government in China is different from that prevailing in India. It is the right of the Chinese people to have a Government of their choice, and no one else has a right to interfere; it is also the right of the Indian people to have a Government of their choice, and no one else has a right to interfere. In India, unlike China the law recognises many parties, and gives protection to the expression of differing opinions. That is a right guaranteed by our Constitution and, contrary to the practice prevailing in China, the Government of India is often criticised and opposed by some sections of the Indian people. It is evident that this freedom of expression, free press and civil liberties in India are not fully appreciated by the Government of China, and hence misunderstandings arise."

Then again, in another matter it says

" From the statement made on behalf of the People's Government of China, it appears that, according to them, the Panch Sheel or the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence may or may not be applied according to convenience or circumstances. This is an approach with which the Government of India are not in agreement. They have proclaimed and adhered to these principles as matters of basic policy and not of opportunism. They will continue to hold to these Principles and endeavour to apply them according to their own thinking., I

I have read out extracts from that Paper. So there is this difficulty.

Dr. Kunzru said that our foreign policy was in the melting pot. He also referred to our nonalignment and to Panchsheel being a slogan and an opiate and so on. I am sorry that Dr. Kunzru has failed to appreciate-he may disagree, but he has failed to appreciate-the basic reasons for our foreign policy. They were not based on merely being friendly to China or some other countryalthough we wanted to be friendly with other countries-but they were also based on a certain mental or other approach to this question. It is a basic thing. These Principles are right-and I do claim that they are right and I should like any Hon. Member here to tell me wherein they are not right. I have yet to find any one, not only here but elsewhere as well, who can say that they are not right, but only they say it is not right to say this to China or some other country. But a

principle is a principle. It does not become unright or wrong because somebody, whom you suspect to be not quite truthful, says it. Therefore, I do not understand what the present situation which has developed, serious as it is, has got to do with putting our foreign policy in what is called a melting pot. So far as I am concerned and so far as our I Government is concerned, our foreign policy is as firm as a rock and it will remain so. It will be some other Government that may change it. The present Government will not and the present Government will hold to nonalignment, because it is a matter of principle, not of opportunism or the convenience of the day. That surely does not mean that we should not be vigilant, that we should not protect India's interests or India's border or whatever it is. Surely that would be a foolish inference to draw from it.

Dr. Kunzru referred to various mistakes of the past. He particularly referred to our keeping things back from Parliament. Well, Sir, what did we do? He said the other day when there was a debate here about Tibet we did not make a full report or a full and comprehensive report to Parliament. Well, Sir, let us go back to that time, a few months ago. That was the time when the message from which I just now read out was sent. I don't quite know what more report we could make at that stage. We could, of course, have said something more. But so far as the border problems were concerned, the position then was as it had been for several years previously, because remember that the recent development, the very recent development, of the last few weeks, is a new development about the frontier problem. It is true that the Government of Chinahad gone on producing maps which were incorrect maps to which we had taken exception. And they assured us that they would look into the matter and correct them where necessary later, these old maps. That was not an adequate or satisfactory explanation to give. Yet it was some kind of explanation and those maps continuing were an irritating feature in the landscape. Still there it was. We are not going to change maps by shouting about them. After all, in dealing with countries, we deal with them diplomatically or by methods of coercion and war. Where we rule out war and where these methods of coercion are silly in the case of such countries, we have to proceed diplomatically.

Right from the first few months of independence, in the first year or two, repeatedly I stated in Parliament that the McMahon Line-I use that word for short. Really I do not know why it should not be called the McMahon Line. It simply means the defined frontier-was our frontier. When I say something in Parliament, it is meant for the outside world and it was meant, if I may say so, for the Government of China. We said this to the Chinese Government in communication, orally and otherwise too. Their answer was vague. I am talking about the maps. I saw no reason at that time-I am talking about six, seven or eight years ago-to discuss the question of the frontier with the Chinese Government because, foolishly if you like, I thought that there was nothing to discuss. I think in the last letter Mr. Chou En-lai refers to this that I would not even discuss this.. I always recognised that they were minor matters, territories which had been considered disputable even before the Chinese came to Tibet. Those areas were there even in the British period. There were minor disputes and the Chinese inherited them and went on with them. We are prepared to settle those matters. You may say that all these frontier matters might be divided into three parts. One is broadly speaking what is called the McMahon Line from the Burmese border to the Bhutan border. Then comes the Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Lahaul, Spiti and then you go on to Ladakh. You must treat these separately. When I talk about the McMahon Line, obviously it is only that area, not of the Ladakh area which is quite different. I am not going into the long history because I do not want to take the time of the House. It is a complicated thing but we have always looked upon the Ladakh area as a different area as, if I may say so, some vaguer area so far as the frontier is concerned because the exact line of the frontier is not at all clear as in the case of the McMahon Line. When discovered in 1958, more than a year ago, that a road had been built across Yehcheng in the north-east corner of Ladakh, we were worried. We did not know where it was. Hon. Members asked, why did you not know before ? It is a relevant question but the fact of the matter is that we just are not within hundred miles of that area. It is an uninhabitable area and it has not been under any kind of administration. Nobody has been present there. It is a territory where not even a blade of grass grows, about 17,000 feet high. It adjoins Sinkiang. We

sent a party, practically of explorers, small group of six or seven or eight or ten, mountaineers and others, to find out about this. One of the groups of this party was apprehended by the Chinese Government and there was correspondence on this. The men belonging to that group were released later on. Now, possibly it was an error or a mistake or wrong on my part not to have brought that fact before the House. I am myself not clear, thinking back on that, what I should have done but our difficulty then was that we were corresponding with Chinese Government and we were waiting for these people, that little party, to come here and tell us as to what happened to them. It took two or three months for them to come. The group which was apprehended by the Chinese was released later-and the men came back after some time. We thought at that time that it might be easier for us to deal with the Chinese Government without too much publicity of this incident. We might have been wrong but it was not a crisis or anything like that. However I am prepared to admit that it was my error not to have brought this matter to the notice of Parliament when it occurred. For the rest, there has been no keeping back really of any information and we have kept Parliament fully informed. There have been plenty of questions.

Dr. Ahmad said that there are no objective reasons for war. Of course there are no objective reasons, no practical reasons, no sensible reasons or no reason whatsoever of any kind. Whichever way you approach it, it would be folly of an extreme type for us to fight over such matters. We may get excited about the sacredness of the Indian soil and the Chinese people may get excited about something they hold sacred, if they hold anything sacred. That is a different matter but the fact of the matter is that nothing can be a more amazing folly than for two great countries like India and China to go into a major conflict and war for the possession of a few mountain peaks, however beautiful the mountain peaks might be, or some area which is more or less uninhabited. It is not that, as every Member of this House knows. When such conflicts occur, something happens which stirs our innermost convictions, something which hurts our pride, our national pride, our self-respect and all that. So, it is not a question of a mile or two or ten or even a hundred miles. It is something more precious than a hundred or a thousand miles and

it is that which brings up people's passions to a high level and it is that which, to some extent is happening in India to-day. It is not because of a patch of territory but because they feel that they have not got a fair treatment in this matter, they have been treated rather casually by the Chinese Government and an attempt is made, if I may use the word, to bully them.

Now, the only time that firing took place was in Longju, a few days ago. In his last letter, Mr. Chou En-lai gives a list of places where India has committed aggression. We have committed

234

aggression on air and we have committed aggression on land. There is no sea; otherwise, we would have been accused of committing aggression on sea also. I might inform the House that we have received a protest about one of our ships having gone into the territorial waters of China. That ship, I think, was going from Hong Kong to somewhere. That is another matter. So, sea is also not left out. Now, what is aggression and what is not aggression depends, of course, on where you put the line of demarcation. Obviously, we may go on saying that they have committed aggression and they may go on saying that we have committed aggression because their line is different from ours and so long as you do not agree to a line, you can always go on saying this according to our own interpretation and our own methods. There can be no limit to that but Mr. Chou En-lai says in his letter that although they totally deny and repudiate the so-called McMahon Line, nevertheless, they had not crossed the Line. That is his argument and he says that they won't cross it till this matter is settled by agreement. I won't go into the long argument but take this particular place where actually firing took place. We got one version from our people and they have no doubt got a version from their own people; the two versions do not meet and they conflict with each other but there is just one simple matter I should like to bring to your notice and to Chinese Government's notice. Over this there has been a protest. There has been a post belonging to the Indian Government at Longju. It so happened that towards the second half of July, we got news that the officer-in-charge of the check post at Longiu was seriously ill. He was supposed to have got appendicitis and nobody was available there to deal with him. So

we sent a message to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the 23rd July, that is, slightly more than a month before this small fighting took place and this was the message to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs :

"The officer-in-Charge of the Indian check post at Longju near the international border in the Subansiri Frontier Division of NEFA is seriously ill. It is essential to send immediate medical relief to save his life. The location of the post is

Then the exact longitude, latitude etc. were given.

"The Government of India propose to paradrop a doctor at the post. Depending on weather the paradropping operation may take place on the 24th afternoon or on one of subsequent days. The aircraft has been instructed to take all rare not to cross into Chinese territory but the Chinese Government are being informed should there be any error of judgment. The Government of India will appreciate if immediate warning is issued to the neighbouring Chinese posts of this operation."

This was a normal message sent to a friendly Government but the mere normality of it shows that we had no doubt about our post. We gave them the longitude, latitude and we said we were sending a doctor and when they say that this is aggression on our part at Longju, I do submit that that argument does not convince. We can of course go into that; I need not convince the House because the House is convinced about these matters.

Now, I should like to go back to one thing to which attention has been drawn, I think, by Diwan Chaman Lall; that is about my talks with Premier Chou En-lai. It is no pleasure to me to contradict Premier Chou. My memory may be wrong; his memory may be wrong. Whatever it is; but it happens I did not trust my memory but a record of the talks I made in an official note within 24 hours of our talk. There is a small quotation given of that. How did this talk arise? How did it take place ? It was Premier Chou who started it and the reason for it was that some months previously I had sent him a message, not about the Indian frontier, but about the Burmese frontier. I had no business to interfere on the question of the Burmese frontier but the Prime Minister of Burma who had been here about that time said that he was having this trouble about the frontier and we discussed it and he asked if I could help in any way. 1 said, it is very difficult to interfere with two other countries of the status they had but still presuming rather our friendly relations with China and with Burma I sent a message to Premier Chou saving that I was sorry that this small matter of the Burma-China frontier was continuing and was not being settled and I hoped that it would be settled soon. Then I used-I remember very well-a phrase. In it I said Burma is relatively a small country; on either side of Burma are these big countries China and India and Burma naturally feel a little apprehensive of both these countries-I included both India and China-and it is up to us to function in a way to remove all apprehension from the mind of Burma which is a friendly country. We are friends with it. Why do anything carelessly which might increase their fear or apprehension ? I included India and I put it in the same level as China in

235

that letter. Then I suggested in that letter-it is not for me to suggest what the frontiers should be-that perhaps he might be good enough to invite U Nu who was not at that time Prime Minister and discuss this with him. Premier Chou agreed to my suggestion and invited U Nu. Later U Nu went and they had talks and I believe he came back fairly satisfied with these talks but I regret to say that although this occurred some time ago, three and half years ago, these talks have not borne fruit in Burma yet. It is still there; there is a feeling in Burma that the assurances given to U Nu about the frontier are not fulfilled by China. So when Premier Chou was discussing this matter over the message we sent about Burma-I had invited U Nu and we had talked in that connection-he said, although we do not recognise this McMahon Line-it was of British Imperialism and all thatnevertheless we are friendly countries, these things should not go on in this way and therefore -he said-we have agreed to recognise the McMahon Line in so far as the Burmese frontier is concerned. We were discussing Burma, remember-and the other few matters will also be settled

soon. In that connection he went on to say, also because of our friendly relations, we shall accept the McMahon Line so far as the China-India frontier is concerned. That was the whole of the Mc-Mahon Line. Then one or two things he added. One was that he did not think that it was a valid line. Certainly he said that; that the British had gone on extending. Nevertheless, we shall recognise it because of long usage and because we are friendly countries. Now, when I heard this I wanted to be quite sure that I had not misunderstood him. So I think three times in various ways. I came back to this subject and made him repeat this. So there was no doubt about it. Because the matter was of some importance to me, when I came away a little later I put it down in writing and there it is. Now, it is a matter of sorrow to me that this thing is now, if not denied-it is anyhow practically denied-ignored and another line is adopted. Of course, it may be that things have happened in China compelling a change in policy; I do not know. That may happen in any country but however that may be, there it is. And this change-over ; it is not sudden. Even in this White Paper those who read it will see that the answer about this McMahon Line etc. is not quite so strong, so positive, as in Premier Chou's letter of yesterday. Gradually, step by step, the policy of China in regard to this matter has become more rigid. Why, I cannot say.

Now, this is a matter, Sir, undoubtedly of concern to us, not only because of its consequence but because such developments produce a feeling of lack of confidence in each other's words and assurances. That is a more important thing, as some Hon. Members said, than a few yards of territory. If there is that lack of faith, lack of confidence, where are we ?

Take another thing. On the one hand we have these maps where large areas of India are marked as if they were China and on the other they say, well, the maps are not precise and accurate. We can change them if necessary but we do not recognise the McMahon Line. Nobody knows exactly what they may have in mind as to where the Line is. It is an extraordinary position for a great State to take up. Even if we subscribed to that it means leaving the matter vague and the possibility of trouble is always there. So far as we are concerned, administratively we have been there. It is true that there is not much of administration in the high Himalayas but still what there is, is there. We have our post; we have our officers. We function ; we have functioned for years there and to be told that this is aggression or this may be aggression is an extraordinary thing. If we have two sets of opinions about this the right thing to do for the two countries was and is for them to sit down and talk about it and argue about it and come to a settlement. Now, I have made our position clear on this border issue by statements in Parliament and later by letters, etc. for ten years now. There is no doubt that the Chinese Government knew about it. They remained silent. They did not accept my position except as I said that we had a talk here in India when Premier Chou came here three years ago, when he accepted the McMahon Line. But apart from that we have been talking about it, acting upon it. Take even the Sino-Indian Treaty about Tibet, five years ago, I think-in 1954. Now we were dealing with Tibet and we were dealing with such matters as affected Tibet. We were dealing with the various extra-territorial rights we had in Tibet, withdrawing them, some soldiering we had, post office, telegraph office, roads, pilgrim routes, trade, commerce and everything, and what were the passes we should go through. Now, normally one would think that, if there was a problem of a bit of Tibet being in India or vice versa, when we are dealing with India-Tibet questions, those matters should have come up for discussion. They did not. I saw no reason why I should push them, because I had nothing to say about them. I accepted the boundary as it was. Nothing was mentioned. And the whole cont of those discussions was that we were dealing with all the remaining problems as between Tibet and India in that treaty with China. And to have it at the back of your mind that you are going to

236

change the whole frontier between Tibet and India and later bring it up, does not seem to be quite straight or fairplay. Now, a very favourite word we often use it too and they use it frequently, but a very favourite word with the Chinese authorities is "Imperialism". Well, there is imperialism in the world. We have known enough of it to dislike it very greatly. We have struggled against it. But it seems to me that sometimes this word is used to cover every sin and everything as if that was an explanation of every argument. Just say

"Imperialism"; it answers everything. British imperialism spread, they say. Undoubtedly British imperialism was here. Undoubtedly in the old days, half a century ago, it exercised pressure on Tibet. Those were the days, the House may remember, when China was not strong, but British imperialism was afraid of Czarist Russia. It was really Czarist Russia and British Empire pushing, being afraid of each other. However, they did do that and various things came. Various settlements were made from time to time and, as Diwan Chaman Lall pointed out, also the tripartite treaty of 1919 or 1914. Although China did not sign it, the real Chinese objection was to the border between Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, and not to this border at all. We were not concerned with that. However, whatever that may be, that was about more than 45 years ago. That is, after that treaty; before that too, there was a vague kind of occupation. Now, to raise these matters on the ground that many, many long years ago British imperialism functioned there, it does seem to me, is some strange argument. How do countries grow? The Chinese State today is a great, very big, colossal State. Was this Chinese State born as such from the head of 'Brahma'? How did it grow so big and great?-Surely, in past ages by the ability of its people and the conquests of its warriors, in other words, by Chinese imperialism. There is no doubt about it and I am sure they would not deny it. I am not talking of the present more enlightened days of China, but of the old days surely-and I have the greatest admiration for Chinese history and culture-not that the world functioned in that way. But the point is that the Chinese State grew in that way, where it came to Tibet. Tibet now is a point at issue, very much so. But where do you draw the line from which a kind of certainty comes - there is no imperialism after and only before? At times, if one discusses the history of Tibet, well, there were periods when Tibetan armies occupied the Chinese capital. There were periods when the Nepalese armies occupied the Tibetan capital. You go far enough. We had even in India, peaceful as we are empires going right over to a large part of Central Asia, in Asoka's time, Chandragupta's times, the Kushan period, and all that. Now, where do you draw the line in history? History is full of changes, full of ups and downs, full of all kinds of things and full of mixtures of people and countries. And if one does go back that way, there is no country in the wide world which may

not be shaken to its foundations and split up and certainly the great Chinese State will not survive if that argument is applied. We do not apply that argument. So, it is strange that these simple human factors, apart from constitutional and other factors, do not seem to be appreciated by the Chinese State and they have valued India's friendship only to a very low extent in the final analysis.

I think we were right in 'working for their friendship and, may I repeat and say. We shall continue to work for it. Any person who has the least responsibility for India's present and India's future cannot allow himself to be frightened and angered and behave in fright and anger. No country should do that, more especially in a crisis. People who are frightened and angry can never act wisely. We have to think of the present, of course, but we have to think of the future of these two great countries. To imagine that India can a sort of push China about is silly. To imagine that China can push India about is, if I may venture to say so, equally silly. Now, therefore, this idea of settling things by this kind of compulsion and force or by threats and bullying is all wrong and we must accept things as they are. Now, if you will read the letter, the message we sent to the Chinese Government yesterday morning, that yellow paper or whatever it is, you will find that we made a suggestion to them there.

You need not read it just now. But you will find that we have suggested to them-there can be no other way-that we must accept the status quo and let us discuss these individual points. I do not know, and I do not see how we can discuss this kind of broad areas. We can discuss individual points where there might be some dispute and there might be complaints. It is one thing to accept or to adhere to the McMahon Line but quite another to see the exact alignment here and there. A village may be there. It is not of great importance provided it is done in a friendly way. We are prepared to discuss, we have discussed once or twice. But we say that it is the status quo, as somebody said it is the status quo prior to any recent incursion. Take Longju. We made a very fair offer. We said : "You say that we committed aggression. We don't agree that we did. But we are prepared to agree to neither your forces nor our forces being at Longju. Let us discuss that matter. Let your forces withdraw

and let our forces remain where they are or two

237

or three miles away. We are not prepared to take them back. That is, we want to approach this matter in as peaceful and cooperative a way as possible. Of course it is fantastic to talk about war etc. in this way and to rush about in a panic. Nevertheless the matter is serious enough. Frankly it is serious because I just do not know how the Chinese mind may think. I just do not know. I have been surprised at present developments. So I do not know. I have great admiration for the Chinese mind, logical and reasonable and relatively calm. But sometimes I wonder if all those old qualities have not perhaps been partly overwhelmed. So we have to be careful. We have naturally to be vigilant, and we have to take such measures as we can to protect our integrity.

One word more, Sir. Very probably these Tibetan developments have angered and soured the mind of the Government of China, very likely. They have been in trouble there undoubtedly, and the Tibetan people have been in much greater trouble of course. And perhaps they have reacted strongly to what we have done, I mean, to the asylum we have given to the Dalai Lama and to certain other factors. We have tried to steer a middle way. We respect the Dalai Lama. Large numbers of people respect him. That does not mean we agree with him in everything. In some ways he is acting wrongly to-day. In so far as our advice was taken we have strongly told him that he is acting wrongly and no good can come if he goes to the United Nations on Tibet. I have told him personally. I have said so in public, and I hold to that opinion. It will do no good to him or Tibet. There it is. Some others have advised him differently. We have contradicted some statements that he has recently made which were very unwise and incorrect, if I may say so. The other day in a speech he delivered, I think somewhere in Delhi, he talked of the McMahon Line and status of Tibet being at the same level which was quite incorrect. So we do not agree with him. We have warned him and I must say in a large measure he has accepted our advice, that is to say, in regard to not indulging in political controversy. But sometimes he has not, and it has been a difficult question for us to decide. We do not want to come in his way. We want to give him freedom of action within limitations.

But no doubt all this must have affected and is affecting the Chinese mind, and perhaps it is due to that and not to the logic or the reasonableness of the Chinese position in regard to India, in regard to our frontiers that they are taking up this rigid attitude. Well, we have to be firm, we have to hold to our position. I shall try to do that. But I shall try always to find a way for peaceful settlements because I try to look into the future, and the future, and the future is dark if it is to be covered by continuing hostility between India and China.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TUNISIA BHUTAN HONG KONG MALI BURMA RUSSIA NEPAL

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Chinese Reply toIndia's Protest

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabah on September 4, 1959 in reply to several callingattention motions :

Yesterday evening (September 3) in fact we received a reply from the Chinese Government to the protest we have made to them. We received it through our Embassy in Peking. It is a fairly long reply and we are examining it fully. But broadly speaking the reply says that they have not committed any aggression, and in fact they have accused us of some aggression on that border and have asked us to withdraw from one or two areas which they claim to be Chinese territory. The rest is an argument but this is the main purport of the reply. We are having that fully examined. As for what the Chinese Foreign Minister said, I believe he did say something to that effect ; that is, he more or less supported the line taken up in the reply they have sent us ; that is, they have

not committed any aggression and in one or two places our patrols have gone into Tibetan Chinese territory.

As for Mr. Ganga Sharan's question as to what is happening on the other side of our border in Sikkim or elsewhere, it is difficult for me to say with any precision. Broadly speaking, there are very considerable numbers of troops, Chinese troops, in Tibet spread out and in the last few weeks or more, many of them were stationed on the Sikkim-India border, originally I think, with the intention perhaps of preventing the refugees from coming into India. So they are there. I cannot say in what numbers they are there. Then there was a reference to certain regions in Ladakh. It is rather difficult for me to make any accurate statement about that. But so far as the corner of the Aksai Chin area is concerned, that is the area across which the Chinese built a road two years ago or more, a road from Gartok to Yarkland, which passes through that area, that has been and is claimed by the Chinese as their territory and I believe in their maps too, not the new maps but the old maps, that is shown as their territory. That is disputed and there are two view-points about that. I do not know how many Chinese are there. I cannot say because so far

238

as we are concerned, we have no representative, we can have none. It is not an inhabited area so far as area goes. It is at an average of 16,000 to 17,000 feet altitude and treeless, grassless almost or hardly of any kind, without any living thing there. It is frightfully cold. So I cannot give any information as to how many Chinese may be in that particular corner of Ladakh-Aksai Chin area.

An Hon. Member: The Chinese have come into our border and have built air-fields. The Chinese have sent a reply to our protest that we are more on the offensive than they are and even the other day the Russian Minister speaking in the Inter-Parliamentary Union said that they believed that India was on the offensive and not the Chinese. Such statements by the Chinese and the Russians do cause us concern. Has the Prime Minister taken any objection to the statement made by the Russian Minister in a discussion in the Inter-Parliamentary Union saying that India was in the wrong and not China ? The Prime Minister : No, Sir, because we have no particular report of that or the context of it. Even the report that has appeared in the press is that that matter was raised at the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Russian representative said that it appeared from the reports he had that India was more at fault than China. Some such phrase appeared. Naturally he must have received reports from China or Wherever it is. There is no question of our objecting to every statement that a person makes.

When asked whether the Prime Minister has apprised the three Great Powers with regard to the situation in this regard, the prime Minister replied : Well, Sir, not directly but as is usual with us whenever any important matter occurs, we inform our various Missions abroad, we send them a report of the facts and the steps we are taking and we ask them wherever necessary to inform the Government concerned there. That is what we have done and in pursuance of that, I suppose some of our Ambassadors abroad brought these matters to the attention of the Governments concerned but there was no direct message from us to the Governments concerned.

An Hon. Member: Does the reply given by the Chinese authorities tally with our facts ? Is it true that our people have encroached or infiltrated into their territory or something like that ?

The Prime Minister : It does not tally with our version of the facts. Obviously that is why we are arguing and we are having this detailed reply and they have mentioned many things in it-names of places about which we have no information. We are trying to get information. In the next two or three days we will probably get more information so as to be able to reply to them as we propose to do in the course of a few days. May I mention to this House that we are preparing a kind of a White Paper which will contain the correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China in the last 4 or 5 years, ever since our Tibetan Treaty. That may not be cent per cent up-to-date in the sense that if I get a message today, it may not be in it but it will be fairly up-to-date till the last ten days or so. As soon as it is ready, I hope

before the Parliament adjourns, it will be placed on the Table of the House.

CHINA INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on White Paper

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on September 7, 1959 while placing a White Paper on India-China relations:-

Permit me, Sir, before I lay this paper on the Table, just to make a brief statement and to clarify some misapprehensions. I find that in newspapers, news appears which, if true, would naturally be a matter of concern to the House. But, it is not always true. For instance, in one of today's newspapers, there is a report about something happening on the Punjab-Spiti border-that the Chinese have entered there and arrested some people and all that. I have not heard of it at all. I immediately got in touch, by telephone, with the Punjab Government. They had not heard any such thing. In fact, they said that it had not happened.

Their report is, that, according to their information, it is not true. I cannot say more than what they have told me. They have definitely said on the telephone that there has been no violation of their territory in Spiti in that particular place.

Then again, there was another report that in Chini in Himachal Pradesh, some traders were arrested. We immediately got in touch with the Himachal Pradesh Government and we have not been able to get a detailed account. But we have

239

had no such report from them. Then again, there was a report in the papers about some firing by Pakistani forces somewhere in the east. Again, we have had no report. I enquired from the Defence people as they get daily reports. Till last night,-no, last evening, they had no report.

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and Letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, 1954-59.

I had promised to do so sometime back, and we are placing these papers. They are fairly up-to-date, but they do not contain the last documents received in the course of the last week. However I shall keep the House informed of any developments. So far as the NEFA border is concerned, there has been no development of note which I can bring to the notice of the House yet. So at any rate, that has not come to our knowledge. So far as the defence of that area is concerned, the House knows that the matter has been put in charge of our Armed Forces and the Defence Authorities.

The House will not expect. me to tell them exactly what steps they take; that would not be proper for them or for the House. But they are in charge and, no doubt, they will take adequate steps. They will not, I take it, just rush about up and down the border, but they will take steps at proper points which they consider right places for them to hold.

CHINA INDIA USA PAKISTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on Indian arrested by Chinese Forces

In reply to a question as to whether it was a fact that Chinese forces had arrested 14 Indians belonging to Ladakh recently, and if so, the action taken in the matter ; and whether there was any information about the whereabouts of the Head Lamas of Hemis and Phiang Monasteries of Ladakh, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on September 7, 1959 :

According to information received from our Consulate at Lhasa, five Indians are held in custody by the Chinese authorities in Lhasa. It is not clear whether they come from Ladakh. Our Consulate has protested to the Chinese authorities about the arrest of these persons.

We have also received some information about fourteen Ladakhi Lamas being in custody in various prisons in Tibet. But we have received no precise information about them. We have approached the Chinese authorities to permit Muslims from Kashmir as well as Ladakhi Lamas to contact our Consulate in Lhasa and to allow them to return to India if they so wish.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether Government have any information about the number of Indians returning to Lhasa just prior to the starting of the trouble in Tibet ? If so, what was the number and how many of them have been permitted to go back home ?

The Prime Minister : We have no definite information. We have some reports about them. I say we have no definite information because people used to go from Ladakh without any formal papers being taken from us-pass-ports. It is an old practice. Two types of Indians went there ; the one were the Lamas and they were for study there ; the other were Ladakhi Muslims who used to go there for trade. According to our old practice nobody need get the papers and most of them did not. So, we had no record. Subsequently, when we tried to find out we were told that about 400 Lamas from Ladakh were studying in the various monasteries of Tibet and about 124 families of Kashmiris, that is Ladakhi Muslims, were there. We have not verified these figures. The Chinese authorities have raised the point that these people are no longer Indian

citizens if ever they were, because many of the Kashmiris-Ladakhi Muslims-have been there for a long long time. That is a matter on which we are conferring with them.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether these 14 Ladakhi Lamas who are in custody of the Chinese authorities in Lhasa are so because of mistaken identity ? If so, may I know whether Government have taken any steps to establish their identity so that they might be released ?

The Prime Minister : There is no question of mistaken identity. It is a question of a person establishing his nationality, not identity. Nationality is normally established by papers, passports etc. Now, they have no papers and passports except such oral or other evidence they might give. Immediately it becomes a little less definite although it might be established. It depends upon the authorities taking a strict view or a flexible view about it. They have said quite definitely that they are Indian nationals from Kashmir. It is true that in the past, sometimes to get over

240

preliminary difficulties they have signed papers which probably go against them, because they got some thing done quickly. That comes up against them now.

CHINA INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MONGOLIA

Prime Minister Nehru's Welcome Speech

Mr. Yumjagiin Tsedenbal, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, paid a visit to India from September 10 to 16, 1959. He arrived in New Delhi on September 10 and the same evening a State Banquet was held in his honour at the Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Welcoming Mr. Tsedenbal, Prime Minister Nehru said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, when you arrived here this morning, we gave you a warm welcome, and memories of old times came to us and echoes of long ago rang in our ears. We remember, of course, the present in which we are, but we remembered also the distant past when messengers from India went to your far country, taking with them many unsubstantial but nevertheless very important gifts. They took their culture, their art and their religion and your forbears were pleased to welcome them and make friends with them, and thus began a close bond of the spirit between our two countries, a bond which is more enduring than history, than perhaps the more material bonds. So, we thought of those old days, and we were happy to welcome you as the distinguished representative of Mongolia.

We thought also of today in which we live and the future for which we work, your country and ours ; and we thought of these two together. And we thought how good it was that in this present and for the future, we were reviving those old bonds in this new context in which we live. We work for peace and the well-being of our people. We work also for peace and are devoted to it, and work for the happiness and well-being of both ; and yet most of us, I suppose, remember because of the very incomplete and limited histories we learnt, of the days when your country sent forth great warriors to conquer nearly half the world as it was known in those days, more than half Asia and half Europe. Those days are past, I hope, and in spite of all the troubles we see and all the preparations for war and the atomic bombs and the rest, I hope we are marching to an era of peace!

I am sure that your country aims and works for peace as ours does, and we want to be comrades and to co-operate in this work of peace for our own good, your good and for the world's good.

I did some little research work today and I

discovered that the area of your country is nearly half the area of India. Our area, I believe, is about 12,70,000 square miles. The area of Mongolia is nearly 6,00,000 square miles, which is a little under half. Then I went on to the population figures of the two countries. Your country's population, you were good enough to tell me, is one million. Our country's is, as I believe, round about 400 million now. So, roughly speaking, we are two hundred times more intensely populated than your country. That itself produces a different type of problem for us as other things do-climate and other things that affect human beings.

So, in some ways our problems are in a different context. Nevertheless, essentially they are similar as are problems of all countries which are trying to develop and trying to get the good things of life for their people. In that we can learn, I suppose, from each other and from other countries. But in doing so, I believe, it is important that each country continues to water its own roots and to derive sustenance from them to retain its individuality which connects it with their distant past and which should project itself into the future. I hope, I believe, we will do that in our country. I hope that your country too will maintain that in the future that you are building.

Therefore, I hope also that those old bonds, cultural, artistic and other, that joined us in the past will join us in the future also, in addition to the new bonds that we may build in the new world that is being created by the efforts of people all over. So, because of all this, and much more, we were particularly happy to welcome you here, and I am sure that wherever you may go in India you will receive warm and heart-felt welcome.

You were good enough, Sir, to invite me to visit

241

Mongolia. I cannot tell you how happy I would be to be able to visit it. Even though it becomes rather difficult for me to pay visits to distant countries, but, still, I shall live in the hope that sometime or other I should come to Mongolia carrying the good wishes of our people to your people and help a little in strengthening those bonds that have united us in the past. Two years ago we sent you our most distinguished ambassador, our Vice-President. We could not have sent you a more suitable person not only because of his great position in India today but because he represents in himself that great past of ours, the present and the future, all combined . So, we chose as our messenger to you the best that we could offer and you gave him a warm welcome and he told us about that welcome and many things about your country.

Now you have come here and not only we but the people of our country will think of Mongolia and the people of Mongolia, and I hope thus we shall strengthen in every way our old contacts and new ones.

So, again I wish you a warm welcome on my own behalf and on behalf of our Government and the people of India. I hope that your very brief stay here will be pleasant and that you will carry back with you memories of friends, memories of comrades, memories of people who will work in co-operation with you in the great tasks ahead.

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to drink to the good health of the Prime Minister of Mongolia.

MONGOLIA INDIA USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MONGOLIA

Mr. Tsedenbal's Reply

His Excellency Mr. Yumjagiin Tsedenbal, Prime Minister of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, in his reply said : Most Honourable Mr. Prime Minister; Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

Friends, I am grateful to Your Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister, for your hearty welcome, and for those kind words and good sentiments towards my people that you have just expressed.

We feel greatly honoured to have come here as envoys of our peace and freedom-loving people on a friendly visit to India, this beautiful motherland of the great nation which contributed so much to human civilization.

The cordial and warm welcome which is being accorded to us, eloquently testifies those friendly feelings which the people of India have towards our people. I can assure you here that our people have the same warm sentiments of friendship and respect towards your people which fought hard and won their freedom and independence overthrowing the hated colonial yoke. The Mongolian people sincerely hail your efforts and successes in the uplift of your national economy scored during the years of independence.

As is known the vital problem of today is that of safeguarding and strengthening world peace. The peoples are placing great hopes in the forthcoming exchange of visits between Mr. Khrushschev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Mr. Eisenhower, President of USA as an important event promising to bring about relaxation of international tension. The people and the government of Mongolia heartily wish every success for the meetings of the leaders of the two great powers.

Our people and government know very well the great efforts made by India for strengthening peace and reducing international tension. We appreciate India's valuable contribution to the settlement of big international problems.

The famous Five Principles of peaceful coexistence "the Panch Shila" first jointly proclaimed by the two great peace-loving countries of Asia, the Republic of India, and the Chinese People's Republic, play an important part in strengthening the friendly relations among peoples, in safeguarding peace in Asia and throughout the world. India, too, was one of the sponsors of the Bandung Conference of 1955, which signified an outstanding event in bringing the Asian and African nations still closer in their struggle fornational independence against colonialism.

The Mongolian People's Republic was founded as the sequence of successful struggle of the Mongolian people against colonialism, and feudal regime. Since the very first day of its existence this country has been pursuing the policy of peace and friendship among nations. The Mongolian people are desirous to develop and strengthen friendly ties with all nations.

242

The ties binding the peoples of Mongolia and India go back to times immemorial. At present our two countries, marching along the path of progress are widening and strengthening the friendly relations between them. You personally, Mr. Prime Minister, have made valuable contribution to this end.

It is a great pleasure for me to note that the visit of His Excellency the Vice-President of the Republic of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, to bur country in 1957, greatly promoted the friendly relations between Mongolia and India.

We hope that our visit to your country will also serve the cause of further strengthening the friendship and co-operation between our countries.

May I request you, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to join me in proposing this toast to the further flourishing of friendship between the peoples of Mongolia and India, to the good health and happiness of our esteemed host, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

MONGOLIA USA INDIA INDONESIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MONGOLIA

Mr. Tsedenbal's Speech at Farewell Banquet

His Excellency Mr. Yumajagiin Tsedenbal, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, speaking at a banquet given by him at Ashoka Hotel on September 11, 1959 said :

Honourable Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

Friends, I am thankful to you Mr. Prime Minister, for accepting my invitation to grace this humble function.

We take great pleasure, too, in welcoming most heartily our esteemed and dear guests who have been so kind as to participate in this friendly party.

I and my colleagues are very happy to be present in your midst in this great peace, loving country, the industrious and gifted people of which are fighting and working hard for the noble cause of peace and progress.

The friendly relations so happily subsisting between our two countries are based on the firm principles of peaceful coexistence of nations and benefit both Mongolia and India and serve the noble cause of world peace.

These relations are testimony to the fact that the Bandung principles, the principles of coexistence, the principles of friendships and co-operation among nations with different social systems, are prevailing in international life.

Enjoying your warm hospitality we are seeing for ourselves with much interest, the life of your great people, the magnificent monuments of the Indian culture, as well as your modern achievements.

Everywhere we feel deep sentiments of friendship and sympathy of the Indian people towards the Mongolian people. I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Indian People, to H. E. Honourable Prime Minister J. Nehru, to the Government of India, which accorded us such warm welcome.

May I propose a toast to the health of H. E. Honourable Prime Minister, J. Nehru, and to that of all our guests present here-to the great Indian people, to the friendship between Mongolia and India, and among all countries of Asia and Africa, to peace all over the world.

MONGOLIA USA INDIA INDONESIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MONGOLIA

Vice-President Dr. Radhakrishnan's Reply

Replying, the Vice-President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said :

Mr. Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Mongolia, Your Ecxellencies and Friends:

I had the honour of visiting the Republic of Mongolia two years back and I received at the hands of the President and the Cabinet of that country a most warm welcome. Though I spent only one day there, they enabled me to appreciate their real love and friendship for us and appreciation of the efforts which we are making.

Many of our countries in Asia leaped into life recently and they are adopting new ideas and are utilising new opportunities for raising their standard of living. In Mongolia also you see that. Industrialisation is proceeding very fast. In addition to industrialisation we require something else ; liberation from external constraints, liberation from the prejudices which we have in our own minds. There is tyranny in our minds, obsessions of which we are victims and there are external constraints of poverty, disease, humiliation, etc.

The Prime Minister of Mongolia just now said, we want to work for peace. If we have to achieve peace, the under-privileged countries have to raise their standards. But, all countries, privileged or under-privileged will have to develop charity, goodness and humanity. There must be a growth in human nature. Mongolia has inherited a great religion which is scientific, ethical and spiritual and I do hope that in their efforts to raise their material standards they will also try to raise their moral standards. The great heritage which you have is something which requires to be preserved. And I do hope the world over there will be an attempt not merely to abolish poverty, disease, unemployment, hunger etc., but also national bigotry, racial discrimination and such other obsessions which even great nations possess. If you are able to get rid of them, the world will be a safe place for humanity and I hive great pleasure now in asking you to rise and drink to the health of the Prime Minister and wish peace and prosperity to the people of Mongolia and peace in the whole world.

MONGOLIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MONGOLIA

Joint Communique

The following Joint Communique was issued by the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, His Excellency Mr. Yumjagiin Tsedenbal, on the conclusion of the

243

latter's visit to India :

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. Yumjagiin Tsedenbal, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, paid a friendly visit to India from the 10th to the 16th September, 1959. During his visit to India he called on the President and the Vice-President of India and had discussions with the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

During his stay in Delhi and visits to Agra, Bangalore and Bombay the Mongolian Prime Minister saw some of the ancient cultural monuments and a number of industrial and agricultural enterprises and scientific institutions.

The discussions between the two Prime Ministers were friendly and cordial. This exchange of views covered economic development of the respective countries and important current international problems. Both the Prime Ministers agreed that international problems should be resolved by Peaceful methods and in a spirit of mutual understanding. They re-affirmed their strong belief in the principles of peaceful co-existence. They stated that agreement should be reached without further delay on the suspension of tests to be followed by prohibition of production, use and tests of nuclear weapons. This should be a part of general disarmament and the ending of cold war.

The two Prime Ministers welcomed the forthcoming exchange of visits between the Soviet Prime Minister and the President of the United States of America and sincerely hoped that these visits would bring about a general relaxation of international tensions.

The two Prime Ministers referred in the course of their discussions to the age-old contacts between their two countries and were happy to note that in recent years this contact has been renewed and strengthened on a new basis.

The Prime Minister of Mongolia extended an invitation to the Prime Minister of India to visit Mongolia at a time convenient for him. The Prime Minister of India expressed his gratitude for the invitation and hoped that it may be possible for him to pay a visit to Mongolia.

Volume No

1995

TIBET

Prime Minister's Statement on the Question of taking Tibet Issue toU.N.

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on September 4, 1959 in reply to a non-official resolution urging that India should take the Tibetan issue to the United Nations :

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the resolution moved by the Hon. Member appears to be a fairly simple one, simply-worded. But as the course of this debate has shown, behind that resolution lie high international issues and big problems with big

244

consequences. Now, I suppose everyone in this House has a feeling of the deepest sympathy at the sufferings of the Tibetan people. There is no doubt about that. As everyone knows, we have given refuge and asylum not only to the Dalai Lama but to nearly 13,000 others. In fact we have given refuge to everyone who came. I cannot remember the case of a single person whom we denied refuge in this case, in regard to Tibet. That itself was evidence of our feelings in this matter.

But feelings apart, our sympathy for the Tibetans apart, what exactly should we do about it? What exactly should we do even, let us say, to give expression to those feelings of sympathy? Some Hon. Members have delivered rather brave speeches as to the evil deeds perpetrated by other countries. IL is easy enough to talk about them and it is easy enough to find many faults in the ways the countries behave. But, if a country like India has to function, we have to function in a mature way, in a considered way, in a way which at least promises some kind of results. It is absolutely-I should say respectfully-pointless for us to make brave gestures and it is worse than pointless, if these brave gestures react and rebound on us and injure us or injure the cause which we seek to promote.

So far as this question of Tibet is concerned, we may look at it from many points of view : historical, cultural and other contacts with India, China, etc. It is a long and chequered history and one need not go into it. When a country had had a long and chequered history, it gives enough material, it supplies enough material for any party to support any claim. The Chinese claim that Tibet was subject to their sovereignty or suzerainty, I do not know what word they use, for hundreds of years. The Tibetans claim that they were independent for many periods except when they were forced into some kind of subservience. Now, really this may be interesting to the historical students, but it does not help us. It is a fact, of course, that after a period of 40 years or so, for all practical purposes, ever since the Manchu Dynasty fell or a little after that, Tibet was practically independent; even so not 100 per cent, even so China never gave up her claim. But in effect it was independent.

As I said, it does not help us very much. Of course, if this question arose in the International Court of Justice at the Hague-of course, it will not; such questions do not arise there because national States do not take them there and China, anyhow, has nothing to do with the International Court of Justice at the Hague-they might consider all these questions.

The two or three main considerations are that internationally considered Tibet has not been considered as an independent country. It has been considered an autonomous country but under the suzerainty or sovereignty of China. That was the case before India became independent with the United Kingdom, with Russia-not only the Soviet Union but the Czarist Russia previous to thatand these were the main countries concerned. The rest of the world did not pay the slightest attention to Tibet except that it was some kind of a land of mystery.

That being so, when India became independent and we inherited more or less the position as it was in British days, both the advantages and the disadvantages of it, well, for a moment we carried on. We did not like many things there-I mean to say the extra-territorial privileges that we have there which certainly were relics of British Imperialism in Tibet. We did not like that particularly but we were too busy for the first year or two to interfere with anything.

Then came this Chinese incursion or invasion into Tibet. At no time had we denied Chinese overleadership of Tibet, you might call it what you like. That has been the position all along. Even in recent years we have not denied it. Even after independence, even before the People's Government of China came there we had not denied it. In fact, we had somewhat functioned as if we accepted it.

Now, when this came we had to face a difficult situation in law, and constitutionally speaking we could not say anything because of the position we had accepted and the world had accepted. Nevertheless, we were rather pained and upset at the way things were happening, armies marching and what appeared to be a forcible conquest and occupation of Tibet. We sent some notes in those days, some one or two notes politely worded, expressing the hope that this question would be peacefully solved. I am afraid, the replies we got from the Chinese Government were not equally politely worded at that time. I am speaking from memory...

Then, a country, El Salvador, a member of the United Nations, sponsored some kind of a motion on Tibet in the United Nations. It was a motion for the inclusion of the item on the agenda of the General Assembly and with it was a draft resolution condemning, what they called, the unprovoked aggression in Tibet and suggesting the appointment of a committee to study the

245

appropriate measures to be taken.

Now, there was some discussion on this question of the inclusion of the item on the agenda. The representative of India, and I believe the representative in this particular case was the Jamsaheb of Nawanagar, pleaded that this matter might be settled peacefully and it would be better not to take it up in this way. He added, I believe, that we had received some assurances from the Chinese Government that they wanted to settle it peacefully by negotiation, and therefore the inclusion of this item on the agenda be adjourned. This suggestion was supported by the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Australia Soviet Union, and for its own reasons no doubt, even by what might be called Kuemintang China in Formosa. The item was postponed. The postponement was agreed to.

On what basis did the Jamsaheb say that we had received assurances from the Chinese Government ? I am sorry I have not got the exact papers with me, but so far as I can remember, we had received a message from the Chinese Government in answer to our representations and to our requests to the effect that they wanted to settle it by negotiation and in a peaceful way. In fact; I think they had stopped the march of their army somewhere near the eastern borders of Tibet.

Also, some representatives of the Tibetan Government sent by the Dalai Lama were to proceed to Peking to discuss this matter. In those days, until quite recently, the easiest and simplest way for a person going from Lhasa to Peking was via India. It was much more difficult to go via the Gobi desert and all that. In fact, even after the People's Government of China came into power, on several occasions many Chinese travelled via India to Tibet. It was simpler : from Calcutta right up to Gangtok in Sikkim and through the Nathu La onwards. The Tibetan representatives, on their way to Peking, came to Delhi. It was more or less natural. Also I suppose, they wanted to consult us. This happened ten years ago, and I have no very clear recollection of the sequence of events. I know they remained in Delhi for rather a long time; why exactly it was not clear to me. Anyhow they did. It was this sequence of events that led us to make that suggestion in the United Nations, and the matter was not discussed.

Afterwards. as a matter of fact, there was no proper negotiation with the team that the Tibetans sent. Long before they reached Peking. the other developments took place in Tibet. I think the Chinese army started marching again and the Dalai Lama and his representatives came to an agreement with them. Maybe, of course, the agreement might have been under compulsion of events, under pressure, but it was an agreement signed on behalf of the Dalai Lama, etc.

May I say this in this connection? The Hon. Member Shri Vajpayee stated that the Dalai Lama Came to the 17-point agreement with China because of certain assurances that I gave him and further that this was after the Chinese Prime Minister's visit to India. He has got these things rather mixed up. There was no question of my giving any assurances, and the Chinese Prime Minister had not come to India and I had not gone to China. I had not met the Chinese Prime Minister at the time of this so-called 17-point agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama's Government, whatever it was. So, the question of Any assurances from us does not come in at all. The only thing that we accepted was-based on the message received from the Chinese Government-what the Jamsaheb said in the United Nations Security Council, namely, that the Chinese said they wanted a peaceful settlement of this question and on the basis of that, it was not considered.

After that, there was this 17-point agreement in which some stress was laid on the autonomy of Tibet. Again it would be wrong to say that this stress on autonomy was included there because of our pressure and our desire. Certainly, it was our desire undoubtedly but when the agreement was concluded, we were not there ; we were not asked to express our opinion. It was between the Chinese Government and the Tibetans. So, it is not correct to say that they had given us an assurance, which they broke later.

What happened was that, several years afterwards, when Premier Chou-En-lai came here, we had talks about Tibet and the Dalai Lama too was here at that time. The talks, I believe, were really initiated by Premier Chou-En-lai and he wanted to explain to me-he did explainwhat their position was in regard to Tibet not because he was answering some charge mad by me or because he thought that it was incumbent on him to do so but because he felt-I take itthat we had friendly relations and he had to try to convince me of China's position in this case.

He began by telling me that Tibet had always been a part of the Chinese State, 'always' meaning for hundreds and hundreds of years. Occasionally when China was weak, that sovereignty was not exercised properly, but he said Tibet had always been a part of Chinese State.

246

That was his case. He further added, but Tibet is not China proper. It is part of the Chinese State. It is not the Han people there. Chinese are the Han people, but these are the Mongols, Manchus, Tibetans, etc. Tibet, he said, is not a province of China. It is an autonomous region of the Chinese State and we want to respect that autonomy. That is what he told me. In fact, he went on to say that some people imagined that we want to thrust communism on Tibet. That is absurd, because the Tibetans, socially speaking, are so backward that communism is very far from the Tibetan state affairs now. But he said, certainly it is a very backward State and we want to make them progress socially, economically, etc.

Even, then, i.e. three years ago, some trouble had started internally in Tibet or rather on the eastern border of Tibet, particularly in an area which was not in Tibet proper, but it was Tibetan really in population-the Kham area which was on the eastern border of Tibet, but inhabited by Tibetans. This portion had been incorporated in China a little ago ; I forget when, but not now anyway, but previous to all this. The Tibetans there, the Khampas, did not take kindly to certain Chinese measures because although the Chinese Government left Tibet proper more or less untouched in the sense of any so-called land reforms or any other reforms, politically they held Tibet firmly. But they did not interferethat is what Premier Chou-En-lai told me; "We did not wish to interfere ; let them gradually develop themselves." But in this eastern part which was considered a part of China-they treated it as a part of China-this ultimately led to the Khamba rebellion there, a kind of guerilla rebellion, which had already lasted for their time, a year or more when Premier Chou En-lai came here three years ago.. We did not discuss that. But he referred to it and said : We do not wish to interfere with the Tibetans, with their internal structure, internal autonomy, social custom, religion or anything ; but we would not, of course, tolerate rebellion and foreign interference, etc. Well, I do not know what he meant of thought when he said foreign interference or imperialist interference, but I find that they had some kind

of a link in their minds, not so much, I think, of India having anything to do with it, but of foreign countries, United Kingdom or America somehow making incursions into Tibet, because they had got those countries in their mind. They have not guite realised that the United Kingdom has absolutely no interest in Tibet since they left India. They just cannot reach it. They have no means, no representative there ; they have nobody there even to give them any news. And, to my knowledge, neither has the United States, in fact. The only representative in Tibet of any other country is that of India, the Consul-General. Probably the Soviet Union also ; possibly also Mongolians. But what I meant to say was there were no Europeans or Americans. Anyhow this is what he told me :- the rebellion is going on. So we had this talk and you may call it what you like. But it was more an explanation to me. It was not some kind of an assurance extracted by me from Premier Chou En-lai. I say this because people might say : oh, you did this because of that guarantee given to you. It was not a guarantee in that sense. It was certainly something which, when I heard, pleased me, about the autonomy of Tibet, etc. But I have no business to call him to account saying : "You guaranteed and you are not doing it; in that sense, though I must say that I was pained when, because of other developments, the structure of the autonomy broke down completely.

Well, this internal revolt in Tibet gradually spread month after month, year after year. It spread slowly from the east westwards. And I have personally little doubt that the great majority of Tibetans, even though, they did not during this period participate in it, sympathised with it ; I have no doubt about it. And that is for obvious reasons, not on any high grounds but for the simple reason that the Tibetans, like others, have a strong nationalist sense, and they resented these when they considered outsiders coming in and upsetting their life and all the structures in which they lived. So this spread and then other things happened.

One need not go into detailed history but the trouble in Lhasa itself, partly of course, I think may have been caused by various activities of the Chinese governors. Where a ruler, an outsider, an alien ruler has to deal with the population which is not friendly, well, the relationship can well be imagined. It is not a healthy relationship. The ruler is afraid, the people are afraid, both of each other. And when fear governs the relations of two parties, it is likely to lead to bad results. In fact, wherever a country, is a subject country, that is an unhealthy relationship. Well, that led to this upheaval in Tibet and the Dalai Lama's flight from Lhasa, coming to and so on and so forth. After that I have no accurate news of what has happened.

I think we may broadly say that there has been strong military pressure on several parts of Tibet and the Tibetans enjoy far from autonomy under the military government there. It may be that the stories that we hear about happenings inside

247

Tibet are exaggerated, because most of the stories inevitably come from refugees, and refugee however good they may be, having suffered themselves, are apt to give rather a coloured picture, and the picture is not of what they have seen or what they have heard. So, it goes on increasing. So, it may be that the stories are exaggerated. But as a responsible person I cannot repeat these stories till I have some kind of a proof. But whether they are exaggerated or not there can be little doubt that a great deal has happened in Tibet which is deplorable and that the people of Tibet have suffered much and that it can certainly not be said that it is a happy family living together.

Previously when this matter came up before this House I said that our approach to these problems are governed by two or three factors. Among these I mentioned two-our sympathy for the Tibetan people and our desire to maintain friendly relations with China. Now that may appear to be something contradictory and it does in the present context slightly contradict each other. That is the difficulty of the situation. But that does not get away from our basic approach which is governed by these two factors. The third factor, of course, is and always will be the integrity of India and the freedom of India. It is our first duty to protect that.

Why do I say that ? Because I want to repeat that any step that we may take now cannot be taken in a huff, if I may say so, because we are angry and we do something regardless of the consequence of that step. We work not only in the present but for the future-for the distant future. I have always thought that it is important even essential if you like, that these two countries of Asia, India and China, should have friendly and as far as possible cooperative relations. It is a remarkable fact of history-and I do not think you will find it duplicated elsewhere at any time-that during these 2,000 years of relationship between India and China they have not had any kind of military conflict. It has been a cultural relationship. It has been to some extent relationship. It has been a religious association. Through out these long periods they were not passive countries. They were active, positive countries. They want in those days, not like the later days in India when we did become a passive, inert country, tied down by caste and do not cross the seas and not touch this man and do not see that man-that type of country we developedour people went on adventures. They went all over the South eastern seas. They established colonies. They established, not imperialist colonies, but independent colonies. In fact the effect of India all over the south eastern region was tremendous. You see it today. So also was the effect of China there. So these two great big powerful countries were constantly meeting and yet there was no conflict. It is a remarkable fact of history. Certainly nowhere in Europe will you find such a thing or for the matter of that in Asia.

Now it seemed to me that in the future it would be a tragedy not only for India, and possibly for China, but for Asia and the world if we develop some kind of permanent hostility. Natural friendship does not exist if you are weak and if you are looked down upon as a weak country. Friendship cannot exist between the weak and the strong, between a country that is trying to bully and the other who accepts to be bullied. Whether it is an individual or a group or a country that does not happen. It is only when people are more or less equal, when people respect each other that they are friends. So also nations. But subject to that we did work for the friendship of India and China. May I say that in spite of all that has happened and is happening today that is still our objective and we shall continue to work for it. That does not mean that we should surrender in anything that we consider right or that we should hand over bits of territory of India to China to please them. That

is not the way to be friends with anybody or to maintain our dignity or self-respect. But in the long run, it is of importance for these two great countries, whatever internal structures and policies might be, to be friends.

I know that, sometimes, it is difficult to feel friendly when one hears things that irritate, that anger, when we see that our people have not been treated even courteously, when we receive communications from the Chinese Government, which are singularly lacking in even ordinary politeness. All that is irritating. But, then, it is easy enough for any one to get angry and irritated. It is necessary for people who hold responsible positions not to allow themselves to be irritated, certainly to maintain the dignity of the country and the continuity of our policy too.

Many people charge us, 'What about your famous Panch Sheel where are these five principles: Dead and gone and buried or cremated ? Well, it is whatever you like. That indicates a completely wrong approach to this question. What is Panch Sheel ? Panch Sheel or the five principles, they did not become principles because they were embodied in a treaty between India and China they stand by themselves, principles of international real relationship which we held to be correct, and we shall hold to them even if all the

248

world says no to them. Of course, it is obvious that if the other party does not agree to them, that relationship does not subsist. The principles remain true all the same. When people are wise enough, they come back to them. Therefore, there is no question of Panch Sheel failing. It may be, if you like, the question of India failing or China failing. But, the principles remain. This is the outlook.

If you will permit me to go slightly outside the purview of this Resolution, we have to face certain difficult situations on our borders and elsewhere: about the treatment accorded to our people in Tibet by the Chinese authorities. I may inform the House that the first thing that I do every morning is to open a bunch of telegrams, a pretty big bunch. I should imagine that in every bunch there are at least five or six dealing with this affair either from Peking or Lhasa or Gyantse or Yatung, just the latest happenings, the latest developments. Of course, the telegrams we get from Gyantse, Yatung and Lhasa cannot tell us about the happenings in Tibet, because they have no communication with the rest of Tibet. They can only see more or less round about the Consulate or the Trade agency and tell us what are the happenings to-day. There are petty problems arising. Almost every morning, usually, at least, I start the day in a not too pleasant mood because of these messages. I try to overcome that. I am getting accustomed to some extent to do that.

We have got to deal with these difficult problems, these border incidents. If any one asks me, as they sometimes do, what do the border incident indicate, frankly, I do not know what might be in the minds of the other party ; whether it is just local aggressiveness or just to show us our place, if I may use a colloquial phrase, so that we may not get uppish or whether it is something peeper. I do not know.

I might inform the House that only last evening, we received a fairly long reply from the Chinese Governments. That is a reply to the protest I had sent a few days ago about these incidents on the North East Frontier border. It is a fairly long reply. It will, naturally, require very careful consideration. But, broadly speaking the reply is a repudiation of our charge that they had come on our territory, that they had started firing on our patrol there and charging us with having come on their territory and having opened fire on them : that is, complete conflict in the facts reversal of the facts here. We shall examine that reply carefully because it is a long and more or less argued note, with lots of places mentioned and other things. And we shall send them a reply fairly soon, that is, in the next two or three days.

May I also repeat what I said here that before this House rises this session, I hope to place a White Paper before the House containing correspondence between the Chinese Government and our Government ever since the treaty between India and China in regard to Tibet, that is, during the last five years, so that the House may have the background of what has been happening ?

Now, all this is there. We have, on the one hand naturally to protect our borders. And when I say that I want to hold myself, and somewhat restrain my powerful reactions so as not to go too far, in, let us say, military measures and the like; because, when nations get excited and all their prestige is involved, then, step by step, they are driven often in wrong directions. So, we try, at any rate, to balance, balance in the sense of a firm policy where we think we are in the right.' Nevertheless, with always a door open to accommodation, a door open to a settlement, wherever this is possible.

Broadly speaking in regard to this border, that is, the border incidents, as I have just mentioned, they say that we have committed aggression. Now, it is a question of fact, whether this village or that village or this little strip of territory is on their side or on our side. Normally, wherever these are relatively petty disputes, well, it does seem to me rather absurd for two great countries or two small countries immediately to rush at each other's throat and to decide whether two miles of territory are on this side or on that side, and especially, two miles of territory in the high mountains, where nobody lives. But where national prestige and dignity is involved, it is not the two miles of territory, it is the nation's dignity and self-respect that become involved in it. And, therefore, this happens. But I do not wish, in so far as I can, to press the issue so far that there is no escape for either country, because their national dignities are involved, except a recourse to arms. That is not, I hope

An Hon. Member : What is the boundary, according to the latest report ? What is the boundary which they have indicated according to the latest reply that we have received from them ?

The Prime Minister : How can I say that without a large map and all kinds of little things about villages and all that ? The present dispute about that matter is relatively a small matter; whether it may be two miles this side or that side is not a very big thing; but I do not know what

249

their map is, here, there and elsewhere. So far as I am concerned, I have often stated how our frontier from the Burma border right up to the Bhutan border is the MacMahon Line; we held by that and we think it is highly objectionable, highly improper for the Chinese Government to go on issuing maps colouring half of the North Eastern Frontier Agency, one third of Assam and one-third of Bhutan as if they belong to China. That is really an affront. I can understand something happening for a little while, and some mistake; but a continuing thing, to be told year after year for ten years that 'Oh, well, we shall look into it, when we have leisure' is not a good enough answer. That is so.

But having accepted broadly the MacMahon Line., I am prepared to discuss any interpretation of the MacMahon Line: minor interpretation here and there;-that is a different matter--not these big chunks but the minor interpretation whether this hill is there or this little bit is on that side or on this side, on the facts, on the maps on the evidence available. That I am prepared to discuss with the Chinese Government. I am prepared to have any kind of conciliatory, mediatory process to consider this. I am prepared to have arbitration of any authority agreed to by the two parties about these minor rectifications, where they are challenged by them or by us, whichever the case may be. That is a different matter. I say this because I do not take up that kind of narrow attitude that whatever I say is right and whatever the other person says is wrong. But the broad MacMahon Line has to be accepted and so far as we are concerned, it is there and we accept it.

The position about Ladakh is somewhat different. The MacMahon Line does not go there. That is governed by ancient treaties over 100 years old between the then ruler of Kashmir, Maharaja Gulab Singh, who was a feudatory of the Sikh ruler of the Punjab at the time. This was in the thirties of the 19th century. On the one side, there was the treaty of 1842 and on the other side, the ruler of Lhasa and the representative of the Emperor of China, which resulted in Ladakh being recognised as a part of Kashmir State.

Now, nobody has challenged that. Nobody challenges it now. But the actual boundary of Ladakh with Tibet was not very carefully defined. It was defined to some extent by British officers who went there. But I rather doubt if they did any careful survey. They marked the line. It has been marked all along in our maps. They did it. As people do not live there, by and large, it does not make any difference. It did not make any difference. At that time, nobody cared about it.

Now, the question arose. We are prepared to sit down and discuss these minor things. But discuss it on what terms ? First, treaties, existing maps etc. Secondly, usage, what has been the usage all those years. Thirdly, geography. By geography, I mean physical features like watersheds, ridge of a mountain, not a bit of plain divided up. These are convenient features for international boundaries.

I have gone out of my way to refer to these various matters in connection with this Resolution which deals with a simpler issue. Coming back to this particular Resolution, quite apart from the sympathy which the Hon. Mover and some other Hon. Members feel for Tibetans, if we take an action, it should be justifiable in law and in Constitution and we should hope for some results, some results which will help us to achieve the objective aimed at.

Looking at it from the point of view of justification, the United Nations may come into the picture for two reasons. One is, violation of human rights and the other, aggression. Now, violation of human rights applies to those who have accepted the Charter of the United Nations in other words, those members of the United Nations who have accepted the Charter. Strictly speaking, you cannot apply the Charter to people who have not accepted the Charter, who have not been allowed to come into the United Nations. That applies.

Secondly, if you talk about aggression, aggression by one sovereign independent State on another. As I told you, in so far as world affairs are concerned, Tibet has not been acknowledged as an independent State for a considerable time, even long before this happened-much less after. Therefore, it is difficult to justify aggression.

Now, you may say that these may be rather legal pleas. But I am merely pointing out a constitutional aspect of and the difficulties and the procedures involved.

Then, I come to a certain practical aspect. And that is what good will it achieve ? Suppose we get over the legal quibbles and legal difficulties. It may lead to a debate in the General Assembly or the Secuirity Council wherever it is taken up, a debate which will be an acrimonious debate, an angry debate, a debate which will be after the fashion of cold war. Having had the debate what then will be promotors of that debate and that

250

motion do? Nothing more. They will return home. After having brought matters to a higher temperature, fever heat, they will go home. They have done their duty because they can do nothing else.

Obviously, nobody is going to send an army to Tibet or China for that was not done in the case of Hungary which is a part of Europe and which is more allied to European nations. It is fantastic to think they will move in that way in Tibet. Obviously not. So, all that will happen is an expression of strong opinion by some, other countries denying it and the matter being raised to the level of cold war-brought into, the domain of cold war-and probably producing reactions on the Chinese Government which are more adverse to Tibet and the Tibetan people than even now. So, the ultimate result is no relief to the Tibetan people but something the reverse of it.

The question, both from the constitutional and the legal point of view, is not clear. In fact, persons who have examined it think that it is difficult to bring it there. And, from the practical point of view also there is no good result. Then, what exactly is the purpose of taking that subject except may be to satisfy some kind of urge to show sympathy or to show that we are angry. I can understand that urge certainly. But we must not allow the urge to take the reins into its hands and take us away with it to unknown regions and dangerous regions. Therefore, I am unable to accept this resolution and I would suggest to the House also not to accept it.

INDIA USA CHINA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EL SALVADOR AUSTRALIA MONGOLIA BURMA BHUTAN HUNGARY

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Oil Agreement Signed

An agreement for the estiblishment of an oil refinery at Barauni between the Governments of India and the U.S.S.R. was concluded on New Delhi on September 28, 1959.

Shri N.S. Mani, I. C. S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Steel, Mines & Fuel, signed on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. V.A. Sergeev, Counsellor for Economic Affairs, for the Soviet Government.

The Minister for Mines & Oil, Shri K.D. Malaviya and the Soviet Ambassador to India, Mr. Ivan Alexandrovich Benediktov, were present.

The refinery at Barauni will be the second to be established in the public sector and will be based on crude oil from the Nahorkatia region in Assam. The first refinery in the public sector is being set up at Nunmati in Assam, with financial and technical assistance obtained from the Government of Rumania.

The Barauni Refinery will be designed to process about 2 million tons of crude oil per annum. For the purpose of establishing this refinery, the Soviet Government have extended a credit of 100 million roubles or roughly Rs. 12 crores, with a long dated repayment schedule.

NOTE

On the 7th September, 1959, Prime Minister Nehru presented to Parliament

a White Paper containing the notes, memoranda and letters exchanged and the

agreements signed between the Government of India and the Government of the

People's Republic of China between April 1954 and August 1959.

251

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

President Rajendra Prasad's Message on U.N. Day

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad broadcast a message over the All India Radio on October 23, 1959 on the occasion of the United Nations Day.

The following is the text of his message;

"As we celebrate the U.N. Day this year, I feel that the idea of peaceful living or, at any rate, the need to avoid war, is taking roots. It is true that effective concrete steps are yet to be taken, but I suggest that there are indications which go to support this feeling. Whether it is in the field of scientific advances or of economic development, the world seems to have made some progress which sustains the hope for a better future.

In its representative character U.N. is today. more powerful and effective than any international organisation known in human history. There are doubtless differences of opinion, but on many basic issues, member nations are now tending to come closer. All men and women of goodwill must welcome the recent trends in general for the reduction of international tension and for the creation of better understanding. While it is true that U.N. is not designed to be a world parliament, the day may not be far off when such a concept could be realistically pursued.

Never before have representatives of so many nations gathered together to discuss common problems having a close bearing on the future of countries and the well-being of man. The idea of a common effort for solving problems affecting more than one nation has begun to be widely accepted. - The Security Council I and other main bodies of U.N. as also the Specialised Agencies are now more fully aware of the problems confronting them. It should be admitted that as every year passes, the U.N. and the allied organs approach these problems in a more constructive fashion.

India has always had full faith in the principles laid down in the Charter of the U.N. We shall continue in our own small way to do all that is possible to strengthen this world organisation and to make its working more successful.

On this day, when this great organisation was founded 14 years ago, I should like to send my greetings to all member nations of U.N. and their peoples.

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech in General Assembly

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a Speech in the General Debate of the United Nations General Assembly on October 6, 1959.

The following is the text of his Speech :

Mr. President my delegation had the opportunity earlier during the course of this session to offer its felicitations to you on your unanimous election to the high office you hold. Today, we have the pleasure of being able to congratulate you and wish ourselves well upon your return after your brief indisposition. The Assembly would not be as fruitful without your guidance and without your presence with us here. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity of expressing the feelings of our Government and country at the tragic death of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. Bandaranaike. Many representatives have spoken here of his qualities of statesmanship and personal qualities of wisdom and courage, and it is not necessary at this late hour for me to detain you. Ceylon is our closest neighbour. Its Prime Minister was a personal friend of many of our people and we have also been encouraged by the example of his great courage in times of difficulty in his own country and by the leadership that he has given in regard to policies fashioned by himself and neighbouring nations.

My delegation participates in this debate at a rather late stage. Some seventy-nine speakers, not including those who exercised the right of reply, have spoken nearly sixty hours on the various problems that concern the world. This is not a large number of speakers, nor is it a considerable amount of time, and my delegation feels that the opportunity of the general debate-where we not only hear the discussion of world problems as such, but also get some glimpse of each other's countries-is one of the main contributions at the open session of the Assembly which makes for international understanding.

This session of the General Assembly opened,

253

in the early stages, with an address of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. It was one of the greatest events of our time, especially in view of the pronouncements he made and the policy decisions he communicated to this Assembly, to which my delegation will address itself at a later stage.

There has been a degree of criticism and, on the part of the Secretary-General, what sounds somewhat like an apology for the development of events outside the United Nations. So far as the Government of India is concerned, we do not look upon this as though we have to suffer through things as they are or make the best of a bad position. We think that the developments that have taken place in what is called outside the United Nations, in so far as they are developments which contribute towards the progress of humanity, towards world peace and co-operation, are inside the United Nations, in so far as the United Nations is not bound by the limits of this Organisation but by the principles and purposes of the Charter. The Secretary-General has already pointed out the constitutional and other reasons which justify this kind of negotiation.

We think that it is very important, wherever possible, that those who are in a position to negotiate, who are in a position to deliver the goods, those between whom there are greater suspicions than others, should take advantage of every opportunity, and we in the United Nations should wish them well. We are equally anxious that our anxiety or our concern in this matter should find a response in those others who are concerned, that we should be informed, that we should educate ourselves, and that we should make our contribution as to the places where we stand.

The large number of speeches that have preceeded me have as their main themes the central problem of our world, namely the tension that exists. But it has also been characterized by a degree of at least a desire to hope. I think it would be far optimistic to say "by a tone of hopefulness", because that is not characteristic of the Assembly. The Assembly consists of large numbers of hard-boiled representatives of Governments and it is not as though they take a romantic view of things. But right through these speeches. except where intimate problems concerning their own countries and their relations and other factors come in, there has been in these speeches a desire, an anxiety, a passion, that we may feet hopeful in regard to what may happen in the future.

Also, there is very much concern about the development of arms and the fact that after ten to fourteen years of discussing disarmament, the world today stands more armed than it has ever been. What is more, the various proposals that have come in from time to time, though they have engaged the attention of people and have certainly led to the development of the consideration of various aspects and difficulties, have not led to any positive solutions.

Therefore, looking at the world as it is, we find today, at a time when this Assembly meets, that we are, on the one hand, confronted with hope, and, on the other hand with anxiety. And it brought to my mind the kind of romantic fantasy of a famous historical novelist-not of our time but of a previous century-who, in writing in one of his historical novels and fancying for himself the periods when the British Crown received a communication from some British subjects across the seas, namely from the American colonies, wrote in this way :

"It was the best of times; it was the worst of times. It was the age of wisdom; it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief-, it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light; it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us; we had nothing before us."

And he goes on in that way.

The world is very much in that state and it largely reflects the state of development of our times, that we are confronted with problems about which we have little experience. And therefore a pragmatic approach, dealing with problems as they arise and not being committed too far beforehand as to what side on should take, is necessary in the interests of the relaxation of world tensions.

My country has been committed to this position for a long time. In that connection, we welcomed the statement of the representative of Iceland the other day, not about fishing rights in the North Pole-in that we do not want to participate-but in regard to the formation of blocs, not the blocs of the cold war, but the blocs inside the Assembly. We ourselves belong to various groups, and I think that groups, in so far as they seek to offer to the Assembly the collective wisdom, are a constructive force. But if, on the other hand, blocs surround themselves with walls of isolation, then we shall divide the unity of this Assembly. A degree of neighbourliness, a degree of the coming together of people who have

254

common problems and common backgrounds, is to be expected.

But my delegation shares, with the representative of Iceland, the concern that our attempts to cooperate with each other should not result in our isolating ourselves from the whole of the United Nations.

This period has also been one of considerable scientific advancement, including the proximity of human discovery towards finding the origins of life itself.

We have also had placed before us at this session for the first time, although it had been mentioned so many times in speeches by less notable delegations, the proposition that disarmament alone is not what we have to have in this world, but really a warless world. When the time comes, then, in the course of our observations at this Assembly, my delegation would like to draw a distinction between the two proposals that are before the Assembly, one concerned with disarmament and the other concerned with a world without war.

We have before us the report of the Secretary-General, which is of unusual character. It deals with questions of political philosophy and theory ; it deals with problems that have to do with the development of this Organization in the future. And I say, in all humility, that I do not think that our Organization has given proper attention either to these problems or to the report itself. The Secretary-General's report is received as a matter of course, and we are inclined to think that our responsibilities are over when we pay him his meed of thanks.

We are grateful not only to the Secretary-General for this report. In his person, he embodies the whole of the Secretariat. At the end of this general debate, we should like to offer the thanks of our delegation and, if I may say so, the thanks of all of us, to all those persons who make up the Secretariat, who make the functioning of the Assembly possible, and who prepare the large amount of material and the considerable number of documents which we receive, and some of which we do not receive. For all these things, we are grateful to the Secretariat-to the administrative staff, to the interpreters, and to everybody concerned. Most of them are people whose names do not appear in the newspapers and do not even appear in official records. If not for their diligence and their devotion to duty and the hard work they have to put in, often after office

hours, it would not be possible for us to function here. May I therefore take the liberty of asking the Secretary-General to convey to the Secretariat in an appropriate way, the appreciation of my delegation.

It is not possible for me to study this report publicly, because some of it is obviously debatable, and I do not want at this stage of the Assembly to enter into a controversial field. However, one may be permitted to refer to the various points.

The Secretary-General has referred to the universality of the United Nations. I am sure that, as things stand all delegations but one in this Assembly hall would vote for universality as far as membership is concerned. But the observations of the Secretary-General go a little further, when this universal conception has a bearing upon functioning in such a way as though the concern of every Member of the Assembly has to be demarcated in one form or another. I do not say that this is altogether a proposition that should not be considered but it has its pitfalls. It is one of those things that I do hope will engage the attention of the Assembly in the future-that is the development of the Organization, to what extent the United Nations has become synonymous with the entirety of its Members and the Governments represented -and, even where the results are good, to what extent, for the time being or for all time, they have to keep out of it.

There are certain constitutional procedures where, again, there are certain aspects which one would welcome and other aspects which one would want to study. We will all admit that as the work of the United Nations grows, becomes intensive, becomes more a day-to-day affair, the functioning of the representatives of Governments at Headquarters who are accredited to the United Nations would become more important. But my Government has always taken the view that, whether it be in groups, the Asian-African group or the European group or whatever it is, policies are to be made by chancelleries, and therefore no group of representatives, either at a particular time at an Assembly or otherwise, could, in the present circumstances of the world, in the absence of a world constitution and world law, become de facto a world government. Therefore, while

we are fully aware of the importance of day-today consultation, this Organization will carry weight with public opinion in various countries, will have the conscious and enthusiastic support of Governments, only to the extent that, in activities from day-to-day, the Secretary-General's personality itself is more and more in touch with

255

Governments and chancelleries. Mr. Hammarskjold is fully conscious of this matter, and, during the considerable time that he has between sessions of the Assembly, he takes care to visit capitals. Unfortunately, he has to do acerta in amount of sightseeing, but. included in these sights are the statesmen of those countries.

The same applies with regard to voting procedures. When we touch on this matter, we touch a very tender spot. While it is quite true that equality of status, as a great British Prime Minister once said, does not mean equality of function, it is also true that, the less the capacity to function, the more a person is conscious of his status. Therefore, when we touch on this problem, we shall be touching on something which requires a great deal of consideration.

Each State here has one vote. All are equal. The very large country of Iceland, with a population of 200,000, is as important as the country of India, with a population 380,000,000. But it is equally true that a mere massing of votes-whether it is 45 to 11 with 25 abstentions or as in the old days, 55 to 5--does not have the same impact upon world opinion as, shall we say, a vote that reflects the real views and conditions in the world. To a very large extent, a vote in this Assembly has value in direct ratio to its impact upon world opinion and the response it arouses on the part of the world.

The Secretary-General has also made reference to the International Court and its uses. In that connexion, reference was made in the course of the debate to the fact that certain countries-particularly referring to us-had taken the view that we could make decisions on matters where others are concerned, and that it would be far better if we accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court. Merely as a point of inforniation, I should like to inform the Assembly that the Government of India has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, and the documents in this connexion have been circulated by the Secretariat. Of course, the acceptance contains reservations, but those reservations are. not unusual. They are reservations which appertain to all Commonwealth countries, and reservations which are common in diplomatic practice. But, apart from that, we have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court.

It is usual at this time to look at the agenda of the United Nations. It is one of the easiest things to do because we have looked at it for ten years. It is always the same agenda because it is the same world. But there are certain changes and developments, and then our approach to these items will vary. I do not think we should be cynical and say that we discuss the same things year after year. I suppose we discuss the same thing in one sense, but we make a different ap. proach to these problems. Certain new items have come into the agenda, and the Secretary-General's report, I think, constitutes one of the not unnecessary items on the agenda but a document which provides much food for thought. I hope the Secretary-General at some time will give consideration to placing the individual matters for consideration before the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

It is usual on occasions of this kind to refer to ones own country. My delegation has given considerable thought to this and there is good justification for it. It is done for two reasons. One is that in our part of the world great changes are taking place. We are at present in that part of the world which in recent times has come into independence. We also represent a social and economic system where revolutions, political, social and economic, are sought to be established, by and large, by consent. But over and above that we would like to discuss briefly the developments in our own land during the last twelve months or so, because it is one way of communication. We lay great stress upon sending delegations, upon receiving delegations, upon communication of information. Therefore I think that if delegates who are assembled here do not use this opportunity within the brevity of time that conditions us to inform each other of our position we shall not be doing our duty to our own country or to the Assembly as a whole.

It may be that in some cases our national aspirations, our national considerations, our national prejudices and traditions, may import into this an essential balance. In India the main theme about which one may speak is its economic and social development under its other conditions of a planned economy. Various five-year plans have been in progress and we find that this progress has maintained its schedules, and while progress is slow-at least slow according to our standards and our hopes-it has still progressed.

From an expenditure of somewhere about \$ 17,300 million in previous years, last year's expenditures on the progress of planned economy has risen to somewhere about \$ 22,600 million. Also the standards of life of our people have gone up but very slightly, because while the national income, to which I refer now, has gone up, the per capita income in India has not gone up in the

256

same way because of the increase in population. It does not mean that our increase in population is proportionately higher than anywhere else, but the aggregates are much larger. So from a per capita of \$ 49.4 per head in the last ten years, it has gone up to only \$ 57.8 per head of population.

Since independence in our country there has been an increase in population to the extent of 67 millions. That is larger than the population of many countries represented here. This comes about from the fact that, while the birth-rate has gone down one point per thousand of population, the death-rate has gone down eleven points. Fewer people are born, but much fewer people die.-Infantile mortality has also gone down from 146 to 108 in last ten years. That results in the fact that the mouths to feed which press upon the mean subsistence is greater than can be catered to by the increase in wealth itself.

Food production in India has increased in the same way. As far as my recollection goes, in pre-partitioned India-that is, when India and Pakistan were in one country-the total production of foodgrain in India was 47 million tons. In a smaller India, which is about three-fifths of the previous area, last year we produced 73.5 million tons of foodgrain and we are still hungry. The rise in the first five years has been 15 per cent and the following three years about 11 per cent. The production of food in the country, which may sound a rather flat proposition to put forward, is really the basis of all prosperity and peace and, indeed, is the substratum of our international peace and co-operation.

Side by side with the advance in food production has been advances in social development. I would not take the time of the Assembly by going into every item. There are a great number of them which may interest me as a national, but I think the development of co-operation in India is one of the outstanding features in a country where a unique feature is that we have a distinctive Position compared with western Europe. In western Europe democracy and a political revolution whether violent or otherwise, conferring political power upon the masses, came after the Industrial Revolution. We have the reverse process.

In India, we have full-fledged political revolution. We place this political power in the hands of every man and woman of adult age, whether literate or illiterate, whether rich or poor, whether tall or short, and the industrial and economic progress which is to come thereafter, with all the social consequences that follow.

Ten years ago there were in India somewhere about 5.7 million co-operative societies. Today, there are 13.8 million of them. There are 115,000 of our villages which a few years ago were covered by co-operatives; today 179,000 of them are covered. But still there remain nearly 450,000 villages to be covered by co-operatives. There are somewhere about 340,000 co-operative societies in the country and 56 per cent of the people are covered. There is another project where there is so much interest in the United Nations. Indeed, it figures in the report of the Secretary-General with regard to community project developments. India today aspires to cover herself with this form of village democracy and planning, economic and social, right from the bottom. Sixty per cent of our villages are covered by these projects, and 56.6 per cent of our population, somewhere about 165 million.

Then we come to a larger development which has international bearings. In a country like ours which has come into the field of modem development only recently and with a standard of life indicated by the figures I have given with regard to per capita income, modern development, which requires capital goods from highly-advanced countries, and what is more different separators, which also have been conditioned by the economy of other countries, is to a large extent conditioned by our capacity to buy in foreign lands. That is external assistance becomes of great importance. In this sphere the United Nations itself has taken part, although only with what the Secretary-General would in private call at a laboratory stage.

The amount of external aid as far as India is concerned has come largely from the United States totalling some \$ 1,800 million in the last ten years, out of which \$ 490 million is outright aid, the remainder being loans repayable in dollars or Indian currency, with some \$ 200 million or so reserved for the use of the United States Government. Therefore, in the way of outright grants, for which we are grateful, there has been nearly \$ 500 million pumped into the Indian economy. From the Soviet Union, machinery, projects and assistance, in loans or otherwise, amounted to \$ 670 million. Then we have a series of other projects which are of a more co-operative character, largely in the Commonwealth group, as indicated by the Colombo Plan, out of which Canada has been our best friend and helper. Canada is a comparatively small country in the way of population, but it is a rich one. India has received up to 1958-59 \$ 176 million, mainly in the field of machinery and atomic apparatus.

From the small country of New Zealand, with

257

a population of two and a half million, has been poured into India, largely through UNICEF, some \$ 67 million in the last ten years. Australia, one of our neighbours, has contributed to the building of hydroelectric projects to the extent of \$ 23 million. The United Kingdom, in the same way has contributed considerably towards equipment apart from accommodating us in the way of loans. From Norway and various other countries has come assistance to India. Fortunately for us, either in the technical field or in the field of money, aid has not been a one-way traffic. India has in the same way extended either aid or loans to other countries whose names I do not want to mention here, since I have not asked! their permission, to the extent of tens of millions of dollars.

In addition to this, into our country come students-trainees, factory hands, from all parts of the world, more particularly from Asia--nominated either by the Colombo Plan or under various transfer schemes ; and in this way, not only are we being helped by the increase of our own technical capacities, but also a degree of international co-operation in the field of technical development is built up. Neither political ideology, nor distance of other countries, nor racial, religious or other differences have played a part in this.

India has also contributed to the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme up to \$ 3.5 million, and today the Government of India has announced that it will contribute \$ 2 million to the Special Fund if the other figures given out come up to the expected levels.

The index of production in India has gone up from 87 per cent in 1948 to 142.7 per cent. But no country today has any chance of survival, either by a political philosophy or even by a long history, if it does not have at its disposal considerable engineering and technical abilities, and we are glad to think that, while in 1949 we had 2,900 engineers and technicians in the country, today we have 9,300, all trained in India. There are also about 400 foreign students on scholarships in India and altogether about 3,500 students from other countries. We regret to say that the scholarships offered to various Trusteeship Territories have not been availed of fully. Of the 142 scholarships offered to Trust Territories, only twenty-seven have been utilized.

There are some 10,000 Indian students in various parts of the world, the largest number being in the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia.

The most modern of the developments in India are in the field of atomic energy. I am happy to communicate to the General Assembly, as I have done before, that it is not only part of our policy, but a policy which is fully insisted upon and implemented and which has been testified by Dr. Davidson in the World Survey Report- the same scientist whom Mr. Khrushchev referred to as "Davidson"-that while the developments Were of a very high order and we should soon be capable of becoming self-sufficient in the field of atomic technical equipment there was no indication that India would venture into the field of atomic weapons. The atomic energy establishments in India employ 970 scientists and also take into training nearly 200 trainees every year from India and elsewhere. There are two reactors in operation, one completely built in India itself and the other built by co-operation between Canada and ourselves.

India is the country in the world using the largest amount of thorium for the production of atomic fuel. It has also gone into the development of uranium metal plants and of various other things that are required for this purpose, such as rare ores and metals. In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not intend to go into detail in this connexion.

We have had, at the same time, our own share of natural calamities in addition to all other concomitants of adverse character and development that must happen in a democratic society. We have had devastation by floods. The worst floods in history occurred in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and recently in Assam, and also in Bengal and Bombay, causing losses of tens of millions of dollars and rendering large numbers of people homeless. Fortunately, the capacity of our people to adapt themselves to these circumstances has made these calamities less than they otherwise might have been.

Among other developments are the irrigation developments of India notably the Rajasthan Canal, the longest canal in the world, projected some time ago when the British were in India and which today would supply water to part of the Punjab and Rajputana and convert them into food producing areas for the future.

From these matters we must now go on to various other questions which have been raised here specifically. In this matter I should like to deal with questions with which we are intimately concerned.

The Secretary-General, on the one hand, and various delegations, on the other, have referred

258

to United Nations peace forces ; that is to say, the machinery, the instruments, for applying sanctionary powers or carrying out police duties or whatever it may be called. We, as a country have participated in this development, and continue to do so and to carry some of its burdens. I hope, Mr. President, that you will forgive us if we take the opportunity of expressing our views.

The Government of India is not at present prepared to participate in a standing force of the United Nations as such and we do not think that it is a practical proposition. We are surprised to find that some countries have proposed that certain units should be allocated and demarcated for United Nations purposes. But if they are so allocated, what do they do when the United Nations does not want them ? Therefore, it is not possible, in a defence force of any country, to. have troops allocated and demarcated in this way.

Secondly, for political reasons, we think that, with the present state of development in the world and in the absence of world law and of the universality of the United Nations, in the absence of the fact that we as an Organisation are free from group politics and capable of taking objective decisions, we do not think that it would be right to place at the disposal of such an organisation forces which may be moved without the consent of the people concerned. The time will come, in a disarmed world, when war is no longer regarded as a machinery for the settling of disputes, when some kind of political organization may be required to deal with those who break the world law; but we think that it is premature at the present time to speak in terms of a United Nations force or to expect countries to shoulder the responsiblity from the point of view of personnel or of money.

In this connexion I am sure that the Secretary-General will expect us to say that units of the Indian army today in the Gaza Strip are there as a peace force ; and we are happy to participate in this venture. But it imposes considerable burdens upon us, to a certain extent recompensed by the fact that these men, not diplomats, not university men, not men trained in the arts of peace but in the arts of defence, have been the best ambassadors whom our country has ever sent out. They have no quarrels ; they have left no social problems behind them, as occupying armies do. They have created no difficulties in the places where they have gone. And this has been our experience in Korea, as well as with the officers who went to Indo-China, the forces which Mr. Hammarskjold requested in a hurry for UNMOGIL in Lebanon, and now who, for two or more years have stood as a peace force in true Gandhian tradition on the Gaza Strip between Israel and Egypt-giving unfortunate evidence of the fact that there is an armistice line and that the two countries are not at peace.

Then we come to another matter which my delegation wants to deal with as carefully and gently as possible, namely the question of Laos. We would not have entered into a discussion of this matter except for the fact that we carry a certain responsibility in connexion with it. As the Assembly is aware, India is the Chairman of the International. Commission for Supervision and Control in Indo-China.

In 1954, largely under the initiative and the constructive statesmanship of the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden, an agreement was reached whereby fighting in that part of the world stopped and for the first time in twenty-five years, on 11 August 1954, the guns of war were silenced.

As a result of those negotiations and preliminary to a cease-fire in those areas, after many years of very sanguinary warfare in which hundreds of thousands of lives were lost, agreements were signed by the parties which are called the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

I hope the Assembly will pardon me if I feel it part of my Government's duty to communicate to the Assembly the actual position. We have no desire to apportion blame, but, in view of the fact that the United Nations has intervened in this matter and we are part of the United Nations, I think the Assembly should be fully seized of this matter. The Government of India was the Chairman of the Commission, and the other members were Canada and Poland. Decisions were reached by majorities, but were almost always, with one or two exceptions, unanimous. There were three agreements-one on Laos, one on Viet-Nam and one on Cambodia. The parties to the Geneva Agreement on Laos were the Royal Government of Laos, the French High Command and the High Command of the Pathet Lao, that is, the dissident

forces, and of the People's Forces of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, usually called Viet-Minh.

The Viet-Minh, France and Laos subscribed to the final declaration-the final declaration in the Geneva Agreement to which all the Governments represented there were also parties. The Royal Laotian Government made two declarations with reference to articles 3, 4 and 5 of the final

259

declaration regarding political integration and non-involvement in military alliances, and foreign military aid. The period stated with reference to the latter was the period between the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam and the final settlement of the country's political problems.

The responsibility for the execution of this agreement was placed on the parties, that is, the signatories, under article 24 of the Agreement. The International Commission, of which India was the Chairman, was made responsible under article 25 for control and supervision of the implementation of this Agreement.

The special tasks for which the Commission was made responsible included the supervision of the implementation of the Agreement regarding the introduction of military personnel and war material and the rotation of personnel and supplies for French Union Security Forces maintained in Laos. The Commission was also charged with the duty to see that the frontiers of Laos were respected.

Article 25 states:

"An International Commission shall be responsible for control and supervision of the application of the provisions of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos. It shall be composed of representatives of the following States: Canada, India and Poland......."

The political procedures of the Agreement are those given in articles 14 and 15 read with the two declarations made by the Laos Government at Geneva. These are the articles that deal with the responsibility of the Laotian Government in this matter, because it was said that pending a political settlement, the rebel forces had to be grouped in certain areas. Under article 15, the parties undertook to refrain from any reprisals or discriminations against persons or organizations for their activities during the hostilities and also undertook to guarantee their democratic freedoms. The political procedures to the Agreement are those given in articles 14 and 15, as read out.

It is true that the political settlement was delayed for a long time. That is to say, the Pathet Lao people who were concentrated in the two places according to this Agreement, took a long time before they achieved unity with the Royal Government. Without attempting to apportion blame to either party, the Government of India wishes to point out that the Commission and the Commission Chairman materially assisted with their good offices in helping the parties to reach a settlement, as stated by the Prime Minister of Laos and the representative of the Pathet Lao forces in a joint letter dated 29 December 1956, which I am going to read out in a moment. That is to say, though it was not strictly the duty of the Commission, the Commission brought about a settlement among these people, and at the end of it the Prime Minister of Laos issued a communique in these terms :

"Besides the signature of this communique has been facilitated by the attentive interest the International Commission has taken in the settlement of the Laotian problem, interest which in particular is proved by the opportune and correct report addressed to the Co - Chairmen"- Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd; at that time Mr. Molotov and Sir Anthony Eden-"of the Geneva Conference, a copy of which has been forwarded. Moreover, the International Commission and especially Your Excellency" -that is, the Chairman of the Commission-"did not spare their efforts to help the happy success of our talks. The results thus reached contribute in a good measure to the strengthening of peace in the Laotian Kingdom, in South East Asia and in the world. We therefore avail ourselves of this opportunity to forward personally to the International Commission and to Your Excellency our most sincere thanks as well as those of the whole Laotian people".

Now the representative of Laos has said here:

"The International Control Commission, a body established by the Geneva Conference of

1954, saw that it no longer served any purpose and, considering that its task had been completed, left Laos in July 1958." (A/PV. 815, p. 56)

We have no desire to enter into a controversy about this, but we want to put the facts historically correct. The Commission did not leave in July 1958 because its work had been completed but only adjourned sine die with a provision to reconvene in accordance with normal procedures, and the Co-Chairmen also acknowledged this position. These documents were the subject of considerable correspondence between the Co-Chairmen, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd at the time. The Government of India sent the following communication :

"The Government of India have in their previous discussions with the High Commission ... stated that" (with regard to)... "the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam respectively, the three International Commissions have to

260

continue till political settlement is com. pleted in all the three countries, namely, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam. The articles referred to above provide for reduction in the activities of a particular Commission in the light of the development of the situation in the other two countries, but there is no provision in the Geneva Agreements for the winding up of any of the Commissions independently of the completion of political settlement in the other two countries.".....

"Apart from the position of the Government of India on the general question of the inter-connexion of the three Commissions, given in paragraph I above, the Government of India would like to point out that there were two parties to the Geneva Agreement on Laos ; one party signed for the Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the French Union in Indo-China, from whom the Laotian Government derived their authority, and the other party signed for the Commanderin-Chief of the fighting units of the Pathet Lao and for the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army of Viet-Nam.

The second party, namely the one represented by the Vice-Minister of National Defence of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, do not accept the proposal to wind up the Commission made by the Prime Minister of the Royal Laotian Government. In effect, the decision of one Co-Chairman Government, viz., the UK, which supports the view advanced by one of the parties to the Agreement on Laos, viz., the Royal Laotian Government and with which the other Co-Chairman Government, namely, the USSR, and the other party to the Agreement, viz., the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam do not agree, means the unilateral denunciation, by one of the parties, of the Geneva Agreement on Laos, which is bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements not only in Laos but also in other parts of Indo-China.".....

"While the Government of India cannot, in view of the position stated in paragraphs I and 6 above, support this resolution, they would like to point out that a resolution of this type which proposes to amend not only the Geneva Agreement on Laos but the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia and Viet-Nam as well, requires unanimous decision in the Commission and the concurrence of the other two Commissions."

Therefore, we took the view that the Com. mission could not be wound Up unless there was an unanimous decision and the three Commissions had agreed.

"The Government of India are of the view that the unilateral denunciation of the Geneva Agreement of Laos and the winding up or immobilization of the Laos Commission, which are bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements and on the working of the International Commissions in the whole of Indo-China, involve a serious threat to peace in this region."

One of the charges that were given to us was the safeguarding of peace in that area.

Then in reply, when we placed this position before the United Kingdom Government, the United Kingdom Government said that the reply that it had given was without prejudice to the view that the Government of the United Kingdom held that the decision in this matter was one that the Commission itself was competent to make. Then, after that, this reply was communicated to the Co-Chairmen-and this is a very important matter. The two Co-Chairmen, namely, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, wrote to the Government of India in these terms :

"The two Co-Chairmen took notice of the clarification of the Indian Government that this resolution does not affect the legal status of the Commission and does not reduce the competence of the Commission in implementing the tasks and functions assigned to it by the Geneva Agreements. The Co-Chairmen agreed that the resolution of the Commission of 19 July 1958"-that is, to adjourn sine die and to be reconvened in accordance with normal procedures-"was a procedural decision taken to adjourn sine die and having no connexion with the question of dissolution of the Commission. They were agreed that no question of abrogating any of the articles of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos relating to the International Commission, in particular article 39, was involved."

So the position, when Laos made the

261

complaint to the United Nations, was that, as a result of this and in order to have some practical arrangements, the Commission withdrew from Laos with this idea of reconvening. Unfortunately, the Government of Canada did not find it possible to appoint members to it. We have always said that, when things had developed badly in Laos, the international authority, that remained there should be available.

So, to go on with the story, when the Commission adjourned on 19 July there was every prospect of the political settlement being satisfactorily implemented in detail by the Government. The need for supervision and control could be satisfied by occasional meetings in future, if necessary. The position changed later, and was reported to the Co-Chairmen.

When the Commission adjourned, the unity and sovereignty of Laos had been established, And peace prevailed in the whole country. The details of the political integration were being worked out. The present position of armed clashes within Laos is a reversal of the process of settlement reached with the help of the Commission-and I his is an important point.

The Royal Government of Laos has alleged aggression and subversion by the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Whatever may be the motives of the Democratic Republic in working for resumption of the activities of the Commission it is clear that the Commission helped in achieving political integration and in the establishment of the unity and sovereignty of the Laotian Government over the entire territory of Laos. It has also been specifically directed under the Agreement to see that there are no violations of the frontiers of Laos. That was one of the functions of the Commission.

India's view is that the-present trouble is due mainly to the by-passing of the Geneva Agreement procedures and the aggressive attitudes that have prevailed since the Commission adjourned.

Basing its attitude on its experience during its independence struggle, India believes in the pacific settlement of disputes. It is vitally interested in the maintenance of peace in South-East Asia and the world. It undertook special responsibility in connexion with the maintenance of peace in Indo-China at the request of the Co-Chairmen, and, while not wedded to any particular procedures or interested in apportioning blame to parties, would like to see the adoption of procedures which would secure the cessation of fighting in Laos and the restoration of peace both inside and along the frontiers of Laos.

In this connexion, I should like to quote a communication made by my Prime Minister. I have already referred to the fact that the two Co-Chairmen had taken notice of the adjournment motion, which was only for an adjournment sine die with a proviso to reconvene. Writing to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 30 June 1959, since the Secretary-General had very kindly taken it upon himself to use his good offices in his capacity as Secretary-General of the United Nations and had been in touch with us, my Prime Minister wrote to Mr. Hammarskjold in this way :

"The Agreement for the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos was a part of the resolution arrived at in Geneva in regard to the Indo-China settlement. In the Agreements made in 1954, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam was a signatory on behalf of the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao and these Agreements were accompanied by a number of Declarations, including one by the Government of Laos, indicating in general terms that Laos would remain outside the activities of the Power blocs. Again, as a signatory of Geneva on behalf of the Pathet Lao, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is interested in the various Agreements later arrived at between the Royal Government of Laos and the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao.....We are not justified in assuming, and it would be unrealistic to assume, that the conclusions of these Agreements render the problems there, which have become increasingly ominous, solely the internal affairs of Laos. The International Commission, despite its adjournment, stands charged with the responsibilities assumed under the Geneva Agreements. This kind of development and situation which obtain at present were investigated when the Geneva Agreements were made and these were brought within the authority and the functions vested in the International Commission and the arrangements arising therefrom to which the Royal Government of Laos is a signatory.

"We have consistently taken the view that the territorial integrity and unity of Laos is basic to the Geneva Agreements in respect of Laos. Any problem of a territorial conflict' between the different political groups within Laos is not envisaged by the Geneva Agreements. If, however, the 'conflict' relates to the dispute between the North Viet-Nam and Laos, it will be in the nature of a border problem which can well form the subject of discussion and of mediation by and through the Commission." In regard to the raising of the Laotian issue in the United Nations, the Prime Minister of India said to Mr. Hammarskjold.

"It is not clear to me bow any effective action can be taken through the United Nations against a country such as the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam which is not a Member of the United Nations....In fact, any reference to the Security Council would bring these questions into the region of great Power conflicts and put an end to much of the good work that has resulted from the Geneva Agreements."

I want to assure the Assembly that we do not claim any vested interest in this matter, but our country along with Canada and Poland, has struggled for four long years to keep the peace in this part of the world. So far as we are concerned, it has been a considerable strain, and the conditions that prevail have been the subject of communications between our two partners and the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and, latterly, the Secretary-General, all in the hope that what was accomplished in 1954-when, as I said, on II August the guns were silenced-could continue.

For twenty-five years war had reigned in the world, since Japan made its incursions into Manchuria. We think that, if that international body whether established by the United Nations or not it was within its competence, it was there merely for the purpose of peace-if it had continued its functions, perhaps, and only perhaps, the present situation could have been avoided.

Over and above that, we would like to make this submission. Because a country is independent, and this includes our own, and because it is a Member of the United Nations, there is no authority in international law-indeed it would be a very bad precedent-by which it can therefore repudiate agreements it has previously made. This is a denunciation of a treaty, and it remains a denunciation of a treaty.

We were among those who not only supported but made such contributions as we could towards obtaining the admission of Laos into the United Nations. The action taken by the Security Council in its wisdom is a matter for the Security Council, but either the presence of the International Commission was not regarded as sufficiently objective or impartial or it was not considered competent after five years to be able to observe what was going on. It is our view that, if they were there and if there were arms going into the territory, that could have been detected. If North Viet-Nam was at fault-as has happened so many times in the last four or five years in regard to the parties to the Agreement-they would have been taken to task. It is our good fortune that, though there have been difficulties, the parties have, after some time, come to some international court of behaviour in these matters.

All we should like to say is this. The basis of the position in Indo-China is the Geneva Agreements. There is no fighting in Cambodia, but the Cambodian Government does not want the Commission dissolved. It is kept there in an attenuated form. Viet-Nam stands divided at the seventeen-and-a-half degree parallel, into the North and the South. Neither of them is a Member of this body, on account of this decision. We believe that it is largely the Geneva Agreements and the presence of the Commission, and its objectivity, that have been able to maintain peace in that area. It should not be forgotten that, far away as this part of the world may be from the Headquarters of the United Nations, small countries as they may be, inhabited by people on a lower standard of life and so on, and however we may regard them as outside the centre of so-called civilization, any conflict in that area would disturb the stability of South-East Asia.

We all breathed a sigh of relief when, as I said largely to impress the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom at that time, ably assisted by the Soviet Union and, I must say, the Prime Ministers of China and Viet-Nam, and by all the other parties-the Pathet Lao, the Laotian Government and everyone else-and with the help contributed by the former Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mendes-France, an agreement was reached and it kept the peace. Our Government had the responsibility of supplying the greater part of the personnel for maintaining communications. The French Government carried a great deal of the financial burden. The Governments of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom made financial contributions in order to keep the machinery of peace going. It is a great pity if international agreements are disregarded, and in some way any action taken by the United Nations tends to throw a degree of support into this. There is nothing in the action the United Nations has taken that would necessarily be inconsistent with the Geneva agreement, and I am sure it is the desire of the Secretary-General to see the restoration, not necessarily of the Commission or anything of that kind-that is up to him to decide-but that there will be some attempt made to establish the position of the Geneva agreement.

The second matter that concerns us is China.

263

I do not intend to speak at length on this matter because I do not want to stress the question of the admission of China; but my Government does not believe that by evading issues we enlighten ourselves or the people. Our position with regard to the participation of China in this Organization is well-known. It is a matter of great concern to us and a matter of resentment to our people that a country with whom we have been very good friends, a country which is one of our close neighbours and which has more than 2,500 miles of land frontier with us, with which we have had no troubles in the past, has taken it upon itself to commit intrusions into our territory and to proclaim that some 40,000 square miles of it belongs to them.

We want to make our position clear in this matter. On the one hand, we subscribe to the principles of the Charter and by our set of ideas that were put forward at Bandung and by our own treaty relations with China based upon what are popularly called the "Five Principles". What is more, we shall strive as hard as we can to reach settlement on every problem by peaceful negotiation. But there are no individuals in India and no responsible body of opinion prepared to be intimidated, prepared to take aggression lying down. We shall not negotiate with the Chinese until they vacate the territories which they have occupied. These may be small places, they may be mountaintops, but they are our country. Therefore I say this not only officially but also with the hope that my humble voice will reach the Chinese people, with whom we are good friends : I myself have participated in these matters, and we hope that the friendship of our two great countries, which is necessary for the stability of Asia, will not be jeopardized by thoughtlessness on the one hand or by arrogance on the other, and that

China will find it possible to make amends for what it has done, through the withdrawal of every Chinese soldier from our soil-and if they can find any of our soldiers on their soil we shall be the first to withdraw them.

Regarding those areas where boundaries are not marked by posts or pillars that can be seen, sometimes there may be difficulties arising from one party's going into the territory of the other. We have not violated their space, we have not violated their peace and we have not inflicted violence upon them; and what is more, we have not come and talked to the world, or even to our own people, very loudly, even though things have reached this stage. The purpose of my saying this, on the one hand, is to point out that we are not a war-minded people and that we believe settlement of all these problems must be achieved by peaceful negotiation. We would equally like the Chinese to know that a peaceful approach does not mean a submissive approach ; that our country is not prepared to accept a violation of our frontiers, or, where there is a dispute over conditions established over a hundred years ago at least-and sometimes much more-to allow our territory or our frontiers to be altered by unilateral decisions. It may well be that after we have had negotiations some adjustments will have to be made, but our Prime Minister has made it very clear that there cannot be negotiation on the basis of surrender of territories beforehand.

This brings us to the matter of other questions before the Assembly. The first of these is the question of colonial empire. It would be impossible for any delegate from any of the former colonial territories-or indeed, I believe, any Member of the United Nations-to participate in these debates without referring to the colonial problem. We are this year in a position to congratulate ourselves to a certain extent and to feel relieved over the fact that problem of Cyprus -and I hope the delegation of Greece will not mind my saying that we have always regarded it as a colonial problem-has been solved at least for the time being and that it looks as though, as a result of this solution, Cyprus will become an independent nation in 1960. We also would like to lay stress on the fact that it was only recognition of the nationality of Cyprus and by recognition of the problem as a colonial one that a solution was found. There is no way of suppressing these . national aspirations, either by an attempted division of a country or by playing off one Power against another. The problem of Cyprus was solved very largely by the impact of public opinion, channeled through this Assembly.

I would like to express our appreciation to the Government of the United Kingdom as well as to the parties in Cyprus and to Greece and Turkey, for their recognition of the Cypriot nationality, as a result of which Cyprus is well on the way to becoming a Member of the United Nations.

The United Kingdom can also take credit for the impending independence of the territory of Nigeria, of a large portion of colonial Africa which in a few months will become an independent country and, I hope, take her place among us at the next session of the Assembly.

We are also pleased to hear from the representative of Belgium about the project of the Belgian Government for the establishment of independence for her Congo territories. I am not

264

referring to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi but to the Belgian Congo, which is several times larger than Belgium itself, and one of the richest parts of Africa. It is not for my Government to express any views as to the kind of constitution they should have, or its content or the character of their independence, but as in all things, we take these matters at face values. We have got a public declaration made with enthusiasm by the new Foreign Minister of the Belgian Government before this Assembly that his Government has, of its own volition and in recognition of the right of peoples and the readiness of the Congolese people to shoulder the responsibilities of self-government, decided to establish self-government in this area. We shall therefore look forward not with feelings of doubt and suspicion but with hope and confidence, to seeing the Belgian Congo also take its place among the African territories that have come to freedom through the action of the Assembly.

Our own position with regard to colonial empires is that we remain unrepentent. We do not think that there are any peoples who are dabarred from self-government, or that there are any particular people who, rationally, economically or otherwise are to be regarded as especially competent to govern other people. Therefore our country takes the position that, while we shall take no part in underground revolutions or in exporting revolution, we stand in firm solidarity with all those peoples in Africa, Asia and everywhere else who are fighting for their own national liberation. We recognize that nationalism properly channelled is a great constructive force, and, what is more, that if it is suppressed it is likely to go in other directions, affecting the peace of the world as well as the stability and progress of peoples and territories themselves.

In this connexion we should like to refer to the Non-Self-Governing Territories under article 73 of the Charter. I have no desire to say anything that might raise a controversy and evoke the right of reply, but I would like to refer to the fact that the United Nations can claim some credit in this matter, because when we started in this business under article 73, some seventy-four Territories were submitting information. This is an occasion when what we look forward to is the cessation of this information in a wholesome way. Out of the seventy-four Territories, seven have become independent ; fifteen have ceased to send information because those who were responsible for their rule thought they were ready for independence, that they require examination. Now, other Territories which are not sending information would not, in our view, come under article 73 of the Charter. And in this connexion one would like to say that if arguments are put forward in order to relieve these Territories of the necessity of supplying information, then all the dependent Territories would escape this justification, and not have the benefit of justification in the demanding of their freedom either before this body or anywhere else.

A colonial territory is a territory where the majority of the populations can make no impact upon the policy of Governments and where economically, socially and otherwise, they are exploited. There are large parts of Africa in this condition, and there are small portions of Asia in this condition. The Portuguese representative pointed out here the other day that Portugal had no colonies, they were all part of the metropolitan territory. Portugal's reply to the Secretary-General on 8th November 1956 stated : "She does not administer any territories that come under Article 73 of the Charter." That Article is very clear on this matter, and we shall discuss it in detail in the Fourth Committee. Article 73 states :

"Member of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international 'peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and to this end...

"e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories"-that is all we ask for-"for which they are respectively responsible...."

There are 779,000 square miles of Portuguese territory in Africa, apart from other areas, and the territory of Portugal, of which the representative of Portugal has spoken of as part of the Portuguese Republic, consists in Europe of the mainland, Madeira and the Azores, which I suppose are an integral part of Portugal. The territory of Portugal in West Africa consists of Cape Verde, Guinea, Sao Tome, Sao Joao Baptista de Ajuda, Cabinda and Angola. In East

265

Africa there is Mozambique, in Asia the State of India, so-called and Macao, and in Oceania, Timor.

These are territories which are not selfgoverning and which are inhabited by people who make no impact upon the Central Government of the country and which, in a very classic sense, are colonial territories. We request the Portuguese Government to fall in line with other territories, irrespective of any claim to self-government and irrespective of any demands or complaints that may have been made, to assist the United Nations in the propagation of the idea that these territories are held in trust as human beings organized in nations or in territorial units in order to establish their national independence.

These territories are known, under article 134 of the Portuguese Constitution as provinces. Article 135 states that the "Overseas Provinces, as an integral part of the Portuguese State, are united as between themselves and with metropolitan Portugal." Of course, that is how a colony is united. Prior to 1951, these territories were known as "colonies", but the new terminology of "provinces" was introduced by the amendments of 11 June 1951, that is, after the establishment of the United Nations.

Article 33 refers to "the classic mission of Portugal to diffuse the benefits of civilization", which suggests the presence of non-self-governing peoples within the meaning of the Charter. What the Charter asks for is a record of this diffusion of the benefits of civilization. If the benefits of civilization are being diffused by educational and social progress, then that information should be sent. There is a limited measure of decentralization and financial autonomy, but the legislative power remains in the hands of the metropolitan National Assembly.

Portuguese citizens alone may vote or stand for election. "Natives" do not have the right unless they meet certain prescribed educational, religious, financial and social standards. Since Portugal regulates these standards, the "natives" who qualify for citizenship are kept in manageable proportions. Out of a population of 10 1/2 million, only 35,000 people have the vote.

By any reasonable test such as the application of the Factors Resolution 742 (VIII) it can be established that they are non-self-governing. Moreover, Article 4 o. the Portuguese Constitution states that "in the international field it recognizes only those limitations which are derived from conventions or treaties freely entered into". The Charter is such a treaty and Article 73 applies.

I have taken care not to bring any Indo-Portuguese question into this matter but merely to raise the whole question of colonies as such and to request, not to demand, the Portuguese Government to provide this information.

With regard to colonial territories as a whole, there are twenty colonies under France and twenty under the United Kingdom in each of which during the last few years there have been policies which have led to self-government. But these colonial areas cover 50 million people under France and 63 million people in the case of United Kingdom. In each case, they are twenty times as large as the metropolitan countries. My delegation does not suggest in regard to either of these two metropolitan countries that progressive policies are not the rule. If there are violations of them, or complaints about them, they are inherent in the colonial system. We hope, however, that more territories which are dependent will come under Article 73.

I should like to deal for a moment with the position in Africa. To anyone who has spoken about the colonial territories, Africa stands in a category of its own and my delegation has been delighted to notice that year after year for the last three or four years the Secretary-General has paid special attention to Africa, and the establishment of the Economic Commission on Africa is a great measure of progress about which my Government would like to express its appreciation.

Africa has an area of about 11,250,000 square miles and a population of 193 million people. Out of these, 5 million are Europeans, 600,000 are Asians and the rest are Africans. Of this remainder, 103 million are under colonial rule and 6,200,000 more or less under colonial rule. It is to be noted that this Africa, which is regarded as unfit to govern, which consists of colonial territories, supplies a great part of the world's very precious resources. Africa supplies the world with 98 per cent of its diamonds, 94 per cent of its columbite, 84 per cent of its cobalt, 55 per. cent of its gold, 41 per cent of its beryllium, 33 per cent of its manganese, 29 per cent of its chrome, 22 per cent of its copper and 13 per cent of its tin. All this comes from what is called the "Dark Continent", it is dark only to its own people, it is very much a light to others.

Uranium is believed to exist in very large quantities and there are large deposits of iron ore, manganese and bauxite. Two-thirds of the world's cocoa comes from Africa and three-fifths of its

266 palm oil.

So here are territories occupied by small numbers of people compared with the rest of the world, covering a very large area and containing an enormous amount of mineral wealth, which it supplies to the world, territories in I which the peoples are strangers in their own country.

This brings me to the other part of the colonial empire, which presents another picture-Algeria and West Irian. The Indonesian delegation in its wisdom did not take a decision to place West Irian on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. The Government of India considers West Irian as unfinished business, that is that part of Indonesia which, as in the case of Portuguese Goa, is still remaining under alien rule. I do not desire to go into the technical and legal questions which have been discussed so many times. Time after time the General Assembly has appealed to the Dutch and Indonesian Governments to negotiate so that West Irian may be united with the rest of Indonesia and so that the liberation of the former Dutch colony will be complete.

I would like to say, on behalf of a Government that has very friendly relations with the Dutch Government, that any policy of this kind would make the Netherlands Government much more appreciated in the Asian continent, establish to it relations between Europe and Asia, and be a blow to the doctrines of racialism and imperialism which are likely to endanger world peace. A progressive though small country like Holland, with a great technical and industial capacity which must survive very largely by the clientele from the large populations of the world in its own interests and, in addition, as a response to the appeal we make, will, we hope, find it possible, without any pressures from anywhere else and perhaps of its own volition, to enter into negotiations with the Indonesian Government so that this little problem may be solved for ever.

Then we come to the other question of Algeria. I am going to say very little at this moment because the item is on our agenda and no doubt it will come up later for discussion.

My Government and delegation will support the demand of the Algerian people for full national unity and independence, and in due time for their taking their rightful place as an independent nation in this Assembly. We do not subscribe to the allegations made by one side or the other because we are not in possession of these facts. But to us, it is not whether a place is well governed or not so well governed, ill-governed or much worse governed. People are entitled to their independence. Colonialism must end even if the colonialism is a benevolent one. Therefore, we shall support the claim of Algeria for independence. We hope that the recent pronouncements made by General de Gaulle, coupled with the position that under his regime a country like Guinea has been able to become independent, may lead to a position where the French Government and the French President will find it possible to initiate negotiations with the people who are fighting them. After all if there is to be peace in Algeria, the first step is a cease-fire, but you cannot negotiate a cease-fire except with the people who are firing. Therefore, negotiations logically follow and all of the political questions come afterwards. There is no use negotiating with a number of Algerians who may be in France or in New York or somewhere else, in order to stop the fighting in the wilds of Algeria. Therefore, direct negotiations with the FLN, that is the Government that is control of the territory, with a view to finding out-I am not here for a moment saying there may not be matters to discuss; we are not prepared to reject out of hand the approach made by the French Government and we certainly do not question their motives. But it is difficult for us to accept as self-determination for Algeria, self-determination in which the whole of France participates. That would be very much like an equality in the sandwich that was sold by a person who was mixing horse flesh with the sandwich. He was asked, "What is all this?" He said, "It is only a fifty-fifty proposition, one chicken to one horse."

Then we come to the Trust Territories. This is a sphere in which the United Nations can congratulate itself and we are happy to think that Western Samoa, under the very enlightened administration of New Zealand, will now pass on to independence. We should like to pay our tribute to the Visiting Missions, to the New Zealand Government and to the Samoan people who have all co-operated in this development. We hope that there will be no hitches and that in a very short time Samoa will take its place among us as an independent territory and decide the nature of its own association with New Zealand.

We have the Trust Territories of the Cameroons and French Togoland. As the Cameroons is being discussed in the Fourth Committee, I therefore do not wish to go into it. We hope that the Territory of Togoland will take its place, in the same way as Ghana, with us next year.

We have another and different kind of problem

267

in regard to South West Africa. South West Africa was a C Mandate under the League of Nations and ought by rights to become a Trust Territory. The World Court has expressed different opinions in this matter, but the United Nations has always taken the view that South West Africa ought to come into trusteeship. We hope that the Union Government, in spite of all the positions held so far, will recognize sooner rather than later that it is more in harmony with its own position, with the contribution the Union Government has made to the founding of this Organization, with the principles that it, apart from apartheid, often exposes in this Assembly, to come to some position whereby South West Africa in our view in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the obligations which it had undertaken in the League Covenant, will come under trusteeship.

There is one other thing I should like to say. As large numbers of Trust Territories become independent, what the Trusteeship Council has to do becomes less and less. But the Charter provided for this Trusteeship as a new way of treating colonial Territories. May I take this opportunity to make an appeal on behalf of the Government of India and say that one hopes that theenlightened Administering Powers will now find it possible to place other Territories that are Non-Self-Governing under Trusteeship so that they may become independent very soon. That is what is provided for in this Chapter because that would be the best way of proclaiming what they have constantly proclaimed on this platform that Trusteeship is the intermediate step and an

enlightened one provided for by the United Nations and by the League of Nations, and we may hope that voluntarily-nobody can force them-under the provisions of the Trusteeship Council, Territories may be placed in this way under Trusteeship.

I should like to take a much briefer time as regards the question of race relations. There are items on the agenda of the Assembly to be discussed in Committees. Therefore, I do not wish to go into this at great length. However, I have to do that because the Foreign Minister of the Union Government on this rostrum not only merely made an attempt at defending the policy of the administration in regard to race relations, but he also expounded a policy which he thought should be accepted by the world. Now it is quite true, I entirely agree with him, that there is not a country in the world, including my own, where there is not social discrimination based on race, caste, creed or colour or whatever it may be. There is not a country in the world which can say "we are free from this". But equally, there is not a country in the world which is not trying to get away from it. The difference between the apartheidists and the others is that we recognize it is evil and we recognize the weakness of ours that we are still tolerating it. But in the other case it is put to us as a kind of historical pattern of Africa that must be followed. In support of this, we are told that the Dutch went to South Africa before the Bantus. But who went there before the Bantus : the Hottentots and the Bushmen? They are also human beings. If the Union Government is prepared to bring the Hottentots and the Bushmen to self-government, that would be even a greater piece of work than otherwise. So I do not think there is any use going into the history of who came there first and who did not. My Government has not, and I hope never will, argued that people should be turned out of Africa because of their racial origins. We regard these territories as multi-racial societies where other races exist. That would be so in the case of Algeria, that would be the case of South Africa and so on. So when the Foreign Minister of the Union of South Africa tells us, "We are strangers in our land, the land of our forefathers," and that the United Nations wants to turn them out, it is not historically or politically correct. No one has suggested that apartheid in reverse should be practised. What we have said is that there

is nothing scientific in this. Indeed last year UNESCO appointed a committee which produced a report. I am not going to quote from this report as I do not have the time. They examined this question in great scientific detail, the question whether there is a scientific basis for racial discrimination. They came to the conclusion, on scientific grounds, that there are no reasons whatsoever for the practices that obtain politically, socially or otherwise. If I may, I will commend this scientific investigation to the notice of the South African Government.

We stand fully opposed to the whole doctrine of apartheid. If the Foreign Minister of the South African Government tells us, "What is there to complain about, we are going to have a white Africa and a non-white Africa," then that is not the whole story. If there was a white Africa and a non-white Africa and if they step out of nonwhite Africa there might be something to be said for it. But a white Africa and a non-white Africa are under white Africa. Therefore, apartheid only goes to a certain extent. It is not a complete apartheid. I am not supporting it. Therefore, the argument that is put before us in defence of apartheid is a position totally contrary to the principles of the Charter; totally contrary to the investigations made in the scientific field, totally

268

contrary to the sense of human dignity and, what is more, a position that is likely to lead to racial conflict in Africa of a character which can only be inferred by people if they would just look at the numerals : 193 million as against 5 million. That is the hard logical fact to be faced when the time comes. What is more, the industrial development of Africa, all that I have told you, is not possible without the manpower of its populations. If they are good enough to produce wealth, they are good enough to enjoy political power.

I propose, in view of the time, to skip the next part of what I was going to make observations upon, namely, the economic development position, and deal with it in the Committee. How. ever, I must state this. The most outstanding situation of our time has been the visits of great personalities as between their respective countries. If I may say so, it began with the so-called "iron curtain"--a word which is not permitted to be used in correspondence or otherwise by the Government of India-and we think the abandonment of it will be a small contribution, just as the abandonment of the words "running dogs of imperialism" would be on the other side, to the lowering of tensions.

The first of these started when Mr. Bulganin, then Prime Minister, and Mr. Khrushchev visited India three or four years ago. Later followed the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United Kingdom, and then the British Prime Minister to the Soviet Union. The United States Vice-President came to the Soviet Union, and later the Soviet Prime Minister to the United Nations.

In as far as it merely concerns Soviet-United States relations, it would not be my place to comment upon them, but these are world problems. We have at all times stated that we believe in direct talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. As early as 1952, speaking before this Assembly, my delegation said that there are two great Powers in the world. The peace of the world depends upon them and we would subscribe to any proposal to have direct negotiations between them. There is no dignity, no face-saving, involved in this matter. The only way that the problems of this world can be settled is by direct negotiation between countries who are so powerful, who are so strong and who have the capacity to make decisions.

I will not quote the statements. There are statements year after year from 1952 to 1957 where we have made appeals in this Assembly for direct talks between the Soviet Government and the American Government. It is not for us to speculate about what has happened between these He-ads of State. But there is no doubt that we all recognize that when they see each other face to face, one thinks that the other fellow is not so bad as he thought he was. At least it does that much good.

But this has been a political visit and, so far as the United Nations is concerned, it is most important for the statement made by the Soviet Prime Minister before this Assembly, followed by observations by others afterwards. The Soviet Prime Minister's statement, to the mind of my delegation, falls into two distinct parts. One is a proposal for disarmament which belongs to the same category as the discussions that have gone on here for what is called the balanced production, limitation and so on of armaments. The other is an entirely different proposal ... for a warless world, the kind of thing that a Government like ours, which has not the economic or political power or the power to influence has constantly appealed for-that is, disarmament alone cannot bring about peace or settlement in our world; we must have a situation where war is outlawed.

We regard the proposals put forward as proposals not of a visionary character, as they are called, but as embodying vision. My Prime Minister, when he heard of this, said :

"It seems to me as a proposal, a brave proposal, which deserves every consideration. Whether humanity, that is various countries concerned, is brave enough to put an end suddenly to armies, navies, and air forces, I do not know. But the time will come, will have to come, when something of this kind will have to be adopted because in this era of atomic and hydrogen weapons and ballistic missiles, war has become an anachronism."

Therefore we were happy when the General Committee, without any dissenting voice, admitted the item put forward by the Soviet Union with regard to complete disarmament. On the face of it, it looks like two items put by two different parties, but we think that the two different propositions are : one the balanced reduction of armaments and the other the abandonment of war as a matter for settling disputes ; and what is more, the community of the world is established in society where force has a municipal character and a municipal character must necessarily, as a corollary come under world law. Therefore, this is the first great movement

269

towards a world (State or towards the congeries of people who" are characterized by so many differences. We make no reservation for ourselves in subscribing to this objective. It is not an objective which means something that will not happen now, but something which we hope we will work for and, for that reason, speed up the course of disarmament. We are happy to think that the Secretary of State for the United States also supported this saying :

"...it did echo sentiments that are very widely held, that, if it were practicable and if it could safely be done, the type of disarmament which Mr. Khrushchev has spoken about is a high] desirable thing for mankind. From this point of view it must be taken very seriously."

Members of the Assembly will be aware that it is not always that the Soviet Union says of the United States or the United States says of the Soviet Union that the other party "must be taken seriously."

From the West German Defence Minister also comes a similar statement when be says the proposal was a "wonderful, excellent idea and I share his opinion."

The Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom told us that "it is important to make a fresh start with disarmament." Similarly, other countries in uncommitted areas like Burma, Yugoslavia, my own country and Afghanistan welcome it, especially in underdeveloped areas, not merely because of its economic consequences, but because we do not see a world surviving in the context of modem war where it is possible to annihilate not only vast populations but even kill the character of the population, if any did survive, for the future with all the genetic consequences of an atomic war. Therefore, my delegation will support the priority consideration being given to the discussion of the item.

We shall also approach it from the point of view of a warless world with all its implications. We do not share the view that, because a four-year period has been put into it, it is impracticable. In the way that the world is going on-on 4 October 1957, when the first Russian sputnic went up, followed by so many American bodies of the same kind ; and then, two years later and yesterday when another of these things went round the moon-we did not think that in two years these great things could happen. Indeed, we are moving away from the world as from 4 October 1957, as my Prime Minister once said, which makes the Atomic Age look like the Stone Age. The progress of the world cannot be measured merely by the terms of the calendar. Einstein quite rightly in his relativity dissertations points out that time is an event, so that events must measure time. Time by the clock is not what calculates or what conditions the consciousness of human beings, nor must it be the ruling factor in this matter.

On the other hand, the Soviet Prime Minister or those who have followed him have not ruled out the other problems, namely the immediate problems, for limitation of armaments. My Government stands fully committed and publicly proclaims the view that there cannot be any limitation by agreement except with control. We have never been able to understand this argument about which comes first the chicken or the egg. You can talk about control without disarmament or disarmament without control. We think the plans on this should be simultaneous so that when the agreement to disarm is reached the control machinery will be there, and the control apparatus should also be agreed upon the same way. We are glad to think that both in the East and the West, so-called, there have been advances in the problems of control and the problems of surprise attack, and we are also told that there may be some agreement in regard to outer space. In this connexion, may I say that time after time insignificant delegations like ours have put forward suggestions in this way which have not found favour so far as the votes to which you referred are concerned. Some years ago, the United Nations rejected, I believe by 38 votes to 22, or something of that kind, the proposal made by the delegation of India that technical examination of the methods of controlling nuclear explosions might bring you out of it. But we had the pleasure of hearing the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, say a few days ago, that this had been put forward-not the proposal we put forward, but at any rate the idea of the use of technical knowledge for this purpose-and therefore they had reached agreement.

We have asked for a long time, from the year 1949, for an armaments truce, and also for the Secretariat to start what they call the blueprint for a disarmament treaty so that the arguments would be in regard to particular details and not merely to phrase-placing juxtaposition.

There are a number of problems in this connexion which I would have liked to mention,

270 but time forbids it.

I would not like to leave this rostrum without referring to two other matters. One is in regard to the Suez Canal. I refer to the Suez Canal not because anything I say will make a difference in this problem, but because, as I have said repeatedly, the problem is not the Suez Canal, it is something else. I do not intend to tread where angels fear to do so but I would like to point out the position of my Government in this matter.

Two or three years ago, when the question of the Suez Canal came here and the attack on Egypt by three countries took place, the United Nations intervened and there was all this argument. We have always said that the right of free navigation under the Convention of 1888 must be accepted. We have never moved away from that position and we were completely in favour of the development of the instrument that was deposited with the Secretary-General by the Government of Egypt.

We therefore think that this problem is fully covered in pursuant to the principles laid down in the Constantinople Convention of 1888 :

"The Suez Canal Authority, by the terms of its Charter, can in no case grant any vessel, company or other party, any advantage or favour not accorded to other vessels, companies or parties on the same condition. Complaints of discrimination or violation of the Canal Code is incorporated in the Canal Code Violations of the Canal Code shall be sought to be resolved by the complaining party by a reference to the Suez Canal Authority in the first instance. In the event of such a reference not resolving the complaint, the matter may be re. ferred, at option of the complaining party or the Authority, to an Arbitration Tribunal composed of one nominee of the complaining party, one of the authority and a third to be chosen by both. In case of disagreement, such third will be

chosen by the International Court of Justice upon the application of either party. The decisions of the Arbitration Tribunal shall be made by majority of its members. The decision shall be binding upon the parties when they are rendered and they must be carried out in good faith."

Soon afterwards, in order to set all doubts at rest, we are glad to note that the following declaration also was deposited with the Secretary-General on 18 July 1957:

I, Mahmoud Fawzi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Egypt, declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Egypt, that, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Declaration of the Government of the Republic of Egypt dated 24 April 1957 on the Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation, the Government of the Republic of Egypt accept as compulsory ipso facto, on condition of reciprocity and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes that may arise under the said paragraph 9 (b) of the above Declaration..." (S/3818/Add. 1)

So that as far as we are concerned, if there is a violation of any legal rights, intra-national or international, they are today justiciable. Therefore if the existing situation is something that militates against the interests of the parties concerned, or of international behaviour, I think that we should follow the advice of the Secretary General and evoke the operation of the Courts.

I had to race through the last part of this. I express the support of my Government in regard to what may be called the warless world plan which was put forward by the Soviet Prime Minister, a plan which is the same as talking about the outlawing of war. But we think that side by side with it must come other matters.

Mr. Khrushchev referred to the fact that \$ 100 billion was spent in the making of armaments

and that if this money was saved, it would go towards the development of the world as a whole. I have not the time nor the facts before me to detail these matters to you. Not only do we have hope, but we must work for a warless world, a world without war. A world community has been established and at the present time it has been placed in the context of measurable time.

There arises a new situation. Today in this world we have 2,800 million people. Whatever may be your personal views on this matter at the end of this century there will be 5,200 million people in this world. We are increasing at the rate of sixty million a year. And arising from this, my delegation would like to put to the Assembly the fact that the Secretariat should be

271

charged with producing the blueprints of what may be called "a world plan of development." It is not only a question of the Special Fund or the technical aid, or this or that other thing, but how we are going to subsist in this world with 5,000 million people, where on the one hand, the per capita income of a prosperous country is somewhere about \$ 1800 per head, while in other places it is \$ 58 per head, while there are large pockets of unemployment, while there is the position that industrially and socially they are backward, and where there is the problem of feeding these vast populations. So a world of peace must be a world of imbalance. A world of imbalance would be a world that is not at peace.

My delegation would submit for the consideration of the Secretariat that they produce the blueprints of a world plan, which should be the main concern of the Second Committee from next year onwards. It should not be a question of tinkering with this or that, but it should be, recognized that the \$ 100 billion that would be saved would not go to the production of consumer goods which would find their place in the underdeveloped areas. No under-developed country is prepared to take imperialism in reverse. It should not be forgotten that when the making of armaments in the present armed world has stopped and the producers who are now consuming the \$ 100 billion in one way or another turn to peaceful occupation, the under-developed world at the same time is also producing goods.

It is not as in the nineteenth century where some people are hewers of wood and drawers of water. Some people produce raw materials and other people produce finished goods. And in the remainder of the century that is before us, the position will be that there will be a large quantity of production. Equally, there will be large populations. The problem of feeding, housing and, what is more, of establishing a balance between communities and social developments, will become the world problem, especially in a warless world because at the present moment suspicions and fears divert the attention of people away from these problems.

This cannot be solved either by loan schemes, or by charity schemes. They can only be solved in the context of a cooperative world where each party, big or small, poor or rich, makes his own contribution, where the world is taken as one picture, where there are no communities outside world law and outside the United Nations, where production has to match the requirements of the community, and the conception of this, as regards underdeveloped countries, of profit-making loans, would be regarded as an anachronism. The under-developed country that at the present moment may feel very much heartened by the taking of loan from a developed country has to carry in the years to come all the survicing of those loans and mortgage its future in that way.

It is not a question merely of technical assistance as we knew it before, but of a world plan, and the Secretariat, in the first instance, should produce working papers so that we could side by side, as a corollary of a disarmed world, proceed in this way. Therefore, it is not as though we do not have the problem before us. The problem has been brought nearer by the picture of a warless world that is put to us at the present time. I would therefore submit to the General Assembly that this would be one of the tasks that we could undertake. But we could not approach any of these problems if we approach them from the point of view of suspicion, from the point of view of "well, it is a vision of the future."

There is a difference between visions of the future and just being visionary. There is a difference between schemes on the one hand and idle dreams on the other. A world that is so largely populated as ours is likely to be, where there are populations of different types of development, can only be tackled from the point of view of world planning, With our minds on considerations of outer space and what not, the time is fast coming when there will be the reverse of what I am told is the theological doctrine that the ills of this world are solved in heaven. Very soon the time will come when the troubles of heaven will have to be solved in this world, because the quarrels between the different countries using space for one thing or the other has to be settled terrestrially.

Therefore, this world becomes a small planet. It will take its place in the prospective of creation, and we hope that this economic aspect which we have now begun to tackle in the way of SUNFED the Special Fund, the Development Fund, the bilateral loans, and so on, will become a human concern, a project that arises from the principles of the Charter, from the Declaration of Human Rights and our conception of world war and a warless world, and things of that kind.

But for all this, the approach to this matter has to be one where the ends and the means are not separated much one from the other. We could not move toward these projects without faith, and that faith cannot just merely be an idle hope that something would happen. It might be the realization of the truth as we see it, of our

272

faith in the destiny of humanity.

As we said at San Franciso, our people and our Government believe in disarmament only as a means to an end. It is a means that shares the character of the end, as all means should do. But in the next decade disarmament alone will not be enough. Therefore-we ought to address ourselves in the next decade to our main purpose. and-if we have said it once we are prepared to say it one hundred times if necessary-there is only one way before the world, and that is for nations to renounce war as an instrument of policy. This Organization now has to address itself, as a longer-term project, to the idea of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. Disarmament or limitation of armaments is a good thing ; it is an advance on present conditions; but it is not the establishment of peace. We can establish peace only when the

nations have decided to abandon war.

This will be possible-when these weapons of mass destruction and of terror are removedonce confidence is established and once it is possible for us in this Assembly, for example, to say, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that errors of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. If we are able to trust to reason and not to passion, it will be possible to do this.

So, finally, let us realize that, in the face of these great problems, it is our business to listen to the voice of destiny. History is replete with example of the truth that the solution of problems by means that are contrary to ends always results in tragedy. That was the fate of Congress of Vienna. That was the fate of the League of Nations. One cannot reconcile dreams with schemes. If we must have schemes, we will be schemers. If we are going in pursuit of an ideal, then we should not be obsessed by the thought of the peet who, in the mid-war years, reflected the temper of that period of great despondency and cynicism when he said: "In this great hour of destiny they stand each with disputes, jealousies and sorrows." But instead we should say, like the bard who belonged to the age of the Renaissance and of constructive endeavour, that "we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures". And our ventures of today are the ventures of peace-a world that is rid of war, a planned world from the economic and social point of view, and what is more, not lost in idle dreams but harnessed to constructive endeavour by the Organization that is ours, by the ideals that are contained in the Charter. And our ventures-the venture of peace, the venture of world community-we dare not lose. This is our charge and our obligation.

INDIA USA OMAN ICELAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN CANADA SRI LANKA NEW ZEALAND AUSTRALIA NORWAY LATVIA KOREA CHINA LEBANON EGYPT ISRAEL LAOS SWITZERLAND POLAND CAMBODIA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM JAPAN INDONESIA CYPRUS GREECE TURKEY NIGER NIGERIA BELGIUM CONGO PORTUGAL CAPE VERDE GUINEA SAO TOME E PRINCIPE ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE ITALY ALGERIA THE NETHERLANDS WESTERN SAMOA CAMEROON GHANA SOUTH AFRICA BURMA YUGOSLAVIA AFGHANISTAN RUSSIA AUSTRIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Tibet

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the General Assembly on October 21, 1959 on the question of Tibet.

The following is the text of his speech

The Assembly has been discussing this item now for two days, in which time some twenty-five speakers have taken part in the debate. This is the first occasion on which my delegation has taken the rostrum in connexion with this matter.

It is hardly necessary to say that there is considerable divergence of opinion not only in regard to this discussion but in regard to the various points of merit that have come up. There is, however, one common factor among us all. Whether we supported inscription or otherwise, whether we are going to vote for the draft resolution or otherwise, it appears to us that there is a general sense of distress in having to deal with this subject, and that distress is no less with us than with any other delegation. I should like briefly to deal with this matter.

Apart from all other considerations we have to take into account the fact that it is introduced here by two delegations which are very close to us, that of Ireland and that of Malaya. Ireland is close to us not in a geographical sense but by sentiment and by history and by a common concern for the liberty and welfare of peoples. Malaya, a very close neighbour, recently emerged from colonial status into independence. If we take the view which we intend to present largely for the purpose of explanation, it is not the custom or the practice of our Government to evade expression of opinion even if it may not be very popular. So far as this question is concerned they will have a great deal of sympathy from our point of view in the sense that the views expressed by my Government and its representatives, which to a certain extent I shall seek to summarize here, have evoked support neither from the Tibetans nor from the Chinese nor from the Western Powers nor from the uncommitted nations, nor from our friends or our non-friends. But this perhaps is an indication of the complexity of this problem.

Now may I say a word or two about our

273

own position in this matter ? It is not entirely a political one. It is not only coloured, it is conditioned, by our emotional backgrounds and connexions with the territory we now call Tibet.

It emerges into history, so far as we are concerned, only in very recent times, somewhere about the seventh century of this era. But traditionally our connexions with, Tibet go back. to the emergence of the earliest strains of our civilization, which were supposed to emerge from Central Asia, from the banks of the Tibetan lakes. But in more recent times, when after the Buddha had given his gospel to India, or had lived his life in India about ten or twelve centuries afterwards, Buddhism went into Tibet. At that time the Tibetans were not part of any other country-that was 1200 years ago-but from that time onwards there have been religious, cultural and other relations between Tibet and India

Then we emerge into the second half of the thirteenth century, when the new Tibet, as we may call it, takes its place in history, with its chequered progress and with its many vicissitudes. In the thirteenth century the Mongols conquered Tibet. So whatever views we may hold about present Governments or administrations of people, whether of Tibet or China, we would be going against history if we were to say that this was the first time violence of war or conquest had been the fate of this part of the world. In the thirteenth century the Mongol conquerors established themselves as emperors of China, and they conquered Tibet. Then came a series of other matters, and three or four centuries afterwards the Dalai Lama of Tibet, who was originally and basically a religious head, became the political head of Tibet.

In 1640, after overrunning Tibet, Gusri Khan appointed the fifth Dalai Lama as the political head of Tibet. The effective suzerainty of China over Tibet was not even established, but by the eighteenth century China obtaind effective suzerainty over this territory.

Then we pass on to the period of modem imperialism. In 1870, soon after the Franco-Prussian War, the British were apprehensive of Russian designs in Central Asia-this sounds as if we were talking about today-and they started interesting themselves in Tibet and in the period of 1873 to 1899 obtained various concessions in Tibet, not by negotiating with the Tibetans but by negotiating with the Chinese Government. We pass on from that period till we come to 1907, when the Anglo-Russian Convention was signed in regard to China's suzerainty over Tibet, and this was largely done at that time by the British authorities as a safeguard against unilateral conduct by Czarist Russia and was never repealed years afterwards. In this 1907 Convention the Chinese suzerainty was reiterated. Then there was the conference of Simla in 1914 at which the parties who signed, or rather initialled these treaties were Tibet and Great Britain, and that also shows Tibet as part of China.

But for the purpose of this discussion my Government is not so much concerned with the legal niceties or the textual implications of the Charter as such. Therefore, it is not our intention to raise the question of whether the subject may or may not be discussed or whether it may be barred by the doctrine of domestic jurisdiction. We ourselves would not raise that issue, even if we were taking a more active part in this matter. We think the Assembly has a right to discuss it if it so decides to do, but discussion does not mean intervention, and we have always held that point of view. Therefore, while we did not participate in the voting, we have no desire to raise the question of domestic jurisdiction for that reason.

In the document circulated (A/4234), there is a memorandum explaining the request for the introduction of this item by the Governments of Malaya and Ireland, and there is a reference to a letter from the Dalai Lama to the Secretary-General.

The Dalai Lama's letter deals with two aspects of the problem. One is dealt with on the first page, in points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. It deals with political issues. It seeks to establish the Tibetans' status and seeks recognition of their sovereignty as a result of our discussion. The second part deals with present conditions, with human rights and atrocities and things of that character. The memorandum submitted by the two sponsors deals only with the second part. Therefore, in what the Assembly is seized of now there are no political issues, and therefore it is unnecessary for my Government to argue this question at all. So far as human rights are concerned, we state without any reservations whatsoever that we do not have any standards different from what we have advocated from this platform and in a small measure have tried to practise in our political and other relations.

Therefore from the point of view of consideration of these matters, while we did not support the inscription of this item, for reasons which I shall mention in a moment, we do not

274

want in any way to put forward legalistic objections and to try to build up a procedural barrier.

Consideration of this problem must, first of all, have as its central theme the future of the Tibetan people and of the Dalai Lama himself. So far as we are concerned, there have been troubles in Tibet not only in the old days but in recent times also. That is part of the great changes that am taking place in the world. But we should like to have those changes take place more peacefully, with less cruelty, perhaps with less upset. Also, we do not subscribe to the view that these changes are merely the overthrow of certain feudal lords or otherwise. If these upsets have to come, they should come, so far as possible, with the least degree of violence. Butwhile we may wish that, we have no right to impose non-violence with violence. That is to say, we cannot argue non-interference by interfering. Therefore, all we can do is to express our point of view and, without violence to our foreign policy and without violence to our relations with other countries, unless there is justification for it, do what we can within our own capacities.

India inherited the British Position in Tibet in 1947-that is to say, that Tibet was under Chinese suzerainty. In 1954, we entered into an agreement which was not a political agreement in regard to the political status of Tibet as such, but was an agreement relating to trade matters. India has a degree of trade with Tibet, and vice versa, and these trade routes were very often protected by our own physical force in difficult terrain.

When China established itself under this new Government, we regularized these relations. We withdrew the so-called Political Agent from Tibet and appointed a Consul-General who was under the jurisdiction of our Ambassador in China. The treaty we had with Tibet in 1954 is largely concerned with those trade matters-the introduction which establishes the relation between China and ourselves. That is the position.

There have been troubles before. The matter came up here in 1950, and then it was adjourned bemuse it was thought that a peaceful settlement would be brought about. Then, more recently, there have been disturbances in Tibet, for instance the revolt of the Khambas. They themselve are not in Tibet proper, they are in the Chinese province. They are Chinese themselves. However, the Tibetans joined them, and a very considerable revolt appears to have taken place.

As a result, the Dalai Lama himself and some 12,000 or 13,000 of his followers came over to India. I think it would be right for us in this connexion, when considering the concern that parties and countries and peoples have in regard to human rights and humanitarian affairs, to point out to the Assembly that, while we are not a Buddhist country, we alone of all countries in the world have a responsibility, which we willingly undertook, to give asylum to the Dalai Lama, as we had the right but not the obligation to do, and also to receive some 12,000 or 13,000 refugees.

Therefore, no charge that we are indifferent to what happens in a neighbouring country or to the conditions that I have mentioned can ever be brought in this connexion. We still have those refugees in our land. And, although there have been allegations in the past by the Chinese Government-not perhaps the Chinese Government, but Chinese quarters-that India has promoted these troubles, or that India has been a base for this, there has been no justification whatsoever for that sort of statement.

On the other hand, the Dalai Lama is entirely free in India to do whatever he likes. That is evident from the fact that this item has come up here. The Government of India does not approve, does not support the discussion of this item in the United Nations. But, in spite of that, we have done nothing to prevent it. Our view is that it is within the rights of a political refugee, to whom we have given asylum. to exercise his own freedom, within limits, in his own way, and we have not interfered with that at all. At the same time, we have said that we hope and expect that there will be no embarrassment.

This matter has been discussed times without number in India, and my Prime Minister has made the position of the Government very clear. He has said :

"On the one side there was a dynamic, rapidly moving society; on the other, a static unchanging society, fearful of what might be done to it in the name of reforms. The distance between the two was great and there appeared to be hardly any meeting point. Meanwhile, changes in some forms inevitably came to Tibet ... Though physical barriers were progressively removed, mental and emotional barriers increased...

"When the news of these unhappy developments came to India, there was immediately a strong and widespread reaction. The Government did not bring about this reaction. Nor was this reaction essentially political. It was largely one

275

of sympathy based on sentiment and humanitarian reasons, and also on a certain feeling of kinship with the Tibetan people derived from long-established religious and cultural contracts. It was an instinctive reaction."

Then he went on to say, referring to the general criticism that had been made on the Chinese side about our "interference" :

"We have no desire whatever to interfere in Tibet; we have every desire to maintain the friendship between India and China; but at the same time we have every sympathy for the people of Tibet, and we are greatly distressed at their helpless plight. We hope still that the authorities of China, in their wisdom, will not use their great strength against the Tibetans but will win them to friendly co-operation...".

This was in the early part of the trouble Then more and more refugees began to come in. At the beginning of this problem, various countries-it is not my business to mention their names -intimated to us that their attitude must depend, to a certain extent, upon India's reactions to this business. You will find in this Assembly that India and a large number of Asian countries have not chosen to take an active part in promoting and supporting any movement here. That is not, as has been suggested, because of our fear of anybody or because we are too near China and do not want to displease her. Of course, nobody wants to displease his neighbours. But our action in this matter, our posture in this matter, is dictated by considerations which are not of a selfish character. We recognize that equally the action taken by Ireland and Malaya is dictated by motives which they regard as very worthy and valid, and we respect them. But we expect other people to understand that, if we have taken the position in this matter that we have taken, it is not because of extraneous considerations of pressure but because we think that the welfare of the people concerned and their future largely depend upon the degree of restraint that can be exercised.

The Prime Minister of India has said:

"Now, where a society has existed for hundreds and hundreds of years, it may have outlasted its utility, but the fact is that uprooting it is a terribly painful process. It can be uprooted slowly, it can be changed even with rapidity, but with a measure of co-operation. But any kind of a forcible uprooting of that must necessarily be painful, whether it is a good society or a bad society. When we have to deal with such societies anywhere in the world, which as a social group may be called primitive, it is not an easy matter to deal with it. All these difficult things are happening. They should have happened ; they would have happened, may be a little more slowly but with a greater measure of cooperation, because such a change can only take place effectively and with least harm to the fabric, to those people concerned, if it is done by themselves. They May be helped by others, may be advised by others, but it must be done by themselves.

He goes on to say that this applies to us all. He continued :

The moment a good thing is done by bad means that good thing becomes a bad thing. It produces different reactions. That is, I cannot judge of what is happening in Tibet. I do not have facts, neither does anybody in this house, (Parliament) except broadly some odd fact here and there. But I am merely venturing to say that all these complicated systems-not so easy to disentangle; anyhow, whatever it may be-have brought undoubtedly a great deal of suffering to the people of Tibet."

As a result of this there are 12,000 refugees from Tibet who have crossed into India through the North Eastern Frontier Agency, which is Indian territory, and about 1,600 through Bhutan, through the Himalayan territory, and a few hundreds through Sikkim. These refugees are being cared for. But I should like to say, in order to put the international position correctly, that we have disarmed these refugees on the border. And where there have been any instances of arms not being surrendered we have not allowed these refugees to come into our country. That is international law in regard to all political asylum, which we have carried out.

All this is done on the basis of broad policy. I should like to quote again the Prime Minister :

"Our broad policy was governed by three factors : (1) the preservation of the security and integrity of India; (2) our desire to maintain friendly relations with China; and (3) our deep sympathy for the people of Tibet. That policy we shall continue to follow, because we think that a correct policy not only for

276

the present but even more so for the future. It would be a tragedy if the two great countries of Asia, India and China, which have been peaceful neighbours for ages past, should develop feelings of hostility against each other. We for our part will follow this policy, but we hope that China also will do likewise and that nothing will be said or done which endangers the friendly relations of the two countries ... maintaining our dignity, maintaining our rights, maintaining our self-respect, and yet not allowing ourselves to drift into wrong attitudes and hostile attitudes, and trying to help in removing or in solving such problems AS they arise, we may help a little."

This is still our hope. That is one of the reasons we do not want to enter into the fray, to use strong language either way because, after all, the end of this must be some settlement. These problems cannot be solved quickly. The thing one can do in the circumstances is to create an atmosphere which may bring this about. This is our position.

Then the question arises as to whether the presence of the Dalai Lama and his entourage in India does not create a difference in the political relationship. I have already indicated our position in this matter, and that we stand by the Treaty of 1954. What is more, in regard to the 17-point agreement, to which reference has been made by many representatives in this assembly, it is the view of the Government that that agreement still stands. It is quite true that some of its provisions have been broken, but that appears to be the case in many international treaties. If certain conditions are broken we take whatever action is necessary-either party concerned, talking about a different situation. But the 17-point Agreement as a whole stands, and we have not had any difference of opinion on this.

Sometime Ago, on 30 June, some statement was issued which suggested that there was to be established some political changes, and then the Government of India said : "The Government of India want to make it clear that they do not recognize any separate Government of Tibet, and there is therefore no question of a Tibetan Government under the Dalai Lama functioning in India."

I have stated as far as I can both sides of this proposition. Now the matter comes here either as a political issue or as a humanitarian issue. We could argue the legalism of it, as I said, but we do not intend to do it. My Prime Minister informed Parliament that this matter can come up before the United Nations only for two reasons. He said :

"One is violation of human rights and the other aggression. Now, violation of human rights applies to those who have accepted the Charter of the United Nations, in other words, those members of the United Nations who have accepted the Charter. Strictly speaking, you cannot apply the Charter to people who have not accepted the Charter, who have not been allowed to come into the United Nations."

"Secondly, if you talk about aggression, aggression by one sovereign, independent State on another ... Tibet has not been acknowledged as an independent State for a considerable time, even long before this happened-much less after. Therefore, it is difficult to justify aggression." Then, regarding the legal aspects, the Prime Minister went on to say :

"Then, I come to a certain practical aspect. And that is what good will it achieve" by discussion or resolution in the United Nations. "Suppose we get over the legal quibbles ... It may lead to a debate in the General Assembly or the Security Council, wherever it is taken up" -this was said in September of this year-"a debate which will be an acrimonious debate, an angry debate, a debate which will be after the fashion of cold war. Having had the debate, what then will the promoters of that debate and that motion do? Nothing more. They will return home. After having brought matters to a higher temperature, fever heat, they will go home. They have done their duty because they can do nothing else.

"Obviously, nobody is going to send an

army to Tibet or China for that was not done" in other cases. "It is fantastic to think they will move in that way in Tibet. Obviously not. So, all that will happen is an expression of strong opinion by some, other countries denying it and the matter being raised to the level of cold war-brought into the domain of cold war-and probably producing reactions on the Chinese Government which are more adverse to Tibet and the Tibetan people than even now. So, the ultimate result is no relief to the Tibetan people but something the

277

reverse of it."

This is our position.

Just because a matter is a matter that contains features we do not like, we do not therefore necessarily think this is either the forum or any remedy can be brought about here. We have no evidence in regard to some of these matters, nor is it our business to argue the contrary. All that we should like to say is this : that the Prime Minister has said in some other place that so far as aggression and refugees are concerned, these refugees came into India sometime in March or April of this year, and they have not returned since. There may be some exaggerations, there would be some exaggerations, it may be otherwise. We are not prepared to vouch for it either Way.

The problem, as we see it at present, is this. The Dalai Lama is a very young man--I met him myself; he came to see me before I came here. He is highly respected by his own people, at least by a great part of his own people. There is, as I have outlined, a degree of emotional concern in this matter in India, and one would hope that in all the conditions of the world that his future, the future of his people, lie in their own homeland. We would not push them back, we would not be inhospitable, we would not reverse the laws of political asylum in any way. But we would never depart from the belief that reconciliation is not impossible. In this we are somewhat encouraged in the sense that the Dalai Lama, in spite of all the violent language used in controversy either here or in China, is

still the Vice-Chairman of the People's Republic of China, If the Chinese thought that there was an end to all of these things, I personally would have believed that they would have brought a termination to those affairs. Neither I as an individual nor the Government of India can and wish to hold out any prospects or hopes or anything of that kind in this matter. The fact that the Dalai Lama is still a young person with a great deal of vitality, that he is interested in the welfare of his own people who, apart from these 12,000 are in the trans-Himalayan region in Tibet and, what is more, the Chinese Government has not gone the whole way, it may give us some hope that the expression of opinion in the world, with the passage of time, that some reconciliation would come about and that this sorry chapter of history would now be forgotten, would be a past chapter.

We think that, however acute the problem, the path of reconciliation is the constructive path. It is for those reasons that we shall not tighten this deadlock, we shall not add to this by being parties to any acrimonious discussion here.

There have been many arguments about whether this is a cold war debate or otherwise, about whether the motives were one thing or another, but the issue is not whether the Irish and Malayan delegations brought this subject up here in order to promote the cold war. To our mind, the issue certainly is not whether they were asked by someone else to do it. The issue is, what are the consequences? These consequences are before us in the proceedings of the last two days and in the proceedings before the General Committee. Much has been said which can neither be established nor refuted. Many theories have been brought forward. Out of twenty-five speakers, I think that twelve different views have been expressed on these matters. Therefore, it has not led either to a clarification of the Charter position or to the establishment of a solution to this problem.

The problem is largely concerned with the Tibetan people, who have not figured very much in these debates, and we therefore do not find ourselves in a position to support the resolution that is before us, either as it stands as a whole or any part of it. We have been asked whether, if it were put paragraph by paragraph, some representatives could not support one part or another. What other delegations do must naturally depend upon their own judgment. We have examined the draft resolution very carefully, and so has my Government, and we therefore take the only position we can take, that, in the interests of reconciliation in the future, because it does not promote any construetive step at all, the draft resolution contained in document A/L. 264 cannot have our support. We do not see a basis for it in the sense that if it is a question of human rights we must deal with people here who have subscribed to the Declaration, because the Declaration definitely states that it is the States' parties whom it binds. Therefore, I have to state that this draft resolution cannot have our support. We will abstain on every paragraph of it and on the resolution as a whole.

Our abstention, however, will be in no sense-I repeat, in no sense--a lack of concern or a lack of feeling in regard to the Tibetan people or any reflection upon our relations with China. It merely arises from the posture and policy which I have placed before the Assembly.

278

This also does not mean that we are unconcerned when the issue of human rights is raised before us. We have been told that it stands and that it does not stand on the same footing as the case of colonial repression and various things that happen in States where the sovereignty has been held down by physical force by others. The answer to this, so far as I can see, has been fully stated by my colleague from Ethiopia, and I do not wish to take up any more of the time of this Assembly.

In spite of all that has happened in Tibet, in spite of all that has happened in the corridors of this Assembly and in the debating from either side, in spite of the type of language sometimes used and the approaches, wrong or otherwise to a solution, it is the hope of my people and my Government that the plight of the Tibetan people will be resolved by the process of reconciliation and that the incidents of the recent past will become part of past history. At the present moment, with the other incidents that have taken place on the Indian border, it is not possible for me to say whether this may be either proximate or immediate, but any warming up of these issues or any exacerbation of them cannot lead in any way to reconciliation. But at no time have we lost faith in that sort of thing because, I have said, outside the 12,000 people who are in India, the vast bulk of the Tibetan people are still on Tibetan land. They live there and they have to have their being there, and I hope that the young Dalai Lama who has been their leader, in whom a large number of the Tibetan people place a great faith and who has attracted a great deal of sympathy from various parts of the world, will be able to place his talents and services at the disposal of his people and return to them in dignity and in peace. If any one of us, be it my country or yours or anyone else's, or you, Mr. President, can do anything in order to minister to that reconciliation, that would be our role as part of the United Nations.

INDIA USA IRELAND CHINA RUSSIA BHUTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ETHIOPIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Trusteeship Committee on SouthWest Africa

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on October 23, 1959 on the question of South West Africa.

The following is the full text of his statement: Mr. Chairman,

I would seek your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, for making a few preliminary observations which are in the modest view of my delegation, very relevant to the consideration of this and similar problems before this Committee and I hope you will not regard this as either an abuse of time or going beyond the strict province of a delegation.

We meet here as one of the principal Committees of the United Nations and I say this deliberately because while every Committee is equal to every other, increasingly as years go on, here are debated and decided various syntheses of reapprochement reached on questions which involve some of the more fundamental aspects of the Charter, of Human Rights, neighbourly relations, conciliation and things of that character. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to realise, to take stock of our various responsibilities. We have an outstanding and overwhelming responsibility to the Charter and the Organisation-not the Organisation in the narrow sense of these glass and steel buildings, or of its Secretariat or its delegations but the organisation as bounded by the frontiers of peace, goodwill and neighbourliness and also the good ethical principles set out in its Charter. We have an equally outstanding obligation to the peoples whose fate is involved in the subject we are discussing. That is an obligation which we cannot waive ; that is an obligation of which we cannot afford to be ignorant-and that is the obligation on which we cannot, on the one hand, either afford to be weak or on the other to use brave words which do not carry us anywhere.

Therefore my delegation wishes deliberately to address a few words on the subject of our approach to this problem. We regard a solution that is to be reached here on any vital question, whether it be disarmament, peace, South West Africa or anything else, as possible of achievement only by the processes of conciliation, as the United Nations has no mandatory powers, has no sanctionary powers, has no powers of compulsion ; that is both its strength and its weakness. If it had powers of compulsion, we would have a brittle instrument on our hands which would break down the Organisation. Therefore, as my delegation has stated for the last two succeeding years on the question of Indians in South Africa, the one vote we require in order to bring about a settlement is the vote of the Union. And I am not without hope that the day will come when the Union itself will willingly come forward and take part in these negotiations. Therefore, it is our duty, in spite of all the strong feelings we may have, that we do not create a sense in ourselves

of being apart from the Union, or that this is a party issue in which we seek to divide the Assembly.

It is quite true that the issues raised are of a character that arouse passions, emotions and make response of that character for our expression to be firm, So far as my delegation is concerned, we want to reiterate again, that there are three or four items on the Assembly's agenda in which South Africa is in the position where she may feel that a general attack is made against her. So far as my government is concerned, that is not the position.

We are also conscious of the fact that the present Charter itself and, what is more, the Covenant of the League, its predecessor owes a great deal to the genius of South African statesmen. Gen. Smuts in the case of the Covenant and, what is more, in the case of the provisions we are today discussing, the provisions of the Mandate was the architect. I would not say he was a law-giver of the United Nations-that will be unreal and exaggerated-but he made a big contribution to this, and, what is more, on this very question that is before us he made a contribution of a juridical and basic character which should be of help to us. Therefore, I hope that in spite of the fact that various positions have been taken-matters of administrative mishandling or otherwise, as you may look at it, have come under review here-I hope that these would not become a factor in prejudicing this issue, recognising well that ultimately if the United Nations has to survive the spirit-not only the terms, but also the spirit of the Charter must endure. That is to say that there has to be neighbourliness, there has to be the removal of the elements of conflict among nations, namely, social and political imbalance, that exist in the Empire and the conditions that exist in colonial or para-colonial territories. It is in this way that we address ourselves to this problem. That is why year after year this Committee, in good sense, has found equilibrium and has provided machinery whereby further discussions in spite of all disappointments can be carried on ; whereby South Africa if it were so willing, can, without abandoning any positions, make a fresh start of negotiations with the Good Offices Committee, or the South West

279

Africa Committee. Neither Committee need to exclude the Union itself; for, after all, she has to make the agreement.

Now, we start this year's debate on the basis of the report of the Good Offices Committee we reappointed at the 13th Session. The Chairman of that Committee commands the respect of the Trusteeship Committee. He commands the respect of the rest of the Assembly. He has a great record in standing up for human rights, for the liberties of people, and his country stands also as an example of democratic institutions and of the insistence upon carrying out the principles of the Charter. The findings of the report of the Committee now before us are regrettably, failure. It says : "the Committee regrets to inform the Assembly that it has not succeeded in finding a basis for an agreement under its terms of reference. Now this is a very carefully worded sentence. It says 'it has not succeeded', which is a little different from saving : 'it has failed'.

In other words, that is to say, that it can make a further effort. Secondly, it says : "an agreement under its terms of reference". That might mean that it is an invitation to us to examine these terms of reference, if necessary. Now, the Good Offices Committee could probably have been of a greater potency if some of the other member States, who perhaps would not take exactly the same view as most members on this Trusteeship Committee, had found it possible to share our views in this matter, That may well be the position, let us hope, this year or next year or the year after.

Now, coming to the basic positions : the Union view is-and we must not miss this factthe Union still speaks in terms of a 'new look' or 'new approach' that is said to have been created by statements made in 1957. However cynical some people might be, I think it will be unwise to throw this out of the window. When the Union Government says that its attitude is in conformity with the spirit of the new approach and the resolution which was agreed to by a large majority in 1957 we may profoundly disagree with the Union's interpretation, but we do not disagree with the fact that in recognising the new approach there may be subconsciously this desire that there should be a new approach. Therefore, whatever little support there is in this difficulty

we have to catch up and persuade the Union Government, particularly through States who are nearer to it than we unfortunately are ; we should try and make some progress. We may not be led away either by the feelings that may be aroused in us by the very authentic, from our point of view very authentic, and moving stories we heard- not stories in any fictional sensemoving descriptions we heard from the petitioners who appeared before us, by the information we have from the documents before us, such as the reports of the Good Offices Committee and the Committee on South West Africa and the provocative observations of the distinguished chairman

280

of the Union delegation. These are incidents in the resolving of a problem which is so complex, which is rooted in the desires of strong people to maintain their strength and the weak to break the power of repression. That has been the history of all nations in the world; and if all of us were to carry with us only the remembrance of the wounds and the scars that struggle has left upon them, it will not be necessary for us to move to a peaceful world.

Now, the unfortunate part of this is that while the Union Government has reminded the Committee that it had reiterated its willingness to reach an agreement, the agreement it wants to enter into is with what it calls the surviving Allied and Associated Powers. It is difficult to know who the Allied and Associated Powers are. In the strict term of International Law, India would be one of the Allied and Associated Powers, because partly we are signatories to thaw agreements or treaties signed at that time on behalf of the British Crown. The five Dominions of that time were part of the Allied and Associated Powers. The United States is one of the Allied and Associated Powers ; and, no doubt, therefore, the States associated with her, such as Puerto Rices perhaps, and others may also come in under similar interpretation. France is an Allied and Associated Power and, therefore, Guinea would be able to take its place in the same way as we do, as one of the Allied and Associated Powers. So, if I may say so with great respect, the South African Government would be in no better position if she summons the Allied and Associated Powers, because there will be a large number of members of this family, who at that

time were not regarded as legitimate but are now legitimate ; and, therefore, today the Union would be in no better position vis-a-vis the Allied and Associated Powers than it would be vis-a-vis the United Nations. On the other hand, I feel sure that the country of Field Marshall Smuts and the Government that succeeded his government would not want to plead before us that in 1959 they want to resurrect the ghost of the League of Nations-the League of Nations that foundered in its incapacity to meet the rapacity of the war elements in the world ; they would not want to resurrect that! Nor would they want to go back from their own point of view into the commitments of Allied and Associated Powers.

We, on our part, would be very happy if the South African Government would hold to commitments made in Geneva at the time of the negotiations in regard to the Mandates and no one could have made more radical, more fundamental, more far-reaching statements-statements which cut into the position today held by the Union, than the distinguished former Prime Minister of South Africa. I propose to refer to those statements later. But what worries us is that the Union during the last two years, perhaps by a rather unfortunate misunderstanding of the approach by the Good Offices Committee of the previous year seems to think that the only interpretation of this new approach is, on the one hand, to deal with the Allied and Associated Powers, which will include Guinea, India, Ceylon, China and several other countries-we take this view of the Allied and Associated Powers under international law. If the United Nations chooses to disregard that, then the Convention of 1883 in regard to the Suez Canal would be in trouble. Successor States have certain rights and one must be very careful in quoting, in trying to find ways out of situations through methods that are not very correct; they may lead them into more difficult situations.

The other condition the Union makes, in order to find a settlement, is to partition South West Africa. Now partition has now become a well-known imperial device. In the old days the Empire ruled territories by dividing their populations. From times of the Roman empires have followed the principle : divide and rule. Now in the post-war years the fashion seems to be : divide and leave. They divided our country and left it ; they divided our people and left them. So it is divide and leave. So now division seems to be the position. Now, I would like the Assembly, however, to look at this problem of partition from another point of view. Partition is only one aspect of it ; the proposal is not to partition in order to create two independent units of South West Africa. Partition is another name for annexation. Partition means cut the country up, take all the good part and amalgamate it with the Union and leave the remainder, if you want, to experiment with trusteeship. Those are some of the aspects of this problem of partition.

So partition should not be viewed merely as partition. After all, there is no objection to partition as such, there being other things to compensate for it. There are many nations sitting around here today, which a hundred years ago were parts of much larger units, whether they be Austro-hungarian Empire, or any other empire, not to speak of the British Empire. As I said, there is no objection to partition if it were intended to take off the parts which have become matured in order that they may express themselves or rule themselves better. But partition

281

is only the other name for annexation. Now the motive, the purpose, the political purpose and indeed there is no secret about it, is to integrate and take over the richer part of South West Africa, which contains all the diamonds. I think poor people like ourselves must pray, must wish that there were no minerals under the earth in our country, for they attract civilisation. The minerals of a country give that country its name, but they are exploited by, they belong to somebody else. That is the experience of our colleagues in Ghana. So, this partition means the amalgamation of the richer part of Africa with all its great mineral wealth and, what is more, with the most salubrious climate-there is one way of finding in Africa where the climate is agreeable : that would be where the white populations live. I remember distinctly the debate that went on about East Africa when the first Labour Government took office in England. The then Colonial Secretary, who had come under attack at that time had said that the high lands were for the whites and the

low lands for the others-he did not use the expression "the others;" he said something else which I do not wish to repeat. So the high lands are for the white. There it is. So the high lands, the most salubrious places of occupation in the great riches of South West Africa, will be amalgamated with the Union.

There is another aspect which we should look at. Supposing the United Nations by an act of unwisdom agreed to partition, or supposing by force measure something was inflicted, then what happens ? In S.W.A. develops an empire, the empire is extended to this territory on the one hand of which there is the Union of South Africa which proclaims the doctrine that its survival is only possible, as in the case of Sparta, by the liberty of 300 out of 300,000. On the other side of it stands the Portuguese Dominion of Angola; and on the top of it stands Bechuanaland, in a very tender spot and a very tender position at the mercy of the great forces of these two States. A little above is the Central African Federation, which is taking very good lessons from the Union and following the example, indeed as a pupil should. And then there lies to the east coast the territory of Nyasaland, about which out of courtesy and tenderness to our colleagues of the United Kingdom I say very little.

This is the picture of South West Africa. What we are discussing here is NOT partition. We are discussing here a scheme which will bring about a great authoritarian empire under the doctrine of apartheid. It is our business to persuade the South African Government. I do not want to make any secret of it. Apart from this question of race or apartheid, the South African delegation is one of the most interesting and the easiest delegations to deal with. But there is a big 'apart'; That is the trouble. On all other questions we meet them and we can discuss intelligently; we can discuss philosophical views of Gen. Smuts and everything else. We hope that we can some day persuade them, and I have no doubt we can persuade them : there are no human beings, there are no nations, there are no communities which cannot be persuaded. But there is one principle, Mr. Chairman, in regard to persuasion : no one can persuade anybody unless he is willing to be persuaded. Persuasion means the throwing out of one's own personality through the doors of one's mind to somebody else. Now for fear of being

persuaded if we shut our minds, how do our minds reach somebody else? So even in the hardest of times we must not give up this hope of reaching the mind of the South African Union, which has got great liberal traditions-at one time a war was waged by their own people-against whom, I shall not say-in the interest of liberty, as it was then understood. What is more, modern South Africa. I mean white South Africa. is the creationwhether we like parts of it or not-of pioneers who ventured out and while it is true that some acts of cruelty might have followed, they were also accompanied by acts of great adventure and things of that kind. There is also in this matter of humanity an element to which we can appeal, which we must mobilise and use as a counter-poise against evil forces. This doctrine of partition I would like the Committee to look upon not merely as a device of splitting, or splitting the difference, as the English would call it. It is no argument to say that it is a large territory : it is so large, therefore give us a small slice of it. The small slice, first of all, is a big slice in depth. Secondly it involves the principle of annexation.

Now here I would like to look a little back at the history. The Union of South Africa was the only country in the inter-war years which diaregarded the principles of the mandate, Japan following soon after in regard to the Pacific Islands. The Union of South Africa conferred union citizenship on the people of South W.A. in 1923. She had no business to do so, because it was not her territory. At that time the people protested, and the Mandates Commission had a great deal to say about that action of the Union. So, this idea of annexation has always been in their minds.

I do not speak of annexation in the sense of bare naked conquest. They (the Union) profoundly believe, probably, that the best interest of civilisation is served by the doctrine of apartheid,

282

by the kind of government they have after all we have heard the petitioners saying that there are some good hospitals. Therefore they Probably think that more a system of apartheid, that under the system of partition there will be some good hospitals even though for a few people only. The point is that these ideas of annexation have always been with them, and you may, remember, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 in London and afterwards here the Union Government, before the Trusteeship Committee, as I said yesterday, the Union Government, prepared that they were going to submit proposals to the United Nations for the annexation, or rather for what is called making this territory as integral part of the Union. Now integral part clause appears in several Trusteeship Agreements concluded by the. United, Kingdom and by France, but with very good qualifications. It reads to the effect that a certain Territory "shall be administered as though it were an integral part etc." As though it were integral part", in English means that it is not an integral part. But in the case of South Africa the Union wants to reverse this. I do not say this just to give the history and take up your time, but it is necessary to understand how deepseated are their views and where they lead to, and, therefore, it is not sufficient to deal with them merely on the surface. The South African Union has always looked upon the Mandated Territory, apart from the statements of Gen. Smuts and other more liberal element in South Africa as part of colonial conquest. Their attitude reminds me of a Japanese representative of Nagv regime, who at one time is reported to have said, when it was pointed out to have come up, that the fortification of the South Sea Islands was against the Mandate-I do not vouch for the statementhe is reported to have said : Mandates-What ! President Wilson would not allow us to call anything by its proper name in 1921, and therefore we call them Mandates. And that might have been the Union's view also.

My position is confirmed by all that we have heard, by the information we do not get, and, what is more by the implications of the small information that came from the expert of the Union delegation, who very kindly spoke to us. All these point to the fact that the picture in South West Africa today is that of a colonial empire. This picture exists in 1959 and not in 1919.

To come back to the report of the Good Offices Committee that Committee has reported failure and South African Union has stated to that Committee that the only way to deal with the situation from their point of view is to enter into a north treaty with the Allied and Associated Powers. This position is worth examining. I hope-I am sure the Secretariat of the United Nation, would have no option and I do not say that in a totalitarian way-but to advice this Committee that among the Allied and Associated Powers are some thirty countries and not all of them are the category that is contemplated by the Union. If that is so, this idea is worth an examination, though it is open to other defects and we ourselves would not recommend it. Then there is the second proposition of partition. That proposal the Committee has already rejected, and then said enough about it.

From the Good Offices Committee we go on to the S.W.A. Committee. This Committee has been in existence for many years. I think it speaks well of the sense of the United Nations, that in spite of all our failures and in spite of all our difficulties we have kept this Committee going, kept it going not as a fossil, not because we had a committee and therefore we must keep it going, not for that reason. That committee is a proclamation to the Union and to South West Africa that the United Nations still feel that there are methods of negotiations, that there are methods of approach and rapprochement and so on. That Committee has survived inspite of many attacks, and I hope the Assembly will do nothing either to annihilate it, either to make it extinct, or to take away its prestige. For four decades the administration of S. A. has been conducted by the Union under the Mandates-System, whose guiding principle is that the wellbeing and development of the territory's inhabitants from a sacred trust of civilisation. And what has the Committee on South Africa to say? Its report tells us that the Union of S. A. has failed and continues to fail to carry out the obligations it undertook to promote to the utmost the material and the moral well-being and the progress of the inhabitants of the territory. "The Committee," the report continues, "has become increasingly disturbed at the trend of the administration in recent years, and at the apparent intention of the mandatory power to continue to administer the territory in a manner contrary to the mandate,"-here I would like to interpolate that the South African Government has publicity proclaimed that it has no desire to go against the Mandate. Of course the interpretation may be different but they would be quite willing, presumably, they would be proud topically to follow, if it is proved to them that the implementation of the Mandate requires this

plan or the other-contrary to the Mandate", the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the advisory

283

opinions of the International Court of Justice, and the resolutions of the General Assembly. "I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is it possible for any member State or the United Nations to go against more injunctions than this catalogue that. has been recorded by the Committee on South West Africa. Therefore this again we point out to the Union-not in the sense of what the distinguished foreign minister once before called the pillorying-the Union'-but in order that it be known to their people, who in their limited democracy, profess to a democratic way of life and where public opinion matters, even though only among a small part of the population. I have an interesting anecdote about this, Mr. Chairman. In 1921, the League of Nations was discussing the populations of the world. Each country was asked to give its population figure. The distinguished delegate of the Union at that time said that it was $1 \frac{1}{2}$ million. The delegate of India said that he thought there were some Africans there too. "O, 8 million ; you mean the Africans." But in the context of their own limited democracy, there is a public opinion, there are news papers; there is a parliamentary opposition, there are free churches; there is freedom of worship and, what is more, there is increasing industrialization. No country in the world be it the Union of South Africa or any other country will be able to resist the impact, the powerful force of industrial labour in the days to come. I say this with no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of South Africa

The Union has another inhibition. On the one hand it says that it involves to negotiate with the United Nations, but on the other it is union to come to an agreement with the United Nations, as the second party. Now, this is rather a strange insistence for the sake of prestige or for the sake of saving face. My country, so far as possible, does not hold to this doctrine of what is called saving the face. Very often people in saving faces, lose their heads. In this case, when the Good Offices Committee says that the negotiations must be with the United Nations as a party, it is basing itself on one of the three doctrines on which the advisory opinion of the Court has given common conclusions, both in respect of the majority judgment, and also the various minority judgments. Therefore, negotiation with the United Nations as a party is agreed upon by everyone almost on all sides except by the Union, and, therefore, we readily hope that the member States, who are closer in their emotional and political relations to them, would be able to persuade the Union of the rather invidious position that will arise if the Union of South Africa, which must claim for itself a great contribution in the formulation of the Charter including its racial provisions, would want to disregard the United Nations. Even today, South Africa has admitted that this territory has international status. Are they now going to say that status has not to be negotiated with this world body, of which the Union is a member, and in regard to which there are no rivals at present in the world?

In this matter of S.W.A. the usual difficulty, I would not call it a red-herring, the usual difficulty, the usual plea that is raised, the plea of domestic jurisdiction does not arise. Now in this Assembly there are States who, on merits, would agree that if they were dealing with an issue that owing to either philosophical or juridical reasons or their own domestic considerations, they would not want that matter to be discussed in the Assembly under Article 2 (7) does not arise, because sovereignty of this territory does not vest in the Union. The Union may have laid claims to it but it has never pleaded domestic jurisdiction so far that puts one usual difficulty out of the way.

Arising from this debate, Mr. Chairman, these are four or five main things which we have to consider. Among them are their statements made by the petitioners; and here I am sure neither my Asian or African colleagues nor the petitioners themselves nor anyone else who holds a radical view on this question, will think that I am in any way guilty of derogation of the petitioners case before us. It may be granted for argument's sake that a petitioner, a person who makes a representation, is probably likely to present one side of the case more than the other : that is the worst that can be said. But what has been said by the petitioners-not one of them, not only the 8 or 9 who came here but also in the large numbers of other written petitions that we have examined-even if 10% of all that was said

were true, if 10% of that represented the facts, then I think a case of maladministration prevailing in the territory contrary to the provision of Mandate has been established. Therefore, it is not necessary for us, in my opinion, to examine every word or every syllable of the petitions. It should suffice generally to take the broad outline of the presentation. It is an important fact that tribal chiefs and others who are in suppression in South West Africa still have great faith in this organisation and still want to send petitions to it. It is also important to remember that those men who have come before us, particularly of non-African origin, have taken very considerable risks in obtaining information, not newspaper stories for any publicity for themselves. They have come before us in a serious

284

way; they have taken very considerable risks to make, shall we say, a little split in this curtain-I do not say what particular colour this curtain is-on South West Africa. They have done a service to their own country and to the United Nations as a whole by bringing about what is sought to be achieved in the Charter as freedom of information. I would like to say on behalf of my delegation that we owe a debt of gratitude to these men, who at a great risk to themselves and, I must say that in all the circumstances as they saw them, with great restraint have presented the case of South West Africa before us. Their statements. along with other material form. the natural basis of our judgment.

Another set of factors, which we have to examine, is the juridical position, rights and obligations in the context of this particular problem. And Yet another factor is which I purposely put in another category, the Charter provisions, which - are of more than juridical importance because they he at the root of the foundations of the United Nations and involve great moral and ethical issues. I cannot say in that juridical issues are often divorced from moral issues but they are not coterminus.

Mr. Chairman, besides all this there are three proposals before the Assembly. One comes from our neighbouring country of Nepal, another from Mexico and the third from Iran. There I propose to refer to at a later stage. At this time, though it is a very old, hardy proposition, it is well for us to go very briefly into the background of this problem. S.W.A., like many other countries, came into the pale of the modem civilisation in the context of imperial conquest. There was a time when the British Empire did not want to have any part or lot of it. There were several occasions when missionaries and traders asked for protection but the Government of the 19th century England said that it did not want to get involved in these matters. Fortunately that was the time of little Englanders-they expanded afterwards and now they are not so little : At any rate at that time Britain did not go and conquer this place. By the middle of the nineteenth century the German connection with this territory has been established in an unofficial way and, as it happened in those years, the local chieftains-I do not suppose they consulted their populations--made agreements with them and gave them hospitality. This was not the first time that things happened in that way. I have read then in history of an incident in my own home town, where I was born, where the emissary of a great country visited in 1498, landed on that coast and visited the ruler of that time, who showered him with presents and honours and the result was that he took away 1200 inhabitants to his home country and we never heard of them afterwards. Anyway the Portuguese entered this territory and the other parts of Africa which they now have as parts of their colonial empire. However, in the particular area the German influence prevailed and they established themselves after the rebuffs of the then British Empire which was not then prepared to give them assistance and protection though afterwards it became a little more sympathetic. I am not going to read out the whole history of this, but what has to be remembered is this that South West Africa was at no time a 'No Man's Land'.

In 1883 a merchant of Bremen obtained from the Hottentot chief, Joseph Frederick of Bethany a cession of land, later known as Luderitz Bay. Bismark, still unconverted to a colonial policyhe was still a school boy in the imperial businesscaused the British Government to be informed beforehand-they called Britain the elder brotherof the protectorate in words that were almost an invitation to Great Britain to assume sovereignty over the territory. This opportunity, like the previous one, was allowed to slip away-by this unfortunate historian-and in April 1884 Bismark took the initiative and assured Luderitz and his establishments of German protection. The protection is a funny word, Mr. Chairman I You know, under the Treaty of South East Asian Treaty Organisation, your country and mine are under protection even though we did not ask for it ! Below the 28th parallel, or whatever it is, protection is just like the sun which rises and sets without our knowing it. To continue with the historical account belated attempts by the British and Cape Government-i.e. the South African Government of the time, to retrieve the situation were unavailing. In the later part of the 19th century however the Empire had come into existence ; by 1857 India had passed under the Crown and the Empire as such had taken shape. But belated attempts by the British and Cape Governments to retrieve the situation in Southern Africa was unavailing, and in due course protection over German traders developed into full-fledged German annexation of the whole territory. Now there is nothing wrong in it : it is a very old doctrine, Mr. Chairman, that 'Flag follows the trade' not 'Trade follows the Flag,' that is wrong ! Flag follows the trade! British anxiety over German designs in the territory and the fear that the Germans might join across the continentthose were the days of Czarist expansion when Russia and the United Kigdom were everywhere establishing, what are called, spheres of influence, nothing else but spheres of influence in China

285

and other places; the antagonism between Russia and these people is an old business and nothing new. But to continue British anxiety over German designs on the territory-they tried to solve it in those days by inter-dynastic marriages-and the fear that the Germans might join across the continent with the Boers of the Transvaal was one of the reasons that prompted the British Government to declare a protectorate over Bechuanaland and that became part of the Brirish Empire. The first German representative sent to this territory-he does not bear a good name in the present contextwas His Excellency Goering. He was succeeded by Kurt von Francois--that was also not a good name, the first part I mean. He transferred the capital from somewhere to somewhere. It was there that, the first German farmers settled in 1892. And unlike most of us these farmers were very industrious people. In 1893 there was trouble with Hendrik Witbooi, and the Hottentot chiefs

I suppose he did not like this man going into his farm. I believe it happens in the Middle West over here that people going into the farm are not liked. The Germans attacked this man's village and 150 of his subjects including women and children were killed. It could be argued of course that these subjects had no human rights and therefore somebody was trying to impose inhuman rights upon them. The Germans attacked this village and 150 of his subjects were killed. Then Francois was succeeded by Theodor Leutwein, who tried to treat the native population with consideration. You will find in the history of all empires it is always firmness plus the reverse, and the process: goes on. It is the pendulum in all foreign rule. It is part of a policy, but when it goes too far the democracy at home starts biting.

So Theodore Leutwein found much cause for dissatisfaction and it required only a spark to set the country ablaze. The Bondelswaartz Hottentots rose in 1903--come to modern times. This rising was suppressed, but early in 1904 the Hereros revoited and killed a number of German settlers, but not the British or the Boers. The rebellion was quickly quelled but in the 'cleaning up'-it is called 'mopping up' now a days-in the mopping up operations the Hereros were ferociously harried by Gen. Trotha-this man's successor-and were then reduced and this is the important part to which I want to come to-from a tribe of 80,000 people to 15,000 starving refugees, many of whom found sanctuary in Bechuanaland, which was British territory and where liberal traditions prevailed and these people could move in there.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the background in which this Territory starts its career in the modern world. When we talk about sovereignty, we must recognise the fact that power was established not by legitimate rights but by conquest, which was recognised in those days. Then came the period of the Great War-the First World Warand German expansionism encountered the opposition, or rather the firmness of the British empire and its associates, and was defeated. But in years that followed came another troubleanother invitation to civilzation ! In the years that followed these troubles, the depopulation resulting from the methods used in suppressing the rebellion caused a labour shortage. The only thing that did not happen here was that the British Government not ruling this place no Indian immigrants were sent like in South Africa. If S.W.A. were part of the British Empire other consequences might have followed. Labour shortage hampered the development of the territory. The discovery of diamonds in 1908 led to the considerable increase in European population which rose nearly to 15000 by 1913. On the 6th August 1914, that is two days after the declaration of the First World War, the Government of the Union undertook to assume all obligations resting upon the British regular garrison in South Africa. That was a part of the Empire arrangements. Britain having gone to war with Germany, in our part of the world the administration of our country took over whatever responsibilities there were ; South Africa then a colonial territory did the same quite rightly. South Africa then sent a military expedition of its own to German South Africa. And I think, I must say in fairness and in historical context this replacement of regular British garrison and the sending of the military expedition was part of the operations of the First World War against the enemy, Germany, and not against these people. Soon after the preliminary occupation of Luderitz Bay the Boer rebellion interrupted these operations-that is to say the Boer business had not come guite to a conclusion by that time. But later the campaign against the Germans developed rapidly and successfully. In January, 1915 South African forces advanced into the country. This is the beginning of the conquest from acting on behalf of the British Empire against the common enemy now before the period of colonial occupationand after a campaign of swift moment in semidesert and waterless country forces the surrender of the Germans on July 9, 1915. This is the war story.

Then came the end of the empire when the former territories of Germany and Turkey, which normally would have been the booty of war, came under the system of the international tutelage. Thanks to the initiative of the American President,

286

who had entered the war with the promise of no annexations and no reparations, annexations did not take place and these territories after a great deal of haggling and bargaining between victorious. Powers came under the. System of Mandates and South Africa became a `C' mandate, being regarded then as an undeveloped region-God knows why-because these people had been under civilisation for at least six or seven hundred years before with their own tribal systems and with their own ways of rule and, what is more, they were civilised enough for the German missionaries on the one hand and the traders afterwards on the other to conclude treaties with them to acquire land ! But they were not civilised enough to be placed under 'B' or 'A' mandate! At any rate, South West Africa went under `C' mandate and that 'C' mandate went to His Brittanic Majesty and His B.M. made the Union responsible for its administration.

I do not know what the arrangement was that made the Union responsible as part of its defence in the administration of S.W. Africa. The purpose of this historical account, which I have given as briefly as I can, is to point out, Mr. Chairman, that on the one hand the occupation originally was forcible, but at the same time not forcible against the population ; I want to be very accurate about this-not against the population but only against the Germans. The whole operation was in order to beat the enemy and having beaten him the booty of war went to the community of nationals as "Sacred Trust" and that "Sacred Trust" was transferred to the Union and, therefore, the Union's title is only the Mandate. If the Union were today to say that they are not bound by the obligations of the Mandate, then the Union cannot take the benefits. If she must have the smooth, she must have the rough ; if she must have the rough, she must have the smooth. If there are no obligations under the Mandate, there are no rights under the Mandate either. Now if we take the Mandate away, what is left? In that case S.W.A. must come before the United Nations in the same way as Algeria has come before the United Nations for the liberation of the suppressed people. But we do not see this as a colonial position. In the interest of historical accuracy, in the interest of the people of this State, and out of defence to the Union, therefore, it either is a Mandated Territory, which it is-and if it is argued that the Union has no obligations under the Mandate, then the whole basis of the Mandate disappears : you cannot have it half and half. My delegation has said in the case of another Territory that you cannot keep one part and give up the other one. The Union representative Gen. Smuts who took considerable

work in formulating the mandates system had himself said that while this territory was to be administered and so on there was no question of the transfer of sovereignty. Even at the risk of taking the time of this Committee it is necessary for me to point this out.

Article 22 of the Covenant says-"To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant." That is article 22 of the League Covenant. It says further-"The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or this geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League." If sovereignty rests in the Union there would be no 'behalf'. 'Behalf' means some sort of agency, some sort of wardenship. And therefore sovereignty does not exist there. Here I would like to say that in the opinion of my delegation the Union of South Africa is an advanced nationadvanced nation in terms of economic position, or political power, or civilisation, as we generally understand it, or education etc. We not only admit that, we base our position on this that she is an advanced nation capable of this administration. We do not contest its geographical position and we also think that she is best able to undertake this responsibility. But that responsibility has to be exercised in terms of the Mandate, which alone confers this privilege upon them.

If this were not sufficient-this is in the Covenant, Sir-Gen. Smuts, who was responsible for this, has himself gone into this question of the Mandate. He says - "The Mandatory State should look upon its position as of a great trust and honour, not as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for it or its nationals. And in case of any flagrant and prolonged abuse of this trust the populations 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

287

it to somebody else, if necessary."

Now we come, Sir, to the present position. While I do not wish the Committee to be taken again into the petitioner's case and what not, I do believe it my duty just to refer to certain matters. These acts of administration are not individual actions. My delegation does not take the view that there are in South Africa large numbers of administrators who, like those in the Hitler regime which had professional sadists, went to inflict cruelty. We are only talking in terms of criticism or offering our comments on a system not upon individuals. The South Africans we come across, we have met, are people for whom we have highest respect, but they are is well victims of the systems as those whom they victimise. Now the South West Africa Committee says "The Committee has shown in earlier reports that although the administration of the territory has previously been characterised by separate treatment of the different racial components of the population, the adaptation of this situation to the policy of apartheid, the concept of racial segregation and the separate development of the races as a permanent feature of the structure of society has been intensified since the transfer of Native administration from the territorial authorities to the Government of the Union of South Africa in 1955". I think it is necessary to point out that we need not go far. There is the Declaration of Human Rights to which South Africa is a party where it says that people must be governed by the will of those who are being governed and so on. There is no representation of those large populations in the South East African Legislature, or in the Union's Parliament for whose welfare the Union is responsible. The territory is represented, I believe, by six persons in the Lower House and four in the Upper House of the Union Parliament and none of them belongs to the indigenous population nor has the indigenous, population any vote. Therefore, there is no question even of a limited franchise. All non-Europeans in the territory are prohibited by law from voting in the territorial elections. They are also prohibited

from being candidates for elections since membership in both the Union Parliament and the Legislative Assembly of South West Africa is restricted by law to Europeans. Therefore, either in the indirect election or whatever it may be, in the limited election to the Union Parliament or in the Local Parliament of S.W.A., the non. European propulations are excluded. They are prohibited from being candidates and they are prohibited from taking part in the elections. Therefore there is no question that this is nothing except what is comparable to a democracy of the Greek of Spartan days where 300 people had all the rights and 300,000 did not. Then that is one part of apartheid:

The other is the innocuous system of Pass Laws which prevail in this territory! Pass Laws are not just identification cards like those carried by citizens of the United States or any other country. I remember reading a judgment of a distinguished South African judge, Justice Bloomfield, who said: "We (South Africans) have passed so many laws in our country so that when an African gets out of his house, he commits a crime. He makes statutory offences." Now here are some of these Pass Laws! Any policeman may at any time call upon an African who has attained the age of sixteen years to produce his reference book. If a reference book has been issued to him but he fails to produce it because it is not in his possession at the time, he commits a criminal offence and is liable to a fine not exceeding ten pounds or imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month." It is not so much the enormity of the punishment but the fact that people should have to live in this kind of terror and should have to identify themselves, as demand, in the way under penal sanctions. Pass Laws are applicable only to one section of the population. In other countries we carry identifications equally applicable to everybody. There are practices in other countries which we do not approve of. I myself do not want my thumb impression taken by policemen but it is a normal thing of this country. That is, where it is the law they do it. Another example of discriminatory Legislation: "Whenever the Governor-General, in his unfettered discretion-he need not ask anybody-deems it fit to issue the necessary proclamation, an African who has been required by an order of Court to leave a certain area must do so, and no Court of Law may grant an interdict

preventing such removal, nor may appeal or review proceedings, stay or suspend such removal, even when it has been established beyond all doubt that the order of the Court was intended for some other persons and was served upon him in error." You cannot even argue mistaken identity and the person in regard to whom the mistake is made has to pay the penalty! I could read on in this way quite a lot but there is not the time to do so.

Now supposing, for instance, it were argued, as it may be arguable, that things are not so bad; they could be worse as we were told so many times. But we still-as a government, as a people--still hold to the view that even good government is no substitute for people's liberty. It is far better for people to have their own bad government than somebody else's good government.

288

Now, therefore, we come to the juridical position under the Covenant of the League under Artical 22, much of which I have read out. The juridical position is in regard to the World Court and, here again, I intended to go into greater detail but since the delegation of China says they are going to deal with it afterwards, if necessary I will come back to it. There are, Sir, two main sets of documentation coming from the World Courtone belongs to 1950 and the other to later periods -and I must place the whole facts before you. There are parts of this judgment which probably will appear contradictory to one another. Equally there and the answers to these questions were--1. "the South are minority judgments. There are differing views. We have tried, African Union continues to have the international obligations stated as, far as possible, in all honesty to analyse these and find the common factors and this is what we find.

Three questions were referred to the World Court.

1. Does the Union of South Africa continue to have international obligations under the Mandate for South West Africa and, if so, what are those obligations ?

2. Are the provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter applicable and, if so, in what manner, to the territory of South West Africa ?

3. Has the Union of South Africa the competence to modify the international status of the Territory of South West Africa, or, in the event of a negative reply, where does competence rest to determine and modify the international status of the Territory ?

And the answers to these questions were--1. "the South African Union continues to have the international obligations stated in Article 22" and then this answer proceeds to set out what those obligations are in regard to the Mandate and in regard to Chapter XII of the Charter. On the first question, the answer was reached by 12 votes to 2. I do not want to read the names of the judges, that will not be proper. By 12 votes to 2 the Court is of the opinion that "the Union of South Africa continues to have international obligations stated in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and in the Mandate for South West Africa as well as the obligation to transmit petitions from the inhabitants of that territory, the supervisory functions to be exercised by the United Nations, to which the annual reports and the petitions are to be submitted, and the reference to the Permanent Court of International Justice to be replaced by a reference to the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 7 of the Mandate and Article 37 of the Statute of the Court". That is to say, that by a majority of 12 to 2 the World Court advises the United Nations that under Article 22 of the Covenant the obligations remain with South Africa to transmit information and positions received from inhabitants, and that supervisory functions are to be exercised by the United Nations and also that any member of this organization, who was a member of the League of Nations, under Article 37 of the Statute of the Court and Article 7 of the Mandate, can invoke the jurisdiction of the Court .

On Question (2), i.e., are the provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter applicable, and, if so, in what manner, the answer is unanimously in the affirmative and the Court has added-"The provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter are applicable to the Territory of South West Africa in the sense that they provide a means by which the territory may be brought under the Trusteeship System."

Now I haven't the time to place it together with other statements that have been made, but

what the Union has said is that the Mandate in that way cannot function because the League has demised. But for want of time I could have placed before you several statements in which South Africa has herself come here and said that they are prepared to honour these obligations. They were parties to the creation of the Trusteeship System, and Gen. Smuts himself said that Trusteeship System was even superior to the Mandate. These are his words : "The Trusteeship System is not only a substitute for the Mandate but even superior to the Mandate and takes these things over." The World Court has also said that the Charter provides an alternative. If the League has lapsed-it cannot be said that there is nobody whom one may pay ones taxes or who else will receive them. While it may be technically true that the United Nations cannot compel-it cannot compel anybody-to place territories under trusteeship, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Italy and United States, they all placed their former mandated areas under the trusteeship system, of their own free will. The same request was made to South Africa times without number and it was the understanding in 1946 (I remember the discussions at that time) that there will be no difficulty in this matter. In San Francisco Gen. Smuts had said at the Conference which led to the establishment of the system : "The principle of trusteeship is now applied generally. It applies to all dependent peoples in all dependent territories. It covers all

289

of them, and therefore an extension has been given to the principle of very far-reaching and important character. The application of these principles to colonies of a large number of powers will mean a general improvement of administration-I hope the imperial powers will take notice of this-and the setting up of quite new ideals for many of the dependent peoples in those colonies."

Now, if the Union of South Africa is not at the present moment, I say the present moment, disposed to entertain our views, may we, in all humility, submit these documents, of probably the greatest statesman of South Africa has produced and one of the founders of the United Nations, for their attention. Gen. Smuts also said at the same meeting that "if these additions for the advancement of these dependent peoples, politically, socially, economically, are carried out, I have no doubt that the result will be very far reaching. The result will be that as both Sections 'A' and 'B' (Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter) are applied to dependent peoples all over the world, wherever a territory is inhabited by dependent peoples-peoples who are not advanced to look after themselves, peoples who are still backward in development one way or another, they will have the benefits of this new administration.

...Also that the United Nations organization is an important part of it"-Gen. Smuts says that it will be for the United Nations organisation to see that dependent peoples get the benefits contemplated for them in the system. This is to say that Gen. Smuts concedes, not only concedes but argues the case of supervision.

In San Francisco Gen. Smuts not only conceded, he was the advocate of the Trusteeship System with all its implications including the supervision by the United Nations and not by the Allied and Associated Powers or anybody else. Again speaking here on the 4th of November 1946 before this very Committee, and I distinctly remember this. Gen. Smuts said that the Trusteeship System embodied in the Charter has taken the place of the Mandate System occupied in the, Covenants of the League of Nations. Therefore while the Court might have doubts whether the United Nations is successor to the League of Nations or not, South African Government of that time had no doubts whatsoever in that matter. This is what its representative, Gen. Smuts said about this system of Trusteeship. "It is not only the successor to the Mandate System and is in many respects an advance and improvement upon it. The Mandate System dealt with German and Turkish colonies after the Great War. The present Trusteeship System has much wider scope and deals with all territories, whether or not they were under trusteeship or voluntary agreement."

Now, Sir, the fundamental concept of the Trust itself, as that of the Mandate, is the advancement of the inhabitants and their progress in social, economic and political fields and this advance is to be with due regard to the wishes of the inhabitants of the territory. There is no record here, Sir, of any consultation of the inhabitants of the territory in the way that is meant in that position. I would have liked to place more documentation before you, but most of us are familiar with these things and the only purpose of placing them here again is to remind members of the Committee of the position as it is.

Now about these three proposals. One is the proposal of the Mexican delegation. Naturally it is not a proposal to which we can object. But if South Africa will agree to supervise by a body composed on the same pattern as the Trusteeship Council, it is very difficult to understand why there should be replacement of the Trusteeship Council, but so far as the principle of it is concerned we do not find any objection to it except, of course, that the Trusteeship Council is established by the Charter ; and there must be some very good reasons for its displacement. But, of course, if its composition is suitable-and I am sure that members of this Council, if their absence from a body of that kind will assist in any way to bring this territory under Trusteeship, I am sure in the general interest they will be prepared to do sowe have no objection on the merits as put in that Way. But in principle it appears that if on the one hand you have the U.K., the U.S.A., France and the Union (four) and on the other four elected members the purpose is merely to exclude some countries and that may create difficulties. But in any case it is another Trusteeship Council-Trusteeship Council 'B' instead of the present Trusteeship Council 'A' and whether we have the power to create a thing like that, I do not know.

Our friend from Nepal has suggested that we should send a fact-finding mission to South West Africa. We have no objection to that, but if the Union is not prepared to accept the authority of the United Nations and will not negotiate with it, then of course that creates a difficulty regarding the fact-finding mission. But it appears to us, and I feel sure that my colleague from Nepal will agree, that under the Mandates System and, so far as the principle is concerned, under the Trusteeship

290

System and under the statements made by Gen. Smuts over here on a particular point, the Mandatory Power cannot bar any member of the then League of Nations and now the United Nations from having access to these territories. That is to say, in a Trust Territory the Administering Authority cannot create privileges for itself which it cannot afford to other members of the United Nations.

So, in our humble submission, it is open to any member of the United Nations, any Government, any State member of the United Nations to send out people not necessarily to fact-find but to visit these areas, so that our organisation would be seized better of all these things. In any attempt of that kind we are not for a moment suggesting that we should create greater difficulties with regard to South Africa by raising other issues which are unsettled. All we are saying is that a fact-finding mission, even if it cannot come about in the way Nepal has suggested, its substance can be obtained by individual efforts on the part of member governments-and whether it is good thing or not it is for the Committee to consider. We may make an appeal to member governments -particularly member governments who are more of persona grata with the Union that some of us may be-to visit these areas so that the Committee can also feel that we are not being influenced or coming to conclusions only on the basis of documents submitted by the Good Offices Committee or the South West Africa Committee or by our own predilections or by previous history or by the petitioners, but by seeing for themselves the picture that exists. The representative of Iran made another suggestion which, of course, also requires the consent of the Union. That again is the position with regard to the proposal concerning the consultation of the inhabitants.

Now, Sir, soon I hope we will come to the stage of submitting resolutions in this matter. Here, my delegation will take you back for five minutes. We will not take any position and we would not, in any way, promote an activity which is intended, so to say, to pile up opprobrium on the Union. That is not our purpose. We would like not to submit a resolution but to make some suggestions. It will be good thing if into the Committee on S.W.A. the Union were elected as member. She would be there : we could ask her question : she could assist us. The Committee can be assisted by her presence in it, and what is more, the member from South Africa, who will sit on S.W.A. Committee, would not be barred from going into the territory and in that way S.W.A. Committee will become more representative. The second suggestion we would like to make is one that has been submitted before; we will make a request to the South African Government once again, not only once again but as many times as may be necessary-that is not putting it off, we will request the S.A. Government to assist the United Nations in the solution of this problem and take the assurance, so far as we are concerned, of our delegation and so far as others are concerned that this is not an attempt to frame an indictment or to allocate blame or praise, but merely a step in the progress of the United Nations under Article 76. We hope that the Assembly will make an appeal to member governments first on the lines I mentioned a while ago and also to use their influence with the South African Government that this question, which creates so much ill-feeling, takes so much time of this Committee, and creates on the one hand anticipatory and hopeful feelings in the peoples of S.W. Africa and on the other a great emotional, almost evengelical division of this organisation which if not justified would have certain consequences-we hope that countrie's like the United Kingdom and the United States with their great influence all over the seven seas would be able to persuade the S. A. Government-I do not say to see reason but assist, not in order to accept any of the arguments we have stated, not in order to accept any responsibility for misdemeanours but in order to fulfil the pledges given by Gen. Smuts to this organization. In order that the representative of South Africa who, for the first time, has given us details in regard to the administration of the territory, would have the opportunity to give it to the right channel and to the right source if he should come and sit in this Committee on South West Africa, or equally in the Trusteeship Council

Or if they are suggesting that South West Africa is a part of the colonial empire and the Mandate has lapsed, then of course we, those of us who are ex-colonial people, must go into another question, and like Algeria, demand the independence of South West Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will be able, at this time, to pass through this Committee a resolution that is unanimous, and while I am entirely, perhaps, unrealistic but hopeful person my delegation is always hopeful in these matters. We have been negotiating with the Union since 1907. We have not lost patience, nor have the South Africans. South Africans and we are probably the most patient people in the world in regard to negotiations ! What is more, to South Africa we owe a great debt of gratitude because it nourished the Great Gandhiji in his earlier days and gave him the

291

field--not gave him, he found the field-for his experiments and also for the development of the great personality that brought about the liberation of our country and, what is more, gave to the world the great gospel of establishing reconciliation and resolving conflict through means of non-violence. So, therefore, we do not lose hope. And in regard to this resolution that this committee might adopt, it is our hope that even if the Union cannot, today, vote for this at least, she will use her influence with other people not to vote against it and, what is more, refrain from voting against it herself. So, for the first time, would have gone out of this Assembly a resolution in which South Africa is not being ordered to do anything, in which South Africa is probably being asked not to accept anything to which she is opposed publicly, and what is more, if I may say so, there is machinery provided here, which does not hit her in the face. The South Africa Committee is not a partisan committee; so far as my delegation is concerned we are prepared to move that the Union be elected as a member of this Committee and I am sure all of us would agree to that, so that there will be committee in which she herself sits, where some beginning can be made of the reality we hope for.

I say all these things not by way of submitting a resolution but throwing forward ideas in order that this question does not come here merely as a hardy annual for us to repeat most of these arguments. The time is fast running, Mr. Chairman when each delegation like ours will be quoting itself as an authority rather than no-body else. We are getting so ancient. And therefore we hope, that while we do not submit a resolution at the present moment, it will be possible for the Assembly unanimously and without compartmental differences and decisions to come to some agreement in that way. I equally hope that those of us, who are less patient than others, who probably think, who probably consider, that something more is required to maintain the feelings of hopefulness of South West African people, will not do what in our humble view would be a diversion into the path that will be difficult and may only create more difficulties for the more progressive elements in South Africa, for gentlemen like the distinguished delegate who spoke in regard to the conditions there, for the more liberal elements in South Africa by putting forward propositions which may have the smell, the tinge of ultimatum, or anything of that kind.

Our function here is reconciliation. This is the place where differences have to be harmonised and it is a great opportunity not only for the United Nations, for some of us, who may have erred on the path through our enthusiasm, and for South Africa, most of all, for the first time in the history of the United Nations to come forward and say that they would cooperate in establishing not something that is new but something which their own leader-one of the founders of the United Nations-contributed in the Charter. It would give them the opportunity to come before us, not merely as a party that has been pressed under the force of public opinion, but in the awareness of the 14 years of debate, being reminded of some of its own commitments, being reminded of the history of the League of Nations, and, what is more, knowing well that it is not possible to, maintain or perpetuate the conditions that obtain in South West Africa today, also having before them the shadows of those thousands of Hereros and Hottetots, who disappeared when Germans came in. It is all part of history, and remembering all this I hope the Union will break in new history and refrain from voting against the resolution that is being submitted to the Assembly.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SOUTH AFRICA FRANCE GUINEA SWITZERLAND CHINA OMAN GHANA PERU ANGOLA JAPAN UNITED KINGDOM NEPAL IRAN MEXICO RUSSIA GERMANY TURKEY ALGERIA BELGIUM ITALY

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Trusteeship Committee on British(Southern) Cameroons.

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Committee on October 7, 1959 on the future of the British (Southern) Cameroons.

The following is the text of his statement :

Though my delegation has intervened in small ways in the proceedings of this Committee until now, this is the first occasion that we are addressing ourselves to a particular item and therefore, I would take this opportunity, if I may, of conveying to you, Mr. Chairman, our rejoicing at your election as Chairman of this Committee. You are an old associate of ours in the United Nations in this struggle for national independence -a neighbour with whom we have been associated in the struggle for colonial liberation, and we could not think of a better choice for guiding the proceedings of this Committee than a person of your political, administrative and other experience both in the political and the labour movements before the independence of Indonesia. We should like to take this opportunity also conveying our congratulations to the Vice-Chairman, who has

292

now been elected to this post, although not unanimously. Then, there is our friend Mr. Kennedy-as the name denotes-from Ireland, the Rapporteur, by whose ability and application to detail the proceedings of this Committee will be greatly assisted.

Now, this afternoon, we are participating in the general debate in regard to the British administrated Cameroons. Whatever may be the title actually appearing in the agenda-you read it out as a plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons-the position before the Committee arises from resolution 1350 (XIII) of the resumed session of the Assembly. But, before we take up this position, I should like to say that this is the second occasion on which my delegation has been able to participate in expressing publicly and without reservation our appreciation of the contribution the Administering Authority has made not only in the material development of a former colonial area placed under its administration as a mandate and later a Territory under United Nations Trusteeship. Once again the United Kingdom has come before the United Nations, not in order to defend a position, not in order to make claims for itself, but to report that the purpose of the Trusteeship System have been achieved in this particular area. This is an occasion for gratification, not only for the Administering Authority, but for the United Nations as a whole.

Speaking in the general debate yesterday in the plenary session, my delegation said that the Trusteeship System had, to a very considerable extent, justified itself in the advances to freedom attained in the Italian, British and French colonial areas and that in other parts including the territories administered by New Zealand and Belgium similar advances were in prospect. For in that way the object of the Trusteeship System in the short period of a decade had begun to bear fruit which was visible before our eyes. It is not often that the results of long-range political policy are thus available for us in a tangible form; and, therefore, our reasons to congratulate both the Administering Authority and ourselves are real. I said in this general debate in the Assembly that as a result of the success of the Trusteeship System and because the original placement of certain territories was as part, or perhaps an experiment, or perhaps a limited venture, the Administering Authorities who are in possession of colonial areas will now seriously consider placing more territories under the Trusteeship System which has an advantage of development towards self-government under the auspices of a character different from those of a colonial empire; and what is more, which will shift the whole world from the whole conception of a colonial system.

My delegation did not put this suggestion forward merely to find some work for the Trusteeship Council to do, but because we think that it is a normal development which should take place in the United Nations. Otherwise, it would look as though: Well, the evil is over; now, what about us being entrusted with a task that is done with? There are colonial areas in the world comprising several million square miles of territory and hundreds of millions of colonial peoples, and it would be a good thing if as a result of the experience gained the Administering Authorities on the one hand, and the United Nations on the other, were able to extend the use of this system.

Now, we have here before us diverse material for our consideration. On the one hand, we have the Visiting Mission's report. The Trusteeship Council having been informed by the Administering Authority that in this territory the object of the Trusteeship System had been accomplished and, what is more, the neighbouring territory of which this Trust Territory was administered as an integral part, was going to be independent and, therefore, it would no longer be possible to administer this Trust Territory in that way or as a part of the metropolitan territory or the imperial territory, or the metropolitan country, asked the United Nations to take the steps that were required for implementing the further stages of the trusteeship. And, therefore, a Visiting Mission was sent out some time ago and it has produced a report. It is our duty to express our gratitude to the members of the Visiting Mission; on behalf of the Government of India, I should like to convey our thanks and our appreciation to them through you, Mr. Chairman. At the same time, also, there is a matter of principle: that Government does not consider itself bound by the opinions expressed by any member of the Visiting Mission, even though he is a national of that country. There is nothing in the report with which we would like to disagree, but we should like to restate the principle that the members of this Visiting Mission as of previous Visiting Missions are to be considered as independent persons-not as nationalsreporting for the United Nations : the nations concerned hand over their services for this purpose to the United Nations.

The next set of documents which we have is the report of the Trusteeship Council. The Trusteeship Council in its wisdom, and also guided by the experience of previous years, examined and surveyed the reports of both the Administering Authority and of the Visiting Mission

293

and passed on the task of decisions to the General Assembly. This is as it should have been. For after all, the responsibility rests with the Assembly as a whole. Thus this problem came up before the resumed session and the resumed session passed a resolution-1350 (XIII), to which I have referred earlier.

Now, having regard to the debates which we have held during the last few days. I think it is as well for us to say here and now that this resolution is not only apart of the records of the General Assembly; that the decisions embodied in it are decisions that bind us; they are not merely views, they are not expressions of opinion; they are as good decisions as any decision we shall make here. Therefore, any variation of those decisions would require the usual procedural sanctions. It is sometimes, perhaps, forgotten in the pressure of changed circumstances; or in a desire to produce some results that, perhaps, these procedures cannot be overlooked. We are not sticklers for procedure as such, but if there are resolutions of the Assembly, they have got to be treated with the respect that is due to them.

Now this resolution, again I should like to submit, is not about the Southern Cameroons as such. The resolution deals with the Cameroons under British administration It is a matter of very great political, constitutional and legal importance because there is only one Trust Territory-the Cameroons under British administration. It may have two parts; it may have four provinces; on the map it may be shaded in different colours ; it may lie in different parts on the continent of Africa, sometimes isolated or separated one from another. But, so far as the law of the United Nations is concerned-so far as the history of this question is concerned-there is only one Trust Territory, governed by one agreement : the Trusteenship Agreement of 13 December 1946. This is a matter that enters into the consideration of the whole of this question. But the resolution has two separate paragraphs dealing with plebiscites in the northern and southern parts of the Territory because the General Assembly in its wisdom considered that the assessment of opinion through a plebiscite or otherwise, that the procedures that had to be adopted in order to implement the very laudable results of the Administering Authority's work, had to be accomplished by dealing with these two parts of the Trust Territory separately. For the purpose of convenience, therefore, having referred to this constitutional position, I will now confine myself to those aspects of this resolution and the other documents before us that deal with the Southern Cameroons, and which we have been discussing for some days.

May I say in this connexion that it is necessary for us, who do not belong to Africa, who do not belong to the Trust Territory-who probably are not familiar with the interior of these matters-to realize that while the peoples of these territories are ancient peoples, far more ancient than the Trust Territory some of the so-called ancient civilizations, with their own institutions and customs, the lines that are drawn on the map, the names they have, the nationalities-they are all of recent growth. The better part of modern Africa, in the sense that it comes before us, whether as independent territories or otherwise, has come into the era of modem civilization as a result of imperial conquest and, therefore, it could not be as though we could look back into history and say: these are its boundaries. The boundaries on the map are partly the result of administrative reasons and partly the result of conquest. It is very doubtful as to what would be the position if these territories had not been taken from Germany. Germany, in the early part of the nineteenth century, being last in the race for colonial territories, grabbed what parts of Africa were available. When people landed on a particular place of land, they either saw a village, or a mosquito, or a fish, or something, and formed the territory after its name. It is only historical that that extent, in the same way as Togoland was called the village of Togo; the Cameroons after some insects of some kind and so on ; they give those local names in that Way. I am not saying all this in any derogatory sense, but to place our minds in the historical context that there is behind this all these considerations.

So, these colonies having been wrested by the Allied and Associated Powers from the Central Powers after the First World War, and the United States, having entered the war after the first year or so and, therefore, having become a participant and, what is more, an important participant in the discussion of the Peace Treaty at Versailles, President Wilson-who was both an idealist and a statesman-introduced the conception, or rather re-introduced the conception of trusteeship in the minds of the European statesmen, also coupled very closely to some non-European Statesmen. The idea of Trusteeship is a very old one particularly to the nationals of the present Administering Authority. This idea of trusteeship had been brought to their attention in the tumultous days of the eighteenth century. Then the thirteen colonies, which formed afterwards the basis of the United States were going through the process of revolt and

294

their discontent was being discussed in the House of Commons and a great conservative statesman told his colleagues that these territories are territories in trust. What is more, when the same kind of situation was in existence in our part of the world, and when a gentleman called Warren Hastings was being impeached for his high-handed actions in India, it was said in the House of Commons that these territories were in trust and the real owners of it were the people of India and, that when trusts are abused there are only two remedies; either to bring an end to the trust by revolts or by wars on the one hand,; or by changing the trustee. These were the arguments advanced by Edmund Burke who took part in those deliberations of the House of Commons. And he said: "All political power which is set over men, and ... all privilege claimed or exercised in exclusion of them, being wholly artificial,"--meaning man made-"and for so much a derogation from the natural equality of mankind at large, ought to be in some way or other exercised ultimately for their benefit." That was the eighteenth century, when they were speaking in terms of natural rights and of political institutions that were just emerging. He continues : "If this is true with regard to every species of political dominion, and every description of commercial privilege, none of which can be original self-derived rights," (that is to say, they are rights established by the economic relattions or by conquest, or by law : they are not natural rights as understood at that time) "'or grants for the benefit of holders, then such rights or privileges, or whatever else you choose to call them, are all, in the strict sense, a trust; and it is of the very essence of every trust to be rendered accountable ; and even totally to cease, when it substantially varies from the purposes, for alone it could have a lawful existence."

I did not read out this extract merely for the purpose of historic interest. There are two

features of a trust which are in the Trusteeship System also. One is accountability. In the time of Edmund Burke, it was the national accountability by the East Indian merchants to Parliament, or by administrators of the East India Company to Parliament again : but, today, it is the responsibility of one nation to the international community therefore, it is international accountability. The other is good administration. Those are two of the features of the trust system. And the third one is that trust must mature. There are no tyrannical trusts and, therefore, whether, it is incorporated in the trusteeship agreement or in the provisions of the Charter or not, inherent in the objects of the Trusteeship System, namely the development of peoples towards self-government is the implication that trust must come to an end. Scholars writing in the last five or six years and examining the position in regard to the termination of institutions set up by the United Nations have been nonplussed by the idea that there are no provisions in the trusteeship agreement and the Charter for the actual termination of trust. The logical answer is that it is inherent in the Charter provisions because it says that the object of the Trusteeship System is self-government and, therefore, when self-government comes tutelage goes away ; it is eliminated.

A scholar writing on this says : "Since the goal of the Trusteeship System is self-government or independence, it would seem that the trustee. ship agreement must be terminated when that state of development has been reached by the inhabitants of the territory. The question arises as to who is to decide when this goal has been attained with regard to any particular trust territory. To comply with Article 79 of the Charter, this must be decided upon by the General Assembly or the Security Council in the case of strategic areas. This termination is a form of alteration." This, therefore, implies that if there is to be any change in anything that is said over here that will require the consent of the General Assembly and it cannot be a matter which can be operated in any other way.

Now, let me come to the resolution. The resolution starts on page 2 of this document, A/RES/135 of the thirteenth session. Now, in the resolution the recommendations are in 2b. After having put questions in regard to Northern Nigeria, we come to paragraph 3 which states:

"Recommends further that the plebiscite in the Southern part of the Territory should be conducted during the next dry season between the beginning of December 1959 and April 1960." I am sure that neither the representative of the United Kingdom, nor those associated with him, who also are members of his delegation, as either the Prime Minister of the Territory, or the leader of the opposition in Territorial legislation will misunderstand us when we say that this, at the present moment, is the operative decision and, therefore, this is the stage from which we have to proceed to whatever we want to do when we decide what we want to do. The present position before the Assembly is that the plebiscite in the Southern part of the Territory should be conducted during the next dry season between the beginning of December 1959 and April 1960. Therefore, if this decision still stands, then it would be for the Assembly as was the case in Togoland to appoint and establish the necessary plebiscite machinery to operate within this period. But even if as a result of all that we have heard-all

295

that we know-any changes occur and changes are to be made in the decisions we have already taken, then those changes have to be made in a legal and constitutional way. Secondly, there is paragraph 4 of the resolution which states: "Decides that the two alternatives to be put to the people in the southern part of the territory and the qualifications for voting in the plebiscite should be considered by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session," that is, now. The resolution goes on to express the hope that all concerned in the territory will endeavour to reach agreement before the opening of the fourteenth session on the alternatives to be put in the plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons and the qualifications for voting in it etc. etc.

Now, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to these three paragraphs. Not only is this resolution the expression of the will of the Assembly ; this resolution makes decisions on particulars. First of all, it says that there should be a plebiscite-the plebiscite to be at a particular time and, then, it decides that there should be two alternatives, and all that is left to be agreed between the parties concerned is in regard to what those two alternatives shall be. So it is not as though we have got an open-end programme. Much of the work has been done in the resumed session; the resumed session was operating under the difficulty of not being able to provide the two alternatives to be put up and it desired, quite rightly, that the Administering Authority should be able to bring about some agreement between the contending elements in the territory in regard to those questions. Now, from that have arisen certain expressions of the position on which we want to offer our observations. The parties I emphasize this-the parties in this matter are the United Nations and the Administering Authority. The parties in Africa, in the Cameroons, are parts of the Administering Authority. The Trusteeship Agreement cannot be operated or terminated merely by some agreement reached between these local parties, however important they may be. And, therefore, what was sought in this resolution was the grounds he prepared for getting over the difficulties that may be local in order that the United Nations and the Administering Authority could carry out the next stage of this process. So this is the position of this resolution and this is what also led to our raising a few problems in regard to the suggestions that were put forward which, in our humble opinion, would have encountered difficulties.

Now, I thought in my recollection at the time I had participated in this myself, that in the beginning of the trusteeship agreement in 1946, when there was much controversy-much controversy. In which the United Kingdom delegation and the other metropolitan Powers were on one side and my own country along with the United States of America-represented at that time by Mr. Dulles in this Committee-was more or less on the other : I am not saying that there was a tug of war, but they represented different points of view. At that time also came up the question: Who were the parties most directly concerned and how were the Trusteeship Agreements to be amended, and so on? In 1946, the General Assembly approved a proposal of Mr. Dulles in this connection; it is part of the decisions of the Assembly. With regard to the question of including in the Trusteeship Agreements some provision for alteration or amendment in the light of changing circumstances, the Sub-Committee decided by a majority vote to recommend "that the General Assembly instruct the Trusteeship Council to observe whether the Trusteeship Agreements which had been approved by the

General Assembly, operate in fact to achieve the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System."

"Secondly, if it is the opinion that, in the light of changing circumstances and practical experience, some alteration or amendment of any such Trusteeship Agreement will promote the more rapid achievement of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System, "to submit such. proposed alterations or amendments to the Administering Authority so that if agreed on, in pursuant to Article 79, such alterations or amendments may then be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.

I read this out in order to point out two things: first of all, these alterations-since there is no special provision for amendment of the Trusteeship Agreement-as my delegation pointed out to the legal Counsel the other day, has to be in pursuance of the objectives of the Trusteeship System, namely, in promoting the advance towards self-government.

Secondly, irrespective of that, it has to be done by our referring it, or whoever refers it, to the General Assembly: it must come before the General Assembly. In other words, we cannot deal with the Trusteeship Agreements and all the arrangements that exist in connection with it which concerned the Administration of vast territories merely by informal understandings of any character. Though it was not a resolution of the Assembly, the United Kingdom, at that time, expressed agreement with it, insisted that this should be regarded as instruction and should be incorporated in the Rapporteur's report. So I

296

say this because it is not the thought that it is merely arbiter dicta. It was the United Kingdom delegation at that time that came forward in support of it, and said that it may be included in the records of the Assembly, and it will be so found.

Then, again, in 1946, the delegation of India in the Sub-Committee, while considering Trusteeship Agreements, proposed the following modification to the agreements-under consideration:

"This agreement is valid for the period of ten, years; at the end of which it may be renewed with

or without amendment at the discretion of the Trusteeship Council."

The United Kingdom delegation opposed this amendment because we were asking for automatic termination in ten years in anticipation of these difficulties which we face now. The United Kingdom. delegation opposed this amendment in a written observation Which stated the following : "In considering the proposed amendments by India, the United Kingdom delegation has been guided by two primary criteria : one, the question of whether the amendment proposed is in Accordance with the Charter; two the question whether acceptance of it, will result in the trusteeship agreement with more advantages to the inhabitants in the territory concerned." These are almost the same words which my delegation submitted the other day.

At the same session, Mr. Thomas, who represented the United Kingdom, said that it was not necessary to go beyond the method of trusteeship in common law. "A trust is expected to remain invariable under the law when the ward enters into its enjoyment. I repeat "a trust is expected to remain invariable until the ward enters into its enjoyment." That is, the disposition of these territories must be at the termination of trusteeship and not before. It is in these circumstances that the Visiting Mission went out. We have a very useful report, but not a report that helps very much either in the formulation of these questions or in regard to time element in this matter. But after surveying the situation, they suggested-they did not recommend-they suggested the method that might be used.

Again, the General Assembly in resolution 224 (III) spoke of "the entity of the trust", in connection with the consideration of the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements relating to the Administrative Unions. And the summary records state that the delegations of Australia, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom-all administering countriesgave "an assurance to the Sub-Committee-this was in 1946-which was later approved by the Fourth Committee and, subsequently, by the General Assembly, and this is what they said : "The delegations of Australia, Belgium, France and the United kingdom, being the delegations of States submitting the Trusteeship Agreement to the approval of the General Assembly, wish to give the assurance that they do not consider the terms of the articles above quoted as giving powers to the Administering Authority to establish any form of political association between the Trust Territories respectively administered by them and the adjacent territories which will involve an annexation of Trust Territories".

In this statement that I have read where the first part is not relevant just at the present moment, because neither the United Kingdom, nor any other Administering Authority, has attempted either to have an annexation or anything of that kind in regard to Trust Territories : the question has not arisen in that form. But it is the second part that is important, where it says that the status of the Trust cannot be extinguished; that is to say, there can be no alteration for the purpose.

Later on the General Assembly adopted its resolution 224 (III) in which : Recalling. that the General Assembly had approved these. agreements upon the assurance of the Administering Powers that they do not consider the terms of the relevant articles of the Trusteeship Agreements as "giving powers to the Administering Authorities to establish any form of political association between the Trust Territories respectively adminstered by them and the adjacent territories which could involve the annexation of Trust Territories in any sense, or would have the effect of extinguishing their status as Trust Territories" in its own deliberations of this question the Trusteeship Council also observed that Administrative Unions must remain strictly administrative in nature and scope, that their operation must not have the effect of creating any conditions which will obstruct the separate development of Trust Territories in the fields of political, economic, social and educational advancement as a distinct entity.

Therefore, so far as the United Nations is concerned, in the interpretation of my delegation, irrespective of the fact that a part of the Northern Cameroons is separated from the rest of it which is contiguous with the Southern Cameroons by the Nigerian territory projecting between the two. The Trust Territory is a distinct entity.

Now, if I may respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, in the future when we discuss Trust Territories, perhaps we should have a very large map of these territories right in front of us, because I am sure-and my colleagues will agree with me-the general impression that anybody would have topay is that Northern Cameroons is a kind of enclave separated from the rest of the Cameroons. But if you look at the map you will find that very nearly half of the Northern Cameroons is in the north of Nigeria and, then there is Nigerian territory, and then you have well over half of the Northern Cameroons which is contiguous to the Southern Cameroons. So it is not as though they are naturally, two separate areas. Geographically the bulk of the Northern Cameroons and the entire Southern Cameroons are one stretch of territory. That is additional consideration for looking into the question of the future of these territories which, in the last analysis, can only be decided by the peoples themselves. But in considering those decisions, in making arrangements for implementing those decisions, we may not overlook these considerations.

This problem seems to have engaged the attention of the Assembly at subsequent sessions. At the seventh session this is much later, in resolution 293 (VII), the Assembly said: "Considers that in order to assist the Council in the discharge of its functions and to avoid the possibility of any Administrative Union operating in such a manner as to prejudice the achievement of the objectives of the Trusteeship System, the following safeguards are necessary and brings them to the attention of the Administering Authorities (1) That the Administering Authorities furnish clear and precise separate financial statistical and other data relating to the Trust Territories-they always do that. (2) The Administering Authorities facilitate the access of the Visiting Mission, etc.-they do. Then this is the important part : "the Administering Authorities continue to maintain the boundaries, separate status and identities of Trust Territories participating in the Administrative Union." That is to say, that this Trust Territory of the Cameroons still hangs together, even either administered as part of a neighbouring territory or, as in the case of Tanganyika, as a part of a union either for judicial purposes or traffic purposes with the rest of Britain's East African territories. And the safeguard is that the Administering Authorities ensure with regard to Trust Territories, participating in the Administrative Unions, that the expenditures on the Administration welfare and development of any such Trust Territory for a given year be not less than the total amount of public revenue derived from the Territory for that year. All this is intended to maintain the personality of this territory.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom in July, 1958, submitted a memorandum and in speaking on the memorandum he informed the Trusteeship Council-said Sir Andrew Cohen : We suggest that as the first step the Council should instruct its forthcoming Visiting Mission to include in its report the views on the method of consultation which will be adopted when the time comes for the people of the Northern and Southern sections of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration to express their wishes concerning their future." In bringing forward this proposal, I believe that he acted in accordance with the wishes expressed by various members at the last session.

Now, this matter came up for a great deal of questions and answers in regard to petitioners and the United Arab Republic made the following statement. "I have listened to the observations of the representative of the United Kingdom and I regret that I have to come back once again to my suggestion. I believe that my proposal does not exclude the possibility mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom, but to put emphasis on the "Northern and Southern sections" in this draft resolution, is something that is not consistent with reality, whereas my suggestion is to retain the words "the Territory." It is entirely consistent with the Trusteeship Agreement. On the other hand as the representative of Italy has not formally accepted my suggestion, I shall seek a separate vote on the phrase "Northern and Southern Sections of the Territory." And what happened to the vote ? There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. Therefore, the words "Northern and Southern sections" were deleted. That is the position in regard to the United Nations.

Now, the distinguished representative of Israel this morning has done us the honour of referring to statements I made in this Committee some days ago. And two or three points were brought out-that is, that legalities do not matter very much, but we should have commonsense solutions. Now, if the representative was a lawyer, he would say, law is essentially commonsense. In another part of his statement it is suggested that the parties immediately concerned are Ghana, Guinea, etc, No one, least of all my delegation, yields to anyone in either respect for the concern or the judgment of our African colleagues in this matter. But it would be wrong, in our loyalty for the Charter, in our friendship with them, to suggest that any particular Member of the United Nations is less concerned. The quotation, more or less, says this; "anyonefamiliar with the drafting and the approval of the Trusteeship Agreement is aware of the compli-

298

cations that we Play run into in order to, interpret this particular Article 79. I suggest that we be guided by ordinary commonsense; that is what we try to do here. Let us say that all Member States are concerned with the problem of the British Cameroons. The Trusteeship Agreement has been approved by the General Assembly and the opinion of the Israeli delegation is that independent West African countries like Ghana, Guinea, etc., are today States even more directly concerned with the fate of the Trust Territories, together with other countries, namely, Nigeria and the Cameroons Republic. Now, I do not know what the implication of this is, but we stand entirely unashamed, unapologetic, for raising these few other obligations of the United Nations in this matter, and I am sure that these Member States mentioned, would have no difference of opinion with regard to our own concern in this matter. Therefore, the States directly concerned also have been a matter of much discussion in the United Nations for a long, long time, to which I shall refer in a moment. Therefore, the concern of the Israeli delegation, when he said : "We greatly fear that the extension of the legal debate may introduce extraneous elements throughout this discussion that has very little to do with the item before us." I think if he has some application to legalities in matters which concern others, we will have less trouble in the world.

Now, this question of the 'States directly concerned' also came up in 1946 and the records say the following : "the approval of any terms of trusteeship by this session of the General Assembly should be on the following understanding with respect to States directly concerned. All Members of the United Nations have had an opportunity to present their views on the terms of trusteeship now proposed to the General Assemby for approval. That is, there will be no specification by the General Assembly of States directly concerned in relation to the proposed Trust Territories. Accordingly, the General Assembly, in approving the terms of trusteeship, does not prejudge the question of what States are or are not directly concerned within the meaning of Article 79. It recognizes that no State has waived or prejudiced its rights hereafter, or to claim to be such a State directly concerned in relation to the approval of subsequently proposed Trusteeship Agreements, or any alteration or amendment of those that are approved, and procedures to be followed in the future, with reference to these matters, may be subject to later determination. This was in November 1946.

I have several extracts here from the writings of scholars on the subject but as time is short I shall not go into them. But there is very enlightened and a quantitative and large legal opinion supporting that provision. Now, other body of opinion that is before us, apart from the decisions of the United Nations, and the Visiting Mission's report, is the statement of petitioners. The Committee as a whole, and my delegation no less than anyone else, attaches a great deal of importance to the role of the petitioners before this Committee. We have, almost, without exception, voted for the hearing of petitioners. We think, in the context of the Trusteeship Council, it is a form of assessment of opinion and in fact the democratic way of thinking on our decisions. So, in this matter, there have been before us seventy-five written petitions-seventyfive petitions have come to regard to the choices to be put to the people of the Southern Cameroons. They have expressed their views on the choices of questions to put in the plebiscite. Only one petitioner has favoured continued trusteeship; seventeen petitioners suggested that the questions should be "secession from Nigeria or integration with Nigeria". The remaining fifty-seven petitioners state that two straight questions should be put : namely, "federation with Nigeria or unification with the French Cameroons." In laying stress on the opinion of the petitioners, we are in no way implying any derogation to the opinion expressed either by the Administering Authority or by the Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons or by the Leader of the Opposition. The

very idea of petitioners coming here is a recognition by the United Nations that there are other less formal opinions, but nevertheless, opinions deeply felt, of which the United Nations must be seized. For reference purposes, Mr. Chairman, the document concerning all this evidence is A/C./4/418. I have given you the summary of what it contains.

Now, we refer to these two gentlemen, who have occupied the place of Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons at, one time or another, Mr. Foncha at present, and Mr. Endeley previously, and they have been good enough to acquaint the Assembly, with their views as to what the question should be. And on 24 September 1959, that is, a few days ago, Mr. Foncha submitted these questions in this way : "(1) the self-governing region within independent Federation of Nigeria, (2) Separation from Nigeria with a period under trusteeship. That is the proposition supported only by one petitioner. Now, Mr. Endeley would prefer the questions (1) Do you wish to continue as an autonomous or self-governing region in an independent Federation of Nigeria? (2) Do you wish to secede from Nigeria to effect reunification with the Cameroons' Republic ?

299

Here, I think it is only fair to say that the Administering Authority has always been conscious about the sense of autonomy, about the desire for degrees of exercise of power and functions by and, therefore, the Northern Cameroons have had a comparatively closer existence with the rest of the Territory. But while these problems were discussed at the conference in London, and as a result of those discussions, a degree of autonomy has been established and the Southern Cameroons are in possession of a regional assembly or Parliament ; the distinguished Prime Minister, who is with us, is the head of the government at the present time.

Now, this is a convenient moment for us, therefore, to deal with legal issues which I raised the other day. It is desired to change the dates in resolution 1350 (XIII) then with the advice of the Secretariat, Mr. Chairman, you will no doubt advise the Committee as to what procedure is to be followed. There is some doubt whether in rescending a resolution of a previous Assembly a two-thirds majority is required or not. My delegation takes the view that any decision of the Assembly, particularly a decision so recent as a few months ago for rescinding, requires two-thirds majority as though it were in the same session. This is, however, a matter for your own ruling. The second question relates to amending of the Agreement. From what I have said, it must be clear in the view of my delegation any changes in regard to the Territory, splitting it into two parts, which I read so much about, that cannot be made by an amendment of the agreement. This matter was discussed the other day and it was the view of the Administering Authority and of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, that this change could be brought about by an amendment of Article I of the Trusteeship Agreements. My delegation is in profound disagreement with this, because the amendments can only be in regard to detail of procedure, administration, and similar other things. You cannot amend the corpus of a Trust. The whole of this exercise is in order to administer something. It is just like saying : you can change a doctor, you can change the treatment, but it is no use changing the patient : if you can't change the patient, cut him up into pieces. That is the position.

Now, the separate entity question I have dealt with at length. Article 79, has been invoked and my delegation has stated the limitations with regard to that 79. If at the time of the drafting of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority or the United Nations, represented by the Secretariat, had been careful to incorporate into definite provisions for amendment, then things should have been easier. There is enough authority to show from writings on trusteeship that Article 79 cannot be invoked where there is no such definite provision. I have dealt with the question of the "States directly concerned."

Now we come to the immediate proposition. Politically, we are faced with such a situation that makes me want to say, looking back on the Israeli intervention it has been suggested that the intervention by the delegation of India was, it was implied, apart from not being, consonance with common sense-I hope it is sense, anywaythat the real cause for our objections was not legal but political. And I quote : "As it happened it is quite possible some may apply to the territory of South West Africa. Of course, all issues that come here would be political, but they have legal implications or legal basis or legal consequences, and so on. Secondly, the repercussions, the setting of precedents are legal matter of political consequences. Therefore, it is Impossible to separate these matters in this way.

Now, to go on, therefore, to the present situation. There is a body of opinion in this Assembly represented by the present Prime Minister of the Cameroons, who feels for various reasons that there must be a little more time in regard to the assessment of opinion, which the Assembly has now decided must be by plebiscite. Now, here again, I want to submit to you Mr. Chairman, and to the United Kingdom delegation with great respects, that the matter, the ambit of search for agreement which was enjoined by that resolution was only in regard to what two alternatives should be put; not in regard to whether there should be a plebiscite or not, or at what time it should be held or in what form. That would be another matter. And, therefore, if we are to meet the view of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, to which some support has lately come from the leaders of the opposition also, we have to find ways and means of doing this. Now, with regard, therefore, to the termination of the Agreement, the question of the termination of trusteeship must first be considered. And here I would like to ask the Committee to have patience to bear with us, in going into the details of this matter.

First, I said that a Trusteeship Agreement carries with it the termination, like life it must come to an end, and that termination is fulfilment of the goal of independence. The United Kingdom delegation, in a memorandum communicated to the Trusteeship Council has stated that these Territories are fit for self-government. I read

300

out from this memorandum the other day "the Cameroons has not been left behind in the political progress of its neighbour;but its separate existence has been carefully maintained." That is to say that, on the one hand, the entity of the trust has been maintained-that is entity of the Cameroons; separate existence of the Cameroons, as a whole not of the Southern Cameroons, has been maintained. At the same time, they are politically as advanced as the Territory of which they have been administered as an integral part namely Nigeria. Now we have it on the authority of the United Kingdom delegation that Nigeria is to become independent on the first or the second of October. Therefore, two problems arise : one, there will be no territory with which it can be administered, because, as Sir Andrew Cohen told us the other. day, when Nigeria becomes independent it will cease to be one of the territories of Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom; it will pass on to Her Majesty the Queen of Nigeria. (Interruption)

Well, I am quite prepared to give way and have an elucidation. The last thing I want to do is to misinterpret Sir Andrew Cohen, because there is a long speech afterwards. I am waiting, Sir.

I said that when Nigeria becomes independent the Nigerian territory would have ceased to be the territory of the Queen of the United Kingdom and would have become the territory of the Queen of Nigeria and that is the constitutional position. I have no desire to take a seminar on it, but that is how it is. And therefore, it would no longer be under the Colonial Office if Nigeria is going to really have independence; and, therefore, a new arrangement becomes necessary.

Secondly, the United Kingdom has communicated to us that the Territory of the Cameroons is ready for self-government. "Neither section of the Trust Territory has fallen behind the federation of Nigeria in the advance of that country towards full self-government and ultimately independence." That is what the U.K. memorandum says. So we have the communication from the United Kingdom analogous to communication in regard to Togoland two years ago where it says that the object of the trusteeship system in regard to the development towards selfgovernment is accomplished and it is for us to do the rest. So let us take some steps in this direction. In doing that, whatever may be the letter of the law on this point, it stands to reason and commonsense that opinion of the people, not only expressed through plebiscite at the time of assessment, but even such valid opinion as may be available beforehand, has to be taken into account. And my delegation would be the last in discounting the value of those opinions. Whatever we have said is only to indicate that, that is

not the only element under consideration; it is a substantial element. And, therefore, we get the position here, apart from the question of qualifications of voters, choices, and so on, with regard to the timing of the plebiscite, the timing of the termination. The timing of the termination again is tied up with the fact that there is only one territory and that one territory is administered as part of Nigeria, and could not have been otherwise administered. When Nigeria becomes independent, the trusteeship must also come to an end, from that point of view, unless there is an amendment of the trusteeship. Therefore, on the 1st of October, the trusteeship, in regard to Cameroons, will come to an end constitutionally and legally. There can be no consecutive terminations. There can only be one terminationin view of the Administering Authority's present position-in regard to the two Territories.

However, in regard to the Northern Cameroons, I understand, the plebiscite machinery has left this morning, so that we have gone far enough to get the processes of ascertainment started. Now, we are discussing the South. In the South, first of all we have the request of the distinguished Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons that trusteeship should go on for one year, two years, three years, five years, or whatever it was, for an indefinite period. And it was for that purpose that the United Kingdom and others suggested that this Territory may be separated and a new arrangement be made. That new arrangement will be a new trusteeship agreement. It will be a novel process. The purpose cannot be accomplished by any kind of tinkering with the principles to trustehship. Then, what are we to do as practical persons to meet the difficulties in regard to the position of the Southern Cameroons Prime Minister and to keep to the legalities and to the Charter of the United Nations, not to create precedent for the future, and not to create complications for ourselves? My delegation, therefore, suggests that the termination be so authorized that it will take place automatically when Nigeria becomes independent. That agreed, it should be possible by a degree of give and take that the actual termination in Southern - Cameroons should take place by the appointment or by the establishment of the plebiscite machinery on the last day of September. And, having established the plebiscite machinery, that plebiscite machinery naturally had to go through the process of assessment of opinion. It would be in our opinion entirely reasonable that if we establish machinery

301

on the 30 of September, which is what we are bound to do--we are not bound to establish any machinery before--in fact--we cannot because today Northern Nigeria, even if the plebiscite commissioner comes back with the results in four weeks' time or ten weeks' time, as the case may be it will still remain as part of Nigeria for administrative purpose because the Trusteeship System continues. What I am trying to point out is this: the fact that the plebiscite is taken does not bring about the termination of trusteeship. That will come only on 30 September. So, in the Northern Comeroons, when it comes on 30 September, we would have a situation where the future has been decided by those people one way or another; that is their concern, since they have agreed to what I call a compartmental plebiscite.

Now, with regard to the Southern Cameroons also the Trusteeship would have come to an end. Before Trusteeship having come to an end, we the United Nations within our competence, would have appointed the plebiscite machinery, on the way of plebiscite commissioner whatever you like to do. Then, if that is done, it is quite obvious that the preparation of these electoral lists, the establishment of the necessary administrative machinery, both before and after, the process is of enumeration, of counting and of making the returns to the United Nations, will take some time. And, therefore, it will be entirely reasonable, in the view of my delegation, that a time period between 30 September and, what is technically and practically necessary for the attainment of these results, without any political implication, and without it becoming a precedent, that should be possible. And it is, in that way, I hope, that the distinguished Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons, the Administering Authority, the various African and other delegations who have been discussing this with them, will be able to come to some arrangement whereby this period between 30 September and, what is normally required to take a plebiscite, three or four months that period could be bridged over. During that period, the Secretariat of the United Nations would have to make administrative arrangements of an interim nature with the Administering Authority, giving them the legal power

to maintain order or otherwise, all of which is possible under the general rule that it is the duty of the Administering Authority and it is its functions to assist in the taking of the plebiscite. Therefore, there will be no extension of the Trusteeship System, there will be no amendment of this law; there will be no coming here before us of this matter in a legal way. The trusteeship will be terminated consecutively. Plebiscites will be taken separately. What the results are, it is not for us to speculate, because that would be anti-democratic.

But, at any rate, if that is decided, it is the submission of my delegation that the intervening period between the termination of the Trusteeship and the actual return of the plebiscite results-the plebiscite commissioner making a return to the United Nations,-that would have to be conditioned by the practical necessity and not as part of amendment of the Trusteeship Agreement. On this, the best people to advise us are the Administering Authority and the political leaders that have addressed us from time to time. But any advice should have regard to the fact that this period cannot be very long, because the Administering Authority's legal status in that Territory is only as of assisting law and order and other things in order to maintain the situation and enable the conduct of the plebiscite. That period naturally will have to be limited.

My delegation does not want to add to the complications by suggesting a specific date. We have indicated what the principle is on which this arrangement should be based ; that principle is that the period should be sufficient, reasonably sufficient, for making all these arrangements, for taking the plebiscite and returning it. If that period is so sufficient,-and there can be differences of opinion in regard to the length of that period, but broadly speaking it could be a matter of months and not longer and, when that date is fixed, that could be incorporated in the resolution without violating any law.

Now, that is the most difficult part in regard to the plebiscite, namely, the date. And from the date we go on to the second item in regard to the two questions to be posed. The fact that there should be two questions has been decided by the United Nations beforehand. Logically and legally, there is no objection to asking as many questions as one wishes. But, again, from the commonsense point of view, it will be very difficult to ask masses of people, who are to put a cross-mark on a paper, to judge as between so many alternative propositions. Those who are accustomed to the system of proportional representation in their own countries and all the grotesque results that sometimes come out, are familiar with the problem. It is not possible,especially in a plebiscite,-to put too many alternatives ; but, over and above that, there are certain considerations to be taken into account. This territory has been administered as part-an integral part-of Nigeria, as communicated by the United Kindom Government, from 1946 onwards for a considerable time. It has never been

302

administered, since it came out of German hands, as the Cameroons. The French Cameroons and the British Cameroons have remained divided from each other with the pursuit of administration in different languages and in different moulds of thinking for the period of the Trusteeship. All these are practical facts which pose practical problems.

My delegation and others asked the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom about the viability of this Territory to be an independent territory. There is nothing in the law to prevent this being dope. But, my delegation must submit its position that the responsibility of the United Nations in regard to a Trust Territory is not only to release it from whatever control or supervision of the Administering Authority there may be. It could not just release it in a world where it cannot sustain itself. That is not for a moment to suggest that the period of tutelage has not been properly used by the Administering Authority, but it has used it in that way for the scaffolding of the other Territory. That is, for years it has been administered in such a way,-with its civil service, with its financial and other arrangements, -depending upon the neighbouring territory. But because of the difference of opinion, my delegation is fully agreeable to posing two questions; that is to say, do they want to be incorporated into Nigeria ? Or do they want to become part of an independent French Cameroons?

My delegation would like, however, to place

emphasis upon the fact that a Trust Territory can only be so incorporated with an independent country and through the expression of its own will. These two questions, which have been posed at various times by various people would appear to be the convenient questions to ask. Mr. Foncha himself, while he has referred to this question of independent trusteeship, has not laid any great stress upon it lately. In fact, on 26 February 1959 -not so long ago-when the Assembly was making a decision, Mr. Foncha was asked this question, and he said this. The answer to the question whether we envisage three possible solutions for the future of the Southern Cameroons,-full independence, union with the French Cameroons, and union with the Southern Cameroons, which would have seceded from Nigeria, is definitely "Yes". But this particular answer is very problematical, because there is before us no picture of the succession of the Northern Cameroons from Nigeria. We cannot anticipate results either way.

Then, the representative of India wished to know if the United Nations decided to hold another plebiscite to determine whether the people of the Southern Cameroons wished to join the new State of the Cameroons and the responses were to be in the negative, did Mr. Foncha contemplate a free and independent Southern Cameroons or had he in mind a further indefinite period of trusteeship? If the independent State of the Southern Cameroons was envisaged, it would be interesting to know what would be the existing revenue and what would be the anticipated revenue of the Southern State. And Mr. Foncha's answer was. "We prefer a free and independent Cameroon State under those circumstances..I do not contemplate an indefinite period of trusteeship ... The commissioner of the Cameroons will be able to give details."

Now, Sir Andrew Cohen was more practical in regard to viability and I do not want to read out the whole of his answer. However, the impression that was left with my delegation was that while it was possible to administer the Southern Cameroons with some assistance from outside it would be a formidable problem. "I do not see, particularly in the early years how we can solve that problem exclusively from its own resources. Up to now the Southern Cameroons has been staffed with members of the federal public service. The hard fact is that nearly all the professional and technical posts and a large proportion of most of the subordinate posts are necessarily filled by non-Cameroonians. The indications are that many of them would not be able to continue to serve in the Cameroons with the limited prospects that a small territory has to offer," and so on. Generally speaking, there has been no support for this idea of independence for the Southern Cameroons by itself. In so far as the petitioners are concerned-as there is only one in support of it as opposed to 54 of the others against it and 17 of a different kind. Now, therefore, while we do not object juridically to this position, we have also to take account of all the responsibility that rests upon us. We have to see that we do not launch this territory in such a way it is unable to keep in the race with other independent nations of the world.

Now, I think it is only fair to the Prime Minister of the Cameroons to present to the Committee our understanding of the reasons he gave to the Committee for his preferences. He said, and I quote "Separation from Nigeria, resulting in new trusteeship, will keep the door open for the building of a greater Cameroonian nation; the independence that the people of the Cameroons want is nothing short of the selfgovernment or independence indicated in the United Nations Charter-that is independence

303

which has no strings attached to it." But if I might interpolate here, the United Nations charter mentioned here also includes the Trusteeship provisions and the Trusteeship Agreements. Then, dealing with trusteeship territories, you cannot take the Charter and keep it in suspended animation. In addition to the provisions of the Charter applying to the Trust Territory, we have a Trusteeship Agreement. Now, the Prime Minister goes on to say : "We have advanced politically faster than economically; it is because-"that itself is very telling-" it is because of this important problem that we want the continuation of the Trusteeship Agreement as an interim measure to give the Administering Authority a chance to see exactly what is wrong with the Territory's economy, and thus better to build it. Obviously, they must have tried hard in the last ten or twelve years and they have only accomplished what they have done so far. That much for economic circumstances.

Then he goes on to say : "We are cautious and we do not want to leap before we look if there is anything wrong, to gamble with the future of our country. There is one more step that applies to the independence that can be respected. Any suggestion that the colonialists were clinging to us is without foundation. We have chosen to continue under the United Kingdom Trusteeship Agreement simply because we believe that Britain as Administering Authority is fully aware of our problems and their responsibilities. We know the step we are taking to gain our independence..." A very courageous statement ! It is very difficult for a Prime Minister of a dependent territory, being fully conscious, as he says, of looking before leaping, and be able to say publicly that this is his position.

But as against that, there are other views, particularly those of the other political leaders who have appeared here before us. So far as we are concerned I wish to assure you that the idea of having to choose between freedom and continued trusteeship is repugnant and unacceptable to right thinking people of the Cameroons who are closely following events. I am not suggesting that the expression "right thinking" is correct in this particular context. Now, may I here, without going into further documents, just state the position of my Government. This same position was stated in regard to Togoland some years ago when my distinguished colleague from Liberia had moved some amendments to a resolution of ours. The result of those amendments at that time would have been the continuance of trusteeship over a longer period ; and here is the summary record : "The Indian delegation could not accept amendments 6 and 7 proposed by Liberia which called for the insertion in operative paragraph 2 of the words "or its continuance under trusteeship pending the ultimate determination of its, political future." That would conflict with the general view that the time has come to put an end to the trusteeship system in the Territory. Continuance under trusteeship would be a retrograde step which would create an unfortunate impression in Togoland under French administration, the Cameroons and other African territories. Moreover, Togoland under British administration was administered as an integral part of the Gold Coast. That agreement had been accepted by the General Assembly when it approved the Trusteeship

Agreement and, in view of its geographical situation as a small area the Territory could not be administered in isolation."

What was true of Togoland is true of the Cameroons also. So far as my Government is concerned, we want to state categorically and without reservation that we at no time subscribe to any doctrine which impedes the termination of trusteeship over any territory. We would not be able to defend it before our people; we could not cast a vote in favour in any such proposition. It is not because we think that the Administering Authority wants to prolong the period or does not Want the termination in a comparatively short time, but it would be a very bad precedent to set up. When the Administering Authority, which is a colonial Power at the same time, comes to us and says: These dependent people are ready for self-government, and then we turn down and say: No, not yet. So, we could not, with great respect and all the consideration and feeling we have for the Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons, agree to this proposition.

Now, there is something on which we would like some enlightenment from Sir Andrew Cohen. There appear to be certain commitments entered into by the United Kingdom Government with the people of the Northern and Southern Cameroons with regard to these matters. It says here: On 10 February 1958, at the 856th meeting of the Trusteeship Council, Sir Andrew Cohen communicated: Because of the special status of Territory, the United Kingdom Government has given the assurance at the Conference-at the Nigerian Constitutional Conference-that before Nigeria became independent, the people of the Northern and Southern Cameroons would be given the opportunity to freely express their wishes concerning their own future; and I submit that these agreements made at the Nigerian Constitutional Conference covered Southern Cameroons and Northern Cameroons and Nigeria who were

304

parties and who accepted this of the United Kingdom Government. This assurance, in our humble submission, could only be honoured and discharged if the termination takes place on 30 September either straightforwardly-as we had originally intended it at the last resumed session--or in the way that we venture to submit.

Sir Andrew Cohen said, subsequently, on 28 July: "The Cameroons, under the United Kingdom administration, has to be administered as an integral part of Nigeria. This, as I have explained, cannot go on, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, after Nigeria itself becomes independent. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be consultations with the people of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. There is a case where there. Should be a plebiscite immediately. Subject to the views of the Visiting Mission and of the Trusteeship Council, the United Kingdom delegation's intention was to ask the General Assembly to agree that the consultations with the people, once authorized, should be held at the earliest possible date"--that is, support for the view I put forward, namely that the date between the appointment and the establishment of the plebiscite authority, and the taking of the plebiscite should be as brief as possible! Sir Andrew Cohen hoped that a resolution authorizing the United Kingdom Government to proceed with the task would be adopted as early as October 1959, after which the consultations should be rapidly organized. Now, in this parti. cular case-in the case of the Southern Cameroons as it is, in the submission we have made, this would not be rapid organization. Sir Andrew Cohen went on to say: "The results of the plebiscite would be reported to the Trusteeship Council. Once the Council has considered the question, it would be the intention of his delegation to ask for a brief special session of the General Assembly at an appropriate stage in 1960"-now this stage will come in 1961 to decide on the action to be taken in the light of the results of the plebiscite". It is obvious that decisions should be taken some considerable time before the date of Nigerian independence, and that is why my delegation is pressing that the decision in regard to this shall be taken at this Assembly because there will be no other Assemblies before the establishment of Nigerian independence....it akes up a few days, or so to enable the necessary practical and legal arrangements to be made in the Trust Territory. The whole problem has been carefully thought over by the British Government so as to ensure that the people of the Cameroons under British administration will have free and fair choice regarding their future". It will be recalled that in the context of recent developments in Nigeria and the Cameroons under French administration, the

United Kingdom delegation still felt that they had the right programme and properly timed. And this was on 18 November 1958--a year ago !

At the resumed session, Sir Andrew Cohen said, on 20 February: "We shall have to consider whether everything is known about the various possibilities to enable the Assembly to settle now how future of the Southern Cameroons should be determined, and particularly whether there is sufficient agreement between the parties to enable the taking of the plebiscite and the questions to be put at the present session." That again is what we are planning to do. I have no desire now to prolong the observations I am submitting to this Committee ; my delegation would feel in duty bound to offer whatever assistance it can in order that a unanimous resolution might come out of this Committee. But that unanimity can only be assisted by the conformity with the Charter and its provisions, by no violence to law, by no creation of precedents to make difficulties for the future ; by the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement concurrently and not consecutively, denoting other periods between 30 September as we have suggested, and the actual taking of the plebiscite to what is reasonable and practical and, what is more, to some agreement in regard to the questions and the qualification of electors. Now, that is the last point I wish to deal with.

With regard to the qualification of electors, in the Togoland resolution there is a fairly wellworded statement which appeared to us at that time to be entirely opposite, and we would have thought that that would have been the right thing to do. But we understand from private conversations that there are some difficulties in this matter because, in the Southern Cameroons there are a number of Nigerians who have been either living there for a short or for a long time. It is quite possible that some of these people might have no other homes, except the homes which they have in the Southern Cameroons. There are also a number of French Cameroons; who are there, and under the existing law, any political facility that is given to the French and British would naturally differ, because some are British nationals and the others are aliens.

In our humble submission, in the general law of the world as it stands, franchise-if it is franchise -can be based only upon two principles ; one is nationality and the other is domicile. Now, the Cameroons today, irrespective of the commitment in regard to non-absorption, are protected citizens ; they carry a United Kingdom passport

305

and they are protected citizens subject to the protection of the arm of Britain if they are travelling abroad or in other ways. The defence of of that Territory is under United Kingdom control. Therefore, the nationality of these citizens is that of protected persons under United Kingdom nationality. But it may perhaps be unfair to go by British nationality, especially in view of, or pending the independence of Nigeria when the Nigerians, with a Nigerian nationality, are different- from United Kingdom nationals, though they still carry a British passport.

So, the question of domicile rights, speaking for our own delegation-and our position in this matter is not inflexible ; speaking for our own delegation-we think the reasonable and ethical view to-take is that domicile should be the qualification for franchise ; that is to say, if a person has made a place his home-and you do not make a place your home in that sense, by living there for five days, or even a year-domicile is a wellunderstood conception in both domestic as well as in international law. If they are domiciled then in our submission, they would be entitled to participate in the plebiscite.

But we recognize the particular circumstances and the fact that there is a tug of war between the pro-Nigerian view and the pro-French Cameroonian view and, perhaps, there may be justification in looking at this problem with an objective eye in order to find a unanimous decision.

May I now read what we did in regard to Togoland where the problem was not at all an easy one. In the case of the plebiscite in British Togoland, the General Assembly recommended the following qualifications for the voter. (Resolution 944 of the tenth session.) This was originally proposed by the Visiting Mission (1) that the voter be of the age of 21 years at the time of registration ; (2) that he will have resided within the Trust Territory for a period of at least twelve months during the two years immediately preceding registration ;-that is, domicile plus a residential qualification; (3) that he, at the time of registration, be residing within the ward in which he or she applies to register-that is rather different, if I may explain how it is different from what Mr. Foncha wants in regard to the Southern Cameroonians and I shall come to that in a moment-(4) that he or she is not disqualified by reason of disqualification listed under the government ordinances.

Now, with regard to the views expressed, I have already recapitulated what the Prime Minister has to say in this matter. The resumed session looked over the question as to who should vote at the plebiscite and left it for us to decide at the fourteenth session. There is serious disagreement between Premier Foncha and Dr. Endeley. The disagreement arises from the fact that in approximate numbers there are about 10,000 Nigerians and 6,000 French Cameroonians of voting age in the Southern Cameroons. I would have thought that this is an ideal figure for carrying the whole thing out. Dr. Endeley is of the view that the plebiscite should take place on the basis of the existing electoral register. Premier Foncha is of the view that only native-born Cameroonians should be allowed to vote in that plebiscite which will determine the future of the Territory for all time to come. I understand that some delegations including Mexico and Indonesia, have come out in support of Premier Foncha's position on this question. Now, I would like to submit the view of the Government of India in regard to this. I have said that the view in regard to domicile is reasonable; I also said that our position in this matter is not inflexible and we are entirely guided by the desire to get a reasonable and unanimous decision in the Assembly. We could not agree with disenfranchising people who have had their franchise, if the enrolment or otherwise of the plebiscite is going to affect their political rights in the future. That would amount to political punishment of one kind or another. But I understand that that is not the view of Prime Minister Foncha.

Now, we do not agree with the view of Dr. Endeley either in this matter. He said that the plebiscite should take place on the basis of the existing electoral register because we think, in the view of my Government, that there should be no distinction between men and women, between educated, illiterate or literate and also that those who are about the age of 21-they should be entitled to take part-which would not be the case if the electoral register was maintained. On the other hand there is here one difficulty with regard to these so-called native-born Cameroonians. We appreciate the strength of this argument, but, at the same time, there are two propositions ; first of all, Prime Minister Foncha, so far as I understand wants native-born Cameroons outside the Cameroons to vote. Now how that is to be accomplished, we would like to know. Secondly, how are native-born Cameroonians to be found, distinguished from others, because in these territories there are no birth registers, there are no documents concerning births. I noted that in his speeches the Prime Minister said that in the villages everybody knows everybody else. Now we would be going back to the days of the old Britons when somebody would say an oath whether a man had

306

committed a crime or not; that is to say, you will ask the village to say: this is not a Cameroonian, or otherwise. That would be, to a certain extent a kind of mob rule. In any charge that is handed over to the Plebiscite Commissioner, the United Nations, in order to safeguard its own position, would have to place the injunction that the registration of these prospective plebiscite voters would have to be free from any political difficulties, because, after all, without any disrespect to anybody, there are two views on this question and one view is held by the party in power and the other view is held by the opposition-and the registration takes place under governmental authorities.

Of course we have the position that the Administering I Authority is mainly responsible, but in this case the Administering Authority also has taken this view, it appears to me, and therefore you would have to charge the plebiscite administration with the special responsibility of seeing that there is no victimization, no exclusion, and no unjustified inclusion in the electoral register. This is the position, so far as we see it. I would request my colleagues of the African delegations and others who have taken an interest in promoting a resolution on the subject, that in the interests of unanimity it would be far better to obtain theseagreements before a formal resolution is placedon the agenda, because if formal resolutions are placed on the agenda, even if there are no differences in substance, the formulations are such as

to make it difficult for us to defend them in terms of the Charter or before our legislators, then you will have to seek to alter them within the Assembly. You may or may not succeed, but that would be a very bad position. For example, if it were said that on such and such a date the Administering Authority shall free the Southern Cameroons as a separate territory, and so on, that would bring up the whole question of cutting up the Trust Territories. The position does not arise ; it is merely wrong formulation and, therefore, I would request that those who are taking an interest in this matter-after all, a few delegations always promote these resolutions-if it is expected that they should be unanimous on a contribution in a matter of this character, my delegation, as I have already said, will go as far as possible and necessary in order to meet the requirements of the political situation as expressed by the Prime Minister of the Southern Cameroons several times and by the opposition. You should take all these matters into consideration.

But, there are certain principles; those principles are in regard to the amendment and the alteration of the corpus of the trust; the other in regard to concurrent or consecutive termination; in regard to the placement of the authority in the Administering Powers, which is necessary for the purpose of the plebiscite and for carrying on administration during that period without a new agreement; and the bridging- of the period between the establishment of the plebiscite machinery and the taking of the plebiscite. To that-I will not say "to that minimum"-extent that is dictated by reason, by prudence and by technical considerations. In that background, my delegation would be willing-not only willing, it would be anxious-to give all the support that is possible in order to find a solution that is agreeable to all parties concerned.

I ask the Chairman's forgiveness for the long time that I have taken in this Committee.

INDIA USA CAMEROON INDONESIA IRELAND BELGIUM NEW ZEALAND GERMANY ECUADOR NIGER NIGERIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA FRANCE ITALY ISRAEL GHANA GUINEA UNITED KINGDOM LIBERIA MEXICO

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in Special Political Committee onrevision of U. N. Charter

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Special Political Committee on October 15, 1959 on the revision of the United Nations Charter.

The following is the full text of the statement :

Mr. Chairman

The question of amending the United Nations Charter in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108, with a view to increasing the membership of the ECOSOC, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, has figured on the agenda of the General. Assembly every year-as separate items-since the Eleventh Session of the General Assembly. These items are thus, like many others on the agenda, tending to become hardy annuals. I say this in no sense of disparagement of their importance. The fact that these questions as agenda items continue, even if they have been postponed year after year, is sufficient indication of the continued interest of the members of the United Nations in the expansion of the membership of these principal organs of the United Nations. It is also evidence of the continuing existence of the problem of which we have to search for a solution.

The 'raison d'etre' of the problem is clear. Since the beginning of the United Nations there has been an increase in membership by 32

307

countries. The original figure of 51 members reduced two years ago to 50 (as a result of the union of Egypt with Syria) has risen to 82. Of the 32 additional members admitted since the signing of the Charter, 14 are Asian, 12 European and 6 African States, and at least three more African States are expected to join the organisation in the next year or two. The population covered by the present-day membership of the United Nations is 2363 million as against 1707 million at the time of the signature of the Charter. A mere recital of these facts is sufficient to show that there exists a 'prima facie' case for an expansion in the strength of some or all of the principal organs of the United Nations, so that both the composition of such organs and the expression of views and deliberations therein should reflect the present-day composition of the United Nations.

Furthermore, the increase has to be not merely quantitative but qualitative also; that is to say, not only is there need for revising the strength of the principal organs of the United Nations, but the revision should be such as to reflect adequately the geographical distribution of the members of the United Nations; and I use this expression 'geographical distribution' in the broadest sense as I shall indicate later. At the time of the signing of the Charter in 1945, 8 Asian and 3 African States were members of the United Nations. Their strength has now increased to 31, that is 22 Asian and 9 African States, representing a total population of 1253 million. The Asian-African countries thus constitute nearly 40% of the membership of the United Nations and represent more than 54% of the peoples whose countries are represented. It is true that the United Nations works on the basis of sovereign equality of all States, large and small, irrespective of size or population. We do not dispute or impugn this principle. But in so far as the Charter of the United Nations in its very preamble is an expression of the will of the peoples of the world, and the activities of the United Nations have their impact on and are designed for the peace and welfare of the peoples of the world, the peoples of the world are, so to speak, constituents of the United Nations, and considerations of population and geopolitical considerations cannot be altogether ignored in favour of an over-simplified statistical approach to the problem. It is necessary that when a revision of the composition of the principal organs of the United Nations takes place, these considerations along of course with others should, as far as possible. be reflected in the revised composition of these bodies.

The position today is unsatisfactory. We have an expanding world organisation with a static composition of the Principal organs. This inevitably gives rise to unhealthy pressures. In the Security Council as constituted today, out of 6 non-permanent members, there is a single Asian and a single African State, which as a member of the Arab. League may also be regarded as representing Arab States. In the ECOSOC, out of 18 members, there are only 4 Asian-Africans, and the position from the point of view of Asian and African States is even more unsatisfactory than in the Security Council. The gross underrepresentation of Asian and African States of course means over-representation of other areas.

I should like to state once again, Mr. Chairman, that the problem of revision is not merely an arithmetical exercise in the adjustment of figures : In considering the question of revision of the composition of the Security Council and the ECOSOC, we have to consider not only the present imbalance in numerical representation, but various other factors, some of which. I have just indicated. This particularly applies to the Security Council. Article 23 of the Charter says that 'the General Assembly shall elect six other members of the United Nations to be nonpermanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance, to the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organisation, and also to equitable geographical distribution. It is quite clear, therefore, that geographical distribution is not the only factor. But just because it is not the only factor it cannot be dismissed as a factor of importance. Since the Security Council is concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security, geography plays an obviously important part and large parts of the world cannot be left unrepresented in this way. However, the first consideration under Article 23 is the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of internal peace and security and to the other purposes of the organisation.

To elaborate this point further, in reference to the problem of revision of membership of the Security Council, the question may be asked "What is the sort of contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security" is contemplated under Article 23 ? This contribution is not to be merely assessed by the positive contribution which they make or can make; the weight-economic, military, political and geographical-that is inherent in the position of a country or region, or a group of countries, in relation to the rest of the world has also to be

308

taken into account. Secondly, what are the other purposes of the organisation referred to in Article 23 ? One of the purposes of the United Nations Charter under Article 4 is that it should 'be a centre for harmonising the actions of nations in the attainment of the "common ends" of the organisation'.

It is therefore necessary to get the largest possible representation of divergent views and interests in the Security Council, so that these could be harmonised towards the common purpose.

To sum up what I have just said, - Mr. Chairman, the problem we are facing is not merely an increase in membership of the principal organs proportionately or as near proportionately as possible to the increase in membership of the organisation but a rectification, in the broadest sense, of the mal-distribution of membership which prevails at present.

Having recounted the general considerations, Mr. Chairman, we must deal with the practical aspects of the question. There seems considerable support for the view that the membership of the Security Council and the ECOSOC should be enlarged. My delegation shares this view, and is in principle in favour of such an expansion, provided the object of such an amendment to the Charter is to ensure proper and equitable distribution of seats to under-represented regions such as Asia and Africa. Of these two bodies, the case for an expansion in the membership of the ECOSOC is much more clear, while we are not convinced of the need for expansion of the International Court of Justice. According to one view, the expansion should be very modest in order that the principal organs should not become unwieldy. My delegation, Mr. Chairman, agrees with the general principle that the principal organs of the United Nations should not become

too unwieldy, but at the same time we do not favour extreme caution in this matter; the increase in the membership of the principal organs must be substantially related to the increased membership in the United Nations, though it need not be in exact mathematical proportion. If there is to be an amendment to the Charter so as to provide for increased membership we should not merely tinker with the problem. The whole question of increased membership of these bodies should, at the appropriate time, be examined in the light of the larger considerations to which I have given expression. The matter has to be very carefully gone into. The reality of the situation, however, is that however much we may wish to expand the membership of the principal organs of the United Nations', the increase in membership can only be brought about through an amendment to the Charter, and amendment of the Charter under Article 108 requires not only a vote by two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly but ratification by them, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. We have heard the views of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union. One may not agree with all that he has said, but he has given weighty reasons for his views. It is quite clear that apart from other reasons he has given, the Soviet Union is not at present prepared to consider an amendment to the Charter without the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

Several delegations, Mr. Chairman, have commented adversely on the provision of the Charter which requires ratification by all the five permanent members of any amendment of the Charter and thereby confers what is popularly called a 'veto' by any of the permanent members of the Security Council. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to make the position of my delegation clear. We are in favour of an expansion of the membership of the Security Council and of the ECOSOC, but we realise that unless there is unanimity among the Big Powers in favour of the necessary amendments, no Charter revision required for enlargement of the membership of these bodies can come about. It is far from helpful to criticise the provisions of the Charter which contain the 'unanimity rule'; that is the very basis of the Charter and without such a rule, as the discussions in San Francisco have shown, the United Nations would not have come into existence at all; and

as the Charter would not have emerged without agreement among the Big Powers, so there can be no revision of the Charter without the consent of all the Big Powers. That is the reality of the whole situation, and by ignoring it, we cannot solve this question. Furthermore, it is the view of my delegation that if a permanent member of the Security Council takes a view different from that of the members on a question in respect of which it has been given a special position in Article 108 or elsewhere, we should respect that view. It would not help to criticise or even adopt resolutions by large majority. Such resolutions, by appearing to one side or the other to prejudge issues which can only be settled by the unanimous consent of the Big Powers, may conceivably make solutions more difficult. We can only hope for a change in that attitude either through the persuasion that views expressed in the United Nations naturally exercise or as a result of change in the circumstances of the international situation. That is the general attitude of my delegation without any particular

309

reference to the views of the Soviet Union on the question before us which have been expressed before this Committee. From the point of view of practical politics we have to wait until such time as the permanent members of the Security Council are able to harmonise their views on this and on other related questions. Fortunately, we have the beginning this year of a better international atmosphere and a diminution in the cold war and lessening of international tensions appear to be a reasonable prospect. The exchange of visits that have taken place recently and that are likely to take place in the near future between the Heads of Governments of the Soviet Union and the USA are full of promise for the realisation of international understanding and mutual confidence among the Big Powers. We sincerely hope that the day will arrive soon when in the sunshine of goodwill and understanding the fog of suspicion and apparent intransigence not only round the question that we are considering but other questions too with which we in the United Nations are concerned, may disappear.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the consummation of such hopes and the much wished for Charter revision may take time. Many delegations have given expression to their dissatisfaction at the mal-distribution from the point of view of geographical distribution, of the existing membership of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, and have pleaded for agreements which would ensure more equitable distribution, at least in the ECOSOC. While in. the view of my delegation this is no answer to the larger question of expansion of membership of these principal organs, we share the view that pending such expansion, efforts should be directed towards securing agreements aimed at a more equitable distribution of existing seats, which would ensure for Asian and African members, particularly new members, their rightful chance to contribute to the purposes of these bodies. Meanwhile also the inadequacy of representation of Asian African countries on the principal organs could be partially at least rectified by securing to them increased representation in functional Commissions and subsidiary bodies which have been already set up or may be set up in the future by the United Nations.

INDIA USA EGYPT SYRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Letters to President of the Security Council

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanant Representative to the United Nations, addressed two letters to the President of the Security Council on October 12 and 29, 1959. Shri Jha's letters were in reply to Pakistan's Acting Permanant Representative's letters to the Security Council President dated September 9 and 11, 1959.

The following is the full text of Shri Jha's letter dated October 12, 1959 :

I am instructed by the Government of India to refer to a letter addressed by the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the President of the Security Council on 9 September, 1959 (S/4217). This letter like other similar communications in the past attempts to confuse the basic facts of the situation by referring to irrelevant matters.

Since its accession towards the end of October 1947, Jammu and Kashmir has been a constituent State of the Indian Union. It was because of this fact that the Government of India complained on I January, 1948 to the Security Council against Pakistan aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir. It was also on the basis of this position that the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan framed its resolutions dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, and gave various assurances to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council.

The situation about which the Government of India complained to the Security Council in January 1948 is still unresolved. The Pakistan forces still continue to illegally occupy Jammu and Kashmir territory which they were directed to vacate under the resolution of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948.

The Government of India are, under the circumstances, surprised that the Government of Pakistan, who have repeatedly stressed their preference for democratic methods and the rule of law, should, in this case, consider it necessary to object to normal democratic, legal and administrative processes introduced in the territory of the Indian Union at the request of the Government of the Constituent State.

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.

310

The following is the text of Shri Jha's letter dated October 29, 1959 :

I have the honour to refer to the letter, dated 11 September 1959 (S/4219), from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan, addressed to the President of the Security Council and to, state that the Government of India's position in the case of the construction of Mangla Dam in Jammu and Kashmir has been clearly stated in my previous communications to the President. I have, however, been instructed by my Government to correct the following inaccurate statements made in the letter of the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan of 11 September 1959 :

The Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan has, while referring to the statement in my letter, dated 7 August 1959 (S/4202), that "On its own admission, as recorded by the United Nations Commission in its report and its resolution of August 13, 1948, the Government of Pakistan committed aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir", commented that "Neither my Government nor the United Nations as a whole is aware of any such admission". The contention of the Pakistan Acting Permanent Representative is not only unsupported by the facts as reported by the UNCIP but stands denied by them. The following extracts from UNCIP report may be relevantly quoted :

"As set forth in the letter of I January 1948 (S/628), the Government of India placed its complaint against the Government of Pakistan under Article 35 of the Charter, which allows any Member to bring to the attention of the Security Council any situation the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. India alleged that such a situation existed between it and Pakistan owing to the aid which invaders, consisting of nationals of Pakistan and of tribesmen from the territory immediately adjoining that Dominion on the north-west, were drawing from Pakistan for operations against the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which has acceded to India on 27th October, 1947, and was part of India.

"The Government of Pakistan in its communications of 15 January 1948 (S/646 and Corr. 1) denied that it was giving aid and assistance to the invaders..." (paras. 111 and 112). "In the course of this interview, the Foreign Minister (of Pakistan) informed the members of the Commission that the Pakistan Army had at the time three brigades of regular troops in Kashmir and that troops had been sent into the State during the first half of May (1948)" (para. 40).

"The statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to the effect that Pakistani troops had entered the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and later his reply to a Commission questionnaire that all forces fighting on the Azad side were 'under the over-all command and tactical direction of the Pakistan Army', confronted the Commission with an unforeseen and entirely new situation." (para. 127).

According to the Security Council's resolution of 17 January, the Government of Pakistan was requested to inform the Security Council immediately of any material change in the situation. In a letter addressed to the Security Council, the Pakistan Government agreed to comply with this request. The Government of Pakistan had, however, not informed the Security Council about the presence of Pakistani troops in the State of Jammu and Kashmir". (para. 128).

-(The United Nations Commission's First Interim Report. Words within brackets are mine).

"Then came the first bombshell. Sir Zafrullah Khan informed the Commission that three Pakistani brigades had been on Kashmir territory since May..... The Commission....explained to the Pakistanis, the movement of these troops into foreign territory without the invitation of that territory's Government, was a violation of international law......"

--("Danger in Kashmir" : by Josef Korbel, a member of the UNCIP).

"As the presence of troops of Pakistan in

the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was represented by the Government of Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from that State."

311

-- (Para. A 1 of Part II of the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948).

Thus aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir by Pakistan on the one hand and the obligation subsequently accepted by Pakistan to vacate the aggression, are on record.

Another statement made in the letter of the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan reads :

"The United Nations resolutions, which both India and Pakistan have accepted, laid down clearly that the future status of the State shall be decided by a free and impartial prebiscite. The assumption that Jammu and Kashmir State is Indian territory is, therefore, wholly unwarranted."

The Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan is obviously referring in this connexion to the provisions of the United Nations Commission's resolution of 5 January 1959. This resolution, according to its own terms, is "supplementary" to the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948. With regard to the "plebiscite" proposals contained in it, it was explained by Dr. Lozano, Chairman of the United Nations Commission, that they "did not supersede Part III of the resolution of 13 August but were an elaboration of it". The Chairman had stated further that if the plebiscite Administrator found a plebiscite impossible for "technical or practical reasons", he or the Commission would then recommend to the Security Council a solution different from that of a plebiscite (Annex. 8, S/1430). Thus there is no exclusive or final character about the plebiscite proposal.

Even apart from the fact that plebiscite proposals in the resolution of 5 January are only one of the methods envisaged in Part III of the resolution of 13 August, the order in which these matters are to be considered is, first the implementation of Part I, then of Part II and finally of Part III of the resolution of 13 August. The "consultations" envisaged in Part III obviously cannot take place unless Parts I and II have been implemented.

Not only has Pakistan not implemented Parts I and II but has repeatedly violated and continues to violate the terms and the spirit of the obligations assumed by her in the first two parts of the said resolution. Some of her violations, e.g., the augmentation of the so-called Azad Kashmir forces and the annexation of the northern areas after the cease-fire, and totally contrary to the United Nations resolutions and agreements arising thereof as well as to the information given to the Commission by Pakistan, have been placed on record by the United Nations Commission. Others have been detailed by India's representatives in the Security Council from time to time. Meanwhile Pakistan troops and elements which were to be withdrawn from Kashmir under Part II still continue their forcible and illegal occupation of the territory of the Union of India in Jammu and Kashmir, though eleven years have elapsed since the provision for their withdrawal was made and accepted by Pakistan under Part It of the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948. Pakistan has thus in this regard alone violated solemn and vital agreements and continues to do so.

I request that this communication may kindly be circulated as a Security Council document and brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

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

INDIA PAKISTAN USA LATVIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

Shri G. S. Pathak's Statement in Legal Committee on Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation

Shri G.S. Pathak, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Sixth Committee (Legal Committee) on October 19, 1959 on the question of reservations to multilateral conventions and the convention on Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The following is the full text of his statement :

Mr. Chairman,

This item, which concerns the membership of the Republic of India to the Inter-Governmental Martime Consultative Organization, raises questions of great general importance. For the purpose of explaining how India is directly and vitally affected by certain proceedings (which I shall detail hereinafter), and for a proper appreciation of the points that emerge in relation to the law relating to reservations to multilateral conventions, it is necessary, first, to give the background of the problem and the facts which have led to the inscription of this item on the agenda of this

312

session.

India has a vast coastline and more than 3,000 years ago, she emerged as one of the foremost maritime countries of the world. She cultivated trade relations not only with countries of Asia but also with the whole of the then known world. For a long period, India was extensively engaged in commerce. Later the Europeans came on the scene and in course of time the British acquired mastery over the seas surrounding the peninsula. During the time when the territories of India were under the domination and rule of the European powers, colonial trade grew, and the British and other European nations which were engaged in colonial trade developed and built up their own shipping interests.

Since the attainment of independence by

India, shipping became one of the concerns of independent India. Shipping has been rightly described as the handmaid of commerce and national shipping is the necessary concomitant of the economic development of India, as of other under-developed countries. India has also a large interest in international sea-borne trade. Thus, when the Economic and Social Council called the UN Maritime Conference, India participated in the proceedings of the Conference, which met at Geneva from 19 February 1948 to 6 March 1948. The Conference prepared a Convention which was opened for signature and acceptance on 6 March 1948. On that date the Convention was signed on behalf of India, subject to approval by the Government of India.

By a resolution adopted by the Conference for the establishment of a Preparatory Committee of the IMCO, India was appointed a member of that Committee, and her name appeared as such member in the Final Act of the aforesaid Conference.

One of the organs of IMCO was its Council which was to consist of 16 members in accordance with Article 17 of the Convention. India was appointed a member of this Council and her name appeared in Appendix A of the Convention, as such member.

It is necessary at this stage to call attention to Articles 6 and 57 of the Convention

ARTICLE 6 READS:

"Members of the United Nations may become Members of the Organisation by becoming parties to the convention in accordance with the provisions of Article 57"

ARTICLE 57 SAYS:

"Subject to the provisions of Part III, the present Convention shall remain open for signature or acceptance and States may become parties to the convention by

(a) Signature without reservation as to acceptance ;

(b) Signature subject to acceptance followed by acceptance ;

or

(c) Acceptance.

Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

In pursuance of the aforesaid Article, and instrument of acceptance was executed by India which is in the following terms :

Read Annex 1 of the Secretary-General Report-Document A/4235/-

It is necessary to recall, at this stage, the language of Article 1(b) of the Convention, to which this declaration relates. Article 1 clause (b) reads as follows :

The purposes of the Organisation are

1 (b) "To encourage the removal of discriminatory action and unnecessary restrictions by Governments affecting shipping engaged in international trade so as to promote the availability of shipping services to the commerce of the world without discrimination ; assistance and encouragement given by a Government for the development of its national shipping and for purposes of security does not in itself constitute discrimination, provided that such assistance and encouragement is not based on measures designed to restrict the freedom of shipping of all flags to take part in international trade."

The aforesaid Instrument of Acceptance dated 31 December 1958 was lodged with the

313

Secretary-General on 6 January 1959. On that date the Assembly of IMCO was in session in London and the Secretary-General informed the Assembly of the said Instrument of Acceptance.

On 12 January 1959 a resolution moved

by the United Kingdom was passed by the Assembly of IMCO by which the Secretary-General of the UN was requested to circulate the document to member states of IMCO. By this resolution it was further resolved :

"....Until the member States have had an opportunity of expressing their views, the representative of India shall be free to take part without vote in the proceedings of this Assembly."

As a result of this resolution India's right to vote as member was suspended.

The representative of India then stated that his Government considered itself to be a full and unconditional member of the Organization; and that it had deposited an instrument of acceptance in accordance with Article 57 of the Convention. He further stated :

"......There was, therefore, nothing provisional, incomplete, or temporary about its participation in the Organization. Any continuation of the present limitation of India's rights to those of provisional membership was, therefore, not only anomalous but contrary to accepted practice."

"The present attitude of the organization towards the status of the Government of India appeard to be based on the view that the terms in which India had accepted the Convention constitutes a reservation ; and that in consequence, India could not be treated a party until all other signatories had accepted the terms laid down in the Indian instrument of acceptance."

Before dealing with the question with reference to the law relating to Reservations and stating that the status of India as a party to the Convention did not depend upon the assent of all the other signatories of the Convention, the representative of India had said that

"While he did not consider it necessary to examine at the present juncture the question whether or not the terms of the instrument did amount to a reservation in law, his Government was prepared, for the purpose of determining its status as a party to the Convention, to assume that technically its instrument of acceptance did contain a reservation."

Thus, although it is true, that the discussion in the statement of the Indian representative proceeded on what appeared to him to be the basis of the attitude of the sponsors of the Resolution, it is manifest that the point whether the declaration amounted in law to reservation was clearly indicated. The representative of India had no choice in the matter, when IMCO had already proceeded on the view that the Indian Declaration constituted a reservation. At that step he had stated, inter alia, that the Declaration was not provisional, although he did not consider it necessary to examine that aspect further.

By a letter dated 6 February 1959 addressed to the Permanent Representative of India, the Secretary-General of the UN, while quoting the declaration made in the instrument of acceptance by India said.

"...In cases where instruments of ratification, accession or acceptance are accompained by a reservation or by a declaration in the nature of a reservation and where such instruments relate to agreements concluded before the adoption on 12 January 1952 by the General Assembly of the United Nations of its resolution 598 (VI) on reservations to multilateral conventions and where the agreement does not contain any clause on reservations, it is the practice of the Secretary-General to circulate the text of the reservation of declaration to all States parties in order to determine their attitude in this respect."

In this letter the Secretary-General further stated :

"...All States parties to the Convention accordingly are being informed of the submission for deposit by India of its instrument of acceptance together with the text of the declaration and are requested to inform the Secretary-General as soon as possible of their attitude in this declaration."

"...If the Secretary-General receives no objection to the declaration from a State party to the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative

314

Organisation, India will be listed as a party to the said convention and all interested States will be notified accordingly."

Three things clearly appear from this letter :

(1) That the Secretary-General had treated the declaration as a reservation.

(2) The Secretary-General purported to follow his practice relating to reservations on the ground that Convention was concluded prior to 12 January 1952, the date of the General Assembly Resolution 598 (VI).

(3) The Secretary-General will list India as a party to the State Convention provided no State party to the Convention raises any objection to India's declaration. No time was specified for the lodging of the objections nor was the nature or character of the objections indicated. Thus the last sentence was open to the interpretation that the absence of any objection was essential before the Secretary-General could treat India as a party to the Convention, and in case an objection was received India will not be listed as a party.

In reply to the letter of Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of India to the UN, addressed a communication dated 7 July 1959 to the former, in which it was stated that-

"...The Government of India consider

that all action relevant to and arising from the Secretary-General as Depositary of the Instrument of Acceptance and Declaration connected with it, is thereby

fully discharged."

The position taken up by the Government of India thus, was that India had fulfilled the requirements of the law by depositing the instrument of acceptance and that she was a full member of the Organisation automatically and that there was no question of any State party to the Convention raising any objection. Therefore, it was stated in the letter of the Permanent Representative of India to the Secretary-General :

"...The Goverment of India are, however, bound to ask themselves what significance is to be attached to the statement of the Secretary-General made in his letter under reference that if he `receives no objection to the Declaration from a State party to the Convention on the inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization India will be listed as a party to the said Convention and all interested States will be notified accordingly'."

It was further stated in the said letter :

"...The Government of India cannot believe that it can be the intention of the Secretary-General to introduce in this regard by such a statement, arising from his functions as Depositary, a rule or principle of unanimity."

And in this connection reliance was placed on the opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Convention of Genocide.

India's instrument of acceptance along with the declaration was circulated and no objection was raised by any state, except France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

By a letter dated 20 July 1959 sent in answer to the Communication mentioned above the Secretary-General pointed out to the Permanent Representative of India that statements similar to the one made by him were made in other instances. Reference was also made to resolution 598 (VI) of the General Assembly, and it was stated that :

".....It was the understanding and in-

tention that the Secretary-General was to follow his previous practice in respect to agreements concluded prior to the date of adoption of the resolution, namely before 12 January 1952....The practice followed by the Secretary-General is contained in his report on the subject Document A/1372, and applies in respect of IMCO Convention."

The Secretary-General proceeded further :

"....Consequently, until the resolution adopted by the Assembly of IMCO, on 13 January 1959 is modified by a new resolution or decision taken by a competent organ of the IMCO, the Secretary-General, in view of the expression of attitude he has received from some of the States Parties to the Convention, in respect to the declaration accompanying

315

the instrument of acceptance of India of the Convention of IMCO, is unable to receive this instrument in final deposit.

".....It follows from the foregoing that so long as objection exists to the terms of the instrument of acceptance of India it would exceed the authority of the Secretary-General to make the affirmative decision suggested in the penultimate paragraph of the note of the Permanent Representative, as such action would constitute a ruling in favour of one Government's position and against that taken by another. In abstaining from such action, however, the Secretary-General would be reserving to the IMCO the right to pass upon the legal status of the acceptance by India on the basis of its compatibility with the Convention."

Thereupon the item under consideration was proposed for inclusion on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly with the following Explanatory Memorandum:

The first question that emerges from the above facts is what is the true nature and character of the declaration appended to the instrument of acceptance. If the declaration is a mere statement of policy which in law does not amount to reservation, the question what are the principles and procedures relative to reservation, to multilateral conventions would not arise. The answer to the problem then would be that as the true nature and character of the declaration in question, is not reservation in the real sense of the term, the acceptance fulfils the requirements of the provisions of the Convention and of the law and, therefore, the membership of India to the IMCO was the automatic result of the deposit of the Instrument of acceptance.

The legal effect of the application of Articles 6 and 57 of the Convention is automatic. The Secretery-General is not required under Article 57 to circulate the instrument of acceptance before accepting it in deposit for inviting the views or attitude of the party States. The legal effect of acceptance being automatic, the Secretary-General under Article 61 of the Convention "will inform all States invited to the UN Maritime Conference and such other States as may have become Members, of the date when each State becomes party to the Convention, and also of the date on which the Convention enters into force."

The alleged practice of the Secretary-General had reference only to reservations and could not be resorted to where there was no reservation. First, therefore, the question whether the declaration amounts to reservation. Article 1(b) says that "assistance and encouragement given by a Government for the development of its national shipping and for purposes of security does not in itself constitute discrimination, provided that such assistance and encouragement is not based on measures designed to respect the freedom of shipping of all flags to take part in international trade."

Now the Declaration states:

"In accepting the Convention of IMCO the Government of India declare that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted for giving encouragement and assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries. ...and such other measures as the Government of India may adopt ... are consistent with the purposes of IMCO as defined in Article 1 (b) of the Convention."

Assistance and encouragement can be given by a Government to its national shipping only by means of measures taken by it. Therefore, a declaration that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted or may adopt in future for giving encouragement and assistance to national shipping and shipping industry, are consistent with Article 1 (b), is nothing but a restatement of the contents of that Article. The Declaration means-and cannot mean anything else-that all such measures, are and shall be consistent with Article 1 (b). The word "are", in the English language, is also read in a future sense. (Strond's Judicial Dictionary Vol.III.). The contents of the declaration (namely, loans, financing of national shipping companies, or allocation of Government owned or Government-controlled cargoes to national shipping) are merely instances of such measures of encouragement and assistance. They are the normal and natural ways in which such assistance and encouragement are given. Place the declaration alongside Article 1 (b) and there cannot be any room for doubt that the contents of the declaration are identical with the very language of Article 1 (b). "Such other measures as the Government may adopt" is a clear statement that such measures will be ejusdum generis with the instances of measures given earlier.

The declaration emphasises that the sole object of these measures is to promote the development of its own national shipping. The word "sole" excludes the possibility of any other

316

object; and, therefore, the proviso contained in Article 1 (b) does not apply, as a measure designed to restrict the freedom of shipping of all flags to take part in-international trade will be excluded by the expression "sole".

The Government of India, therefore, has merely made a declaration of policy with regard to giving assistance. and encouragement for the development of its national shipping. Such a declaration might not have been made at all and the Government of India would still have been able to render assistance and encouragement for the development of its national shipping, without acting inconsistently with the purposes of the organization. The Government of India made this declaration ex abundanti cautela. We must remember the background in which Article 1(b) was framed. The members who participated in the conference which framed the convention were conscious of the fact that there were under-developed countries in the world which could not develop their national shipping except by assistance and encouragement given to the States. Under-developed countries were an object of special concern to the UN and it could not be the desire of any power, colonial or non-colonial, to do anything which would retard the progress which could be made only by means of such assistance and encouragement given to national shipping.

It must be remembered that the function of IMCO as provided in Article 2. are "consultative and advisory". IMCO can only make a recommendation by way of consultation or by way of advice. It is for the State parties to accept or not to accept such recommendations. It will be robbing the words 'consultative and advisory' of their meaning to read into them any function the exercise of which would result in acts of a binding character. An advice may be followed or not followed. It is liable to be re-examined and, therefore, the statement in the declaration that any recommendation relating to this subject that may be adopted by the organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of India, is only the necessary consequence of the advisory and consultative function of IMCO.

Another necessary corollary of the 'consultative and advisory' character of the functions of IMCO is that the advice received by a party state, being liable to be rejected, shall not have the effect of altering or modifying its national laws. There is nothing in the declaration, therefore, which can be said to be inconsistent with Article 1 (b) of the Convention.

The word 'condition' does not present any difficulty. In the first place it is in the language of the declaration itself that will determine its character. But apart from this, the. word 'condition' has also got the meaning of declaration. Webster's Dictionary says that the "root of the word signifies, to show, point out, diceri, to say, dicari, to proclaim, to dedicate." A reservation' is always an exception and is made when a party to a treaty does not wish to be bound by a particular provision contained in it. A reservation is a special term, limiting or varying the terms of a treaty.' It is not necessary to quote any authority for the meaning of the expression 'reservation' in the law of Treaties. Reservation is a wellknown expression and has a well recognized connotation. The Indian declaration neither declares itself to be a reservation nor does it use the language of 'reservation.' The declaration does not seek to limit or vary any term of the Convention and therefore it is not a reservation at all.

It is important to note that the United States examined the nature and character of the Indian declaration, as that would be the very first question which should arise before the procedure relating to reservations to multilateral conventions could be resorted to

(Quote US letter dated 30 June 1959 addressed to the Secretary-General Annex III to the Report of the Secretary-General)

The result is that the Indian declaration does not subject the Convention to a reservation and does not make the acceptance conditional. That being so, the acceptance automatically produces the legal result viz. that India became a member of the IMCO on making the deposit of the Instrument of acceptance. The procedure for becoming a member as laid down in Article 6 and Article 57 was fully complied with, and that all that was necessary for the Secretary-General to do was to act under Article 61 of the Convention and inform the States concerned of the date when India became a party. No other procedure was called for the Convention or by any other law or resolution of the General Assembly. The procedure adopted by the Secretary-General, therefore, was ultra vires. When I say this, I do not do so in a spirit of criticism. Questions of vires are often raised in the national courts of law and

317

have also been raised before the ICJ. There are sometimes dissenting views on the subject. Such questions are raised because, the Rule of law governs all actions of courts and the examination of such questions never involves the criticism of the exercise of powers by the court. It is a matter of the highest importance and gratification that the Rule of law is insisted on in all matters in the General Assembly, and I am merely invoking that rule in vindication of my country's rights, when I ask this Committee to examine the procedures that have been applied in the present case. We have the highest respect for the Secretary-General and for the high office he holds, and, on a number of occasions, we have expressed our appreciation of the work done by the Secretary-General, in particular, and by the Secretariat in general, on the floor of the General Assembly and in this Committee. Recently my delegation in the General debate gave expression to this appreciation and paid tribute to the work done by the Secretary-General and his staff.

The statement of the Secretary-General is an admirable and well-reasoned document. It is unfortunate that my Delegation is not in agreement with the legal positions set out in that statement but differences on questions of law is not a matter of uncommon occurrence. It is indeed a glory and distinction of the legal pro. fession in which I include judges and the teaching profession and all those engaged in the administration of law, in whatever capacitythat discussions on questions of law take place, differences are resolved by discussion and that this process, indeed, is the very condition of the progress of the legal system. I have every respect for Mr. Stavropoulos for his legal learning and acumen and express my gratitude to him for the courtesy and assistance which we have received from him and no disrespect is meant or could be meant when I give my reasons for differing from the various view as indicated in his report.

In his letter dated 6 February 1959 addressed to the Permanent Representative of India, the Secretary-General refers to the practice which he described in the following terms:

"...In cases where the instruments of ratification, accession or acceptance are accompanied by a reservation or by a declaration in the nature of a reservation and where such instruments relate to agreements concluded before the adop-

tion on 12 January 1952 by the General Assembly of the United Nations of its resolution 598 (VI) on reservations to multilateral conventions and where the agreement does not contain any clause or reservations it is the practice of the Secretary-General to circulate the text of the reservation or declaration to all States parties in order to determine their attitude in this respect."

The Secretary-General has clearly treated the Indian declaration as one in the nature of reservation and there is an implied finding that the declaration was a reservation. This was not within the competence of the Secretary-General both for the reason that his functions are of an administrative character, and also because the procedure applied by him was one which was not warranted by either the Convention or in law or by the resolution of the General Assembly which related only to cases of reservations. I am here assuming but not admitting that the resolution of the General Assembly 598 (VI) was otherwise relevant to the question of what procedure should be applied to reservations made to agreements prior to 12 January 1952.

I must explain here what, according to my delegation, is the scope of this function which I have described as 'administrative'. This function of a depositary is a technical function. It is not purely Instrument of acceptance and any declaration appended thereto. If he finds on examination that there is no reservation, he must accept the Instrument in deposit, without anything more. In case there is any ambiguity, he must ascertain from the State executing the Instrument of acceptance whether it intended it to be a reservation and he must accept the statement of the State in this respect. He has now power to adjudicate himself whether the Declaration constitutes a reservation. This procedure has the sanction of International practice. To quote an instance, in the case of the International Convention for promoting Safety of Life at Sea, signed on 31 May 1929, the United States ratified it subject to certain understandings and intimated to the United Kingdom which was the depositary, that the Convention was not in any way modified by the 'understandings' or was affected thereby. The Government of the United Kingdom was requested to accept the deposit of

the Instrument of ratification without first requiring acceptance of the 'understandings' by signatory and adhering States. The British Government received the deposit of the ratification without requiring the acceptance of these 'understandings' by the parties to the Convention.

At page 16 of the Report the Secretary-General says:

318

".....The circulation by the Secretary-General being thus inherently a ministerial measure, he was serving directly as the agent of IMCO Assembly acting on their request."

To this proposition my delegation takes exception. Under the Convention the Secretary-General, as a functionary of the UN in that capacity alone is designated for a limited purpose, namely, for the purpose of receiving in deposit of the acceptance and for informing the States concerned of the date when a State becomes a party. This does not create a relationship of principal and agent between IMCO and the Secretary-General and the Secretary-General is not required by the Convention or anything contained in the Charter to follow any directions of the IMCO. For the creation of such a relationship suitable language is required. There is no such language in the present case making the Secretary-General an agent of IMCO. He is the administrative Officer of the Organization under Article 97 of the Charter and under Article 98 he shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by the General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. There is no provision in the Charter, whereby the Secretary-General is required to perform any functions entrusted to him by any specialised agency.

The principle of expressio unius est exclusio alterius would apply and only the bodies mentioned in Article 98 could entrust other functions to the Secretary-General. Any other view would result in the situation that while the Charter has excluded bodies other than those enumerated from entrusting functions to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, such functions could be imposed on him by resorting to the Doctrine of Agency. This would amount to an amendment of the Charter. Thus no duties can be assigned by any specialised agency on the Secretary-General and the Secretary-General is prohibited from accepting any such duties from a specialised agency. This idea of agency is repeated in paragraph 29 of the Report.

That paragraph says

"It might even create for the Secretary-General the direct conflict between the authority given him by IMCO as its agent and the views of the General Assembly as a principal organ of the United Nations."

The supposed position of the Secretary-General as the agent of IMCO is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter. Further, he cannot seek and receive instructions from any external authority. Article 100 of the Charter says :

"In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the organization."

The supposed relationship of principal and agent between IMCO and the Secretary-General would create situations in which the Secretary-General might have to seek and receive instructions from IMCO.

Article 100 further states :

"They (i.e. the Secretary-General and the staff) shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organisation."

The acceptance of the position as agent of IMCO will make the Secretary-General responsible to IMCO also. But he is prohibited from taking any action which may make him responsible to any body except the United Nations. By the addition of the function of a depositary the Secretary-General's status as administrative officer of the United Nations is not altered. This function is allotted to him in his capacity as Secretary-General. He does not denude himself of that capacity and status when he performs the function of a depositary. Therefore in the performance of his duties as depositary he cannot seek and receive instructions from IMCO. In the present case on his own showing he has done both and his acts are wholly ultra vires on that account. Even the General Assembly, much less the Secretary-General, could act in a manner contradictory to the Charter.

Mr. Chairman, the concept of a depositary is quite distinct from that of an agent.

'Deposit' is a part of the process of becoming a member. Under Article 57 of the Convention States become parties by acceptance and acceptance is effected by the deposit of the Instrument of acceptance. 'Deposit' is not unlike the 'delivery' which is necessary to give effect to an English deed after signing and sealing it. The process of becoming a member is outside the functions of IMCO. IMCO has no jurisdiction to give any instructions in relation to this process or to pronounce upon the legal effect of an instru-

319

ment of acceptance and its deposit or of, any act in relation to the process of deposit. In the view of my delegation, the General Assembly is the only body which can give instructions to the Secretary-General in relation to the process of deposit. If the Secretary-General feels that he needs instructions it is for him to seek and receive instructions from the General Assembly and the General Assembly alone.

It has now become usual to provide in treaties that the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall be the depositary thereof. This seems to be related to the functions of the Secretary-General as the Registrar of treaties under Article 102 of the Charter. It is conducive to convenience if the Registrar and the Depositary are the same organ. Professor Brierly, in his report (Decument A/CN 4/23) to the International Law Commission, in reference to this practice, says:

"Thus, it would be possible, in the case of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for the General Assembly to lay down regulations for the conduct of that official of any duties laid upon him as a Depositary......"

Mr. Chairman, the question may be asked-Before IMCO came into existence, whose agent was the Secretary-General? Cetainly not of IMCO, because it was not yet born. If an Instrument of acceptance had been received by the Secretary-General at a time when the Convention had not entered into force, according to Article 60 of the convention by 21 States having become parties, he could not be the agent of a non-existent body. Therefore, the so-called agency dots not arise from the fact that the Secretary-General is a depositary. This relationship could not attach itself to him from any later date, if he was not an agent before, as there is no such provision in the Convention. The law in this respect that was applicable before the date the Convention entered into force would continue to apply after that date.

Suppose the General Assembly gives instructions to the Secretary-General in connection with his function as depositary and IMCO also gives instructions and there is conflict between the instructions given by the General Assembly and given by IMCO, whose instructions will he follow ? He can certainly not disregard the instructions of the General Assembly, whose Administrative-Officer he is under the Charter. This clearly demonstrates that the theory of the Secretary-General being an agent of IMCO is incorrect.

If the Secretary-General is the agent of IMCO, on the same reasoning he will be the agent of other specialised agencies also. The agencies may take different views on the procedure relating to reservations and may evolve different practices. In such a situation there will be chaos in International Law and there will be as many practices and laws as the specialised agencies or other bodies who may choose to designate the Secretary-General as a depositary. The United Nations is under an obligation to make recommendations for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialised. agencies under Article 58 of the Charter. Even if IMCO had any jurisdiction over the process of deposit-which it has not-it would be the duty of the General Assembly, to recommend one policy to all the agencies.

It will, be well to bear in mind the nature of relationship between the General Assembly of United Nations on the one side and specialised agencies on the other. On examination of this relationship, it will clearly appear that it will be wholly incongruous with this relationship and inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter to hold that any organ of the United Nations holds a subordinate position vis-a-vis a specialised agency like that of an agent bound to obey the instructions of a specialised agency.

The nature of relationship between the United Nations and specialised agencies will have to be judged on the following considerations :

Specialised agencies are the instruments through which the purposes of the United Nations are achieved under Article 55. The United Nations promotes solution of international economic and other problems enumerated therein. One of the purposes of the United Nations is to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic character. The United Nations is the centre for harmonising the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends (Article 1, paras 3 and 4).

The United Nations takes steps to bring into being a special agency. The United Nations initiates negotiations for creation of a specialised agency (Article 59).

ECOSOC, which has to perform functions as assigned by the General Assembly (Article 66 para 3) calls an international conference for bringing a specialised agency into existence. When a specialised agency is born, it must be brought into relationship with ECOSOC under agreements which are subject to approval by the General Assembly (Articles 59 and 63).

320

The responsibility for. the discharge of functions of the United Nations as set forth in Chapter IX which contains Articles 57, 58 and 59, Tests on the General Assembly and under the authority of the General Assembly, on ECOSOC (Article 60). One of these responsibilities is the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialised agencies (Article 58), and for this purpose recommendation must be made by the General Assembly.

The ECOSOC may obtain regular reports from specialised agencies and also reports on steps taken by these agencies to give effect to recommendations made by the General Assembly (Article 64). These reports will be submitted before the General Assembly with the observations of ECOSOC (Article 64). This implies that specialised agencies shall carry out the recommendations of the General Assembly. The General Assembly shall examine the administrative budgets of specialised agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned. (Article 17, para 3). The result is that at the apex is the United Nations or the General Assembly. The General Assembly gives birth to specialised agencies, has the right and power to supervise the activities of the net-work of specialised agencies, its progeny. The progeny is independent within their sphere but subject to recommendatory control by the General Assembly. Their policies on common matters must be coordinated by the General Assembly. If the policies conflict, there will be chaos and the purpose will be defeated.

Kelson in his book on "The Law of the United Nations", while examining the status of specialised agencies, says that specialised agencies, although not considering to be organs, may be characterised at least as indirect organs of the United Nations. (The Law of the United Nations, A Critical Analysis of its Fundamental Problems' by Hans Kelson, New York 1950, page 146).

The agreements between the specialised agencies of the United Nations generally contain important provisions intended to give assurance that the recommendations of the United Nations will be considered and acted upon. (See Goodrich and Hambroon "Charter of the United Nations", revised edition, page 352).

The learned authors, while referring to the Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which was adopted with minor changes by the General Assembly, says that the Report emphasises :

"the achievement of the necessary degree of coordination between the United Nations and the specialised agencies is, in the last analysis, the responsibility of members themselves." (page 354)

Having regard, therefore, to the exact relationship of the United Nations and the

specialised agencies, it will be incorrect to say that the specialised agencies have got the powers to pass upon the legal effect of acts done in the course of the process of deposit; and that the General Assembly has no power to give instructions to the Secretary-General in this respect.

The IMCO has its own Secretary-General appointed under Article 33 of the Convention, and he is its chief administrative officer. Apart from the duties expressly entrusted to him by the Convention, he is to perform such other tasks as may be assigned by the Convention the Assembly, the Council and the Maritime Safety Committee under Article 38 of the Convention. There is, thus, nothing either in the Charter of the United Nations, or in the Convention of IMCO which may constitute the Secretary-General of the United Nations as the agent of the IMCO for any purpose whatsoever.

Consequently, the Secretary-General's action cannot derive support from the resolution of IMCO. The Office of the Secretary-General is the Creature of the Charter and-its functions are circumscribed by and cannot transcend the Charter. No resolution of any specialised agency can add to the functions of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

A resolution of the specialised agency cannot create jurisdiction and powers for any organ of the United Nations. India was a member of IMCO and no question could, therefore, arise of obtaining information with regard to the attitude of other party States. The resolution of IMCO itself would be ultra vires. And if the General Assembly has to take notice of this Resolution, it is for the purpose of expressing its views of the subject and of finding out what recommendations can be made to IMCO or what instructions have to be given to the Secretary-General. It may be remembered that the members are bound to obey the Charter in preference to a Convention in case of conflict (Article 103).

Reference is mad? in the Report of the Secretary General to Article 55 of the convention. That Article runs thus :

"Any question or dispute concerning the

interpretation or application of the "convention shall be referred to for settlement to the Assembly, or shall be settled in such other manner as the parties to the dispute agree..."

The view of my Delegation is that there is no question in the present case concerning the interpretation or application of this convention. There is no sentence or phrase in any article whose meaning is doubtful or with regard to whose meaning any contention is raised. The principle is well recognised that once the language of a statement is plain and unambiguous, there is no occasion for interpretation of this principle applies to treaties also. The question of the interpretation of the Indian declaration cannot be a question in respect of which it can be predicted that the interpretation or the application of the convention is involved. It is interesting to compare the language of Article 9 of the Genocide Convention with the language of Article 55 of the IMCO convention. Article 9 of the Genocide Convention provided that disputes relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of that convention shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any parties to the dispute. The word `fulfilment' does not appear in Article 55. It must be remembered that IMCO is an organisation for technical matters. It cannot constitute itself a Tribunal for the settlement of disputes. The matters, not being covered by Article 55 cannot fall within the competence of IMCO. But apart from this even if IMCO had got the jurisdiction to decide whether the Indian declaration amounted to a reservation or whether the unanimity or the opposite rule shall apply, the jurisdiction of the General Assembly is not ousted thereby. There is no question of any conflict of jurisdiction in the present case. The view expressed in the Report of the Secretary-General is that the Assembly of IMCO is seized of the matter. The General Assembly is a larger body having a legal Committee consisting of representatives specially qualified in legal matters. IMCO is comparatively much smaller body and India will be excluded from voting. In the view of my Delegation both in law and having regard to considerations of propriety, the General Assembly is the most suitable forum for the examination of the questions involved in this matter.

Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that

there is a case of reservation in the real sense of the term. The question that would arise then will be: what is the current law on the subject and in case where a convention is silent as to the rule to be applied, what is the rule which should be applied. The history of the subject is so fresh in the minds of the honourable delegates that it is not necessary to reiterate beyond stating that the Secretary-. General made a report regarding reservations to multilateral Conventions. Different views had been expressed in the 6th Committee during the 5th session and the Advisory opinion of the ICJ was sought by the General Assembly by its resolution dated 16 November 1950.

In the debates the main controversy centered round the question whether in case where a multilateral convention is silent upon the rule to be applied, it is the unanimity rule which should prevail or the State making the reservation becomes a party to the Convention so far as the non-objecting States are concerned, i.e. the rule of universality. The World Court, on reference, gave its opinion which is reported on page 15 of the Opinions and Judgments of the International Court of Justice of the year 1951.

It is true that the questions referred to the International Court of Justice concerned only the Genocide Convention but the opinion of the International Court of Justice is also based on the general principles.

On the question of the effect of the opinion of the ICJ a jurist of the eminence of Sir H. Lauterpacht has taken the view that the principles laid down by the Court are of general application. In the 8th edition, volume 1, Oppenheim's International Law, at page 915, occurs the following passage :

"...Although the Opinion of ICJ was limited to the case of the Genocide Convention, it must be considered as having a distinct bearing upon the question of reservations in general. While the opinion fails to provide a workable legal rule, it gives expression to the view which is gaining ground, that the principle of unanimous consent to reservations is not well suited to the requirements of International intercourse characterised by multilateral conventions of a general character, and that it is impracticable and unwarranted to give one state (a small or large state), the right to prevent another state from becoming a party to the Convention, although almost all contracting parties consider the reservation appended by it to be compatible with the objects of the Convention".

In volume 39 of Grotius Society Transactions on page 97 and 98 is an article contributed by Sir H. Lauterpacht. Basing himself on the

322

reasoning of general character adopted by the ICJ. he expresses the view that the Advisory Opinion further impaired the rule of unanimous consent as expressing the generally recognised principle of international law. This reasoning of a general character is to be found at page 24 of the report of the ICJ. This reason which is in addition to the one given before ... is of a general character and is stated by the International Court of Justice in these words :

"...It does not appear, moreover, that the conception of the absolute integrity of a convention has been transformed into the rule of international law."

The reasons given by the Court in support of this conclusion were these

(1) The considerable part which tacit assent has always played in estimating the effect which is to be given to reservations scarcely permits one to state that such a rule exists, determining with sufficient precision the effect of objections made to reservations. In fact, the examples of objections made to reservations appear to be too rare in international practice to have given rise to such a rule.

(2) It cannot be recognized that the report which was adopted on the subject by the Council of the League of Nations on 17 June 1927 has had this effect. At best, the recommendation made on that date by the Council constitutes the point of departure of an administrative practice which, after being observed by the Secretariat of the League of Nations, imposed itself, so to speak, in the ordinary course of things on the Secretary-General of the U.N. in his capacity of depositary of conventions concluded under the auspices of the League. But it cannot be concluded that the legal problem of the effect of objections to reservations has in this way been solved.

(3) The opinion of the Secretary-General of the United Nations himself is embodied in the following passage of his report of September 21, 1950: "While it is universally recognized that the consent of the other governments concerned must be sought before they can be bound by the terms of a reservation, there has not been unanimity either as to the procedure to be followed by a depositary in obtaining the necessary consent or as to the legal effect of a State's Objecting to a reservation".

(4) On the question whether the Gene. ral Assembly, in approving the Genocide Convention had in mind the practice according to which the Secretary-General exercising his functions as a depositary, did not regard a reservation as definitively accepted until it had been established that none of the other contracting States objected to it, the Court observed that it "does not consider that this view corresponds to reality. it must be pointed out, first of all, that the existence of an administrative practice does not in itself constitute a decisive factor: in ascertaining what views the contracting States to the Genocide Convention may have had concerning the rights and duties resulting therefrom. It must also be pointed out that there existed among the American States members both of the United Nations and of the Organization of American States, a different practice which goes so far as to permit a reserving State to become a patty irrespective of the nature of the reservations or of the objections raised by other contracting States. The preparatory work of the Convention contains nothing to justify the statement that

the contracting States implicitly had any definite practice in mind?'

(5) "The debate on reservations to multilateral treaties which took place in the 6th Committee at the 5th session of the General Assembly reveals a profound divergence of views, some delegations being attached to the idea of the absolute integrity of the convention, other favouring a more flexible practice which would bring about the participation of as many States as possible."

Therefore, it is quite clear that the

opinion of ICJ was also based upon a finding of a general character viz that there is no rule of international law known as the unanimity rule.

My delegation takes the view that the principle laid down in the opinion of the Court is correct and that there is no unanimity rule recognized by International Law, and therefore even though there might be an objection, one or two states cannot prevent India from becoming

323

a member of the IMCO, even if India had made any reservation, which it has not, as pointed out above.

It is worthy of note that the IMCO Convention bears close resemblance to the Genocide Convention in regard to the material particulars which weighed with the International Court of Justice. The Court remarked in regard to the Genocide Convention that although the Genocide Convention was finally approved unanimously, it is nevertheless a result of series of majority votes. The majority principle-so says the World Court-while facilitating the conclusion of multilateral convention also makes it necessary for, certain States to make reservations. This reservation is confirmed by the great number of reservations which have been made of recent years in multilateral conventions. In the case of IMCO Convention the majority principle was applied at all stages of the proceedings of the Conference including its final approval. In case a State were not prepared to accept any particular part of the draft Convention and had raised the

question in the Conference and the majority had accepted the views of that State, that view would have been treated as the view of the entire Conference and the Convention itself would have adopted the exception to the Draft urged by the said State. A dissenting vote would not have prevented the incorporation of the exception in the Convention itself. It would be anomalous that if at the time of acceptance a reservation is made by a State and if there are only one or two States (out of a very large number of States) objecting to the exception, the one or two States could prevent the State making the reservation from becoming a party to the organization.

Like the Genocide Convention, the IMCO Convention also subserves purposes of universal concern. Shipping is not a matter in which the contracting parties alone are interested. A matter relating to economic purposes stands on the same footing as one relating to humanitarian purposes. For the above reasons the principle of the opinion of International Court of Justice in the Genocide Convention Case would be applicable, even if there were a reservation, and India became a member of IMCO, in spite of one or two objections raised to the Indian Delegation.

The Government of India has stated in the explanatory memorandum that it does not find any resolution or decision of the General Assembly authorising the application of the unanimity rule in regard to multilateral conventions concluded under the auspices of the United Nations. The report of the Secretary-General and the correspondence referred to above which passed between the Secretary-General and the Government of India, shows that the reliance has been placed upon resolution 598 (VI) of the General Assembly of 12 January 1952.) That resolution runs thus :

"598 (VI). Reservations to multilateral conventions

The General Assembly,

Bearing in mind the provisions of its resolution 478 (V) of 16 November 1950, which (1) requested the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion regarding reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and (2) invited the International Law Commission to study the question of reservations to multilateral conventions.

Noting the Court's advisory opinion of 28 May 1951 and the Commission's report, both rendered pursuant to the said resolution,

1. Recommends that organs of the United Nations specialized agencies and States should, in the course of preparing multilateral conventions, consider the insertion therein of provisions relating to the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations and to the effect to be attributed to them :

2. Recommends to all States that they be guided in regard to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951;

- 3. Requests the Secretary-General :
 - (a) In relation to reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, to conform his practice to the advisory opinion of the Court of 28 May 1951;
 - (b) In respect of future conventions concluded under the auspices of the United Nations of which he is the depositary :
 - (i) To continue to act as depositary in connexion with the deposit of documents containing reservations or objections, without passing upon the legal effect of such documents; and

324

 (ii) To communicate the text of such documents relating to reservations or objections to all States concerned, leaving it to each State to draw legal consequences from such communications."

The first clause of the resolution mentions a

recommendation to the organs of United Nations specialised agencies and States to consider the insertion of provision relating to the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations. The second clause of the resolution mentions a recommendation to all States that they may be guided in regard to the Convention on Genocide by the advisory opinion of International Court of Justice. The third clause refers to the procedure to be adopted by the Secretary-General in respect of convention which had not been made prior to 12 January 1952. There is no express provision in the resolution instructing the Secretary-General to apply unanimity rule or the practice founded upon that rule in regard to conventions which had come into existence before. Reference is made in the Report of the Secretary-General to the Summary Records of the 6th Committee in paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Report and it is stated that the representative of the U.S.S.R. called for a separate report on phrase relating to future conventions. The Report says that the spokesman for the joint sponsors explained that "the purpose of the addition of the words referred to by the U.S.S.R. representative in the joint statement, namely, 'future conventions' were not to have any retroactive effect on existing conventions or conventions that had merely been signed, but were only to be applied with respect to future conventions." The Committee then adopted this language by a vote of 32 to 5, with 12 abstentions. Reference is also made to the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General, in charge of the Legal Department. The question that arises is whether in the absence of any express provision in the resolution itself can the statements made in the course of discussions supply the deficiency and should the resolution therefore be read as containing an instruction to the Secretary-General to apply the rule of unanimity or his old practice based upon that rule in respect of conventions made prior to 12 of January 1952? In a case where the language of a resolution or a treaty is doubtful and they have to be interpreted, recourse can always be had to the proceedings or the preparatory work. My Delegation is not prepared to agree that such proceedings or the preparatory work can be utilized for the purpose of creating the provision in a resolution, when the resolution itself is silent. There is no doubt that the General Assembly is not a legislative body and it can merely declare an existing law. It would be strange if 12 of January 1952 would mark a

point of time when the law would change from the rule of unanimity to the rule laid down in the Genocide Conventions. The approval of the unanimity rule could not have been the intention of the General Assembly.

The various points mentioned in the Report of the Secretary-General and not yet dealt with may now be considered. First, as regards the jurisdiction of the General Assembly or the propriety of the consideration of this item by the General Assembly, as shown above, the question relates to the powers and functions of the Secretary-General. Article 10 of the Charter provider, that the "General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter." The Secretariat is, under Article 7 of the Charter, one of the principal organs of the United Nations and under Article 97 the Secretariat comprises the Secretary-General and the Staff. Therefore, in the present case when the question has arisen as to the powers and functions of the Secretariat, Article 10 makes the General Assembly the proper forum for the discussion of the question relating to such powers and functions. The fact that it is at the instance of another body that the Secretary-General has performed the acts does not alter the fact that the matter here relates to his powers and functions particularly when the submission is that the act in question fell outside such powers and functions.

Article 10 of the Charter would apply for another reason. The Charter has contemplated international economic cooperation and IMCO has been created as a result of conference convened by an organ of the UN to subserve one of the purposes of the Charter, namely, to achieve international cooperation in economic matter. If by the application of procedures not warranted by law, a member State is rendered unable fully to take part in the organization created on the initiation of UN, it is certainly a matter which the General Assembly can discuss. In the opinion on Genocide the ICJ has said with regard to Genocide Convention that:

"The precise determination of the conditions for participation in the Convention constitutes a paramount interest of direct concern to the UN which has not disappeared with the entry into force of the Convention."

325

By a parity of reasoning it can be said in the present case that the General Assembly possesses interest of direct concern in the matter of participation of a member State of the UN in the IMCO and the present is, therefore, a question or a matter within the scope of the Charter.

Moreover, for the consideration of the previous resolution of the General Assembly, the General Assembly itself would be the proper forum. The General Assembly may pass a resolution clarifying or amplifying its previous resolution. No other body would be competent to explain or clarify the resolution of the General Assembly, or to pass a suitable resolution if the circumstances of the case so require. The Secretary-General himself would probably like to have the position clarified by the General Assembly itself. In the opinion of the International Court of Justice it is stated that "the General Assembly which drafted and adopted the Genocide Convention and the Secretary General who is the depositary of instruments of ratification and accession, have an interest in knowing the legal effects of reservations to that convention and more particularly the legal effects of objections to such reservations." We are sure that it would be in the interest of the Secretariat itself that the General Assembly should clarify the position and should give proper guidance to the Secretary-General. This Committee is one of the main Committees for the discussion of legal questions and we have complete confidence in the wisdom and judgment of this Committee. Moreover, the question is one of general application which may arise in connection with other specialised agencies and other conventions. IMCO will have no power to give any guidance (if it could give any guidance to the Secretary-General of the United Nations at all) in respect of the procedures to be adopted in relation to other specialised agencies or other convention.

The Report of the Secretary-General says that the reference to the final decision of the IMCO Assembly would include the question of unanimity also. The Report of the Secretary-General further says that the IMCO Assembly had taken no decision on the question whether, the unanimity in vote in India's favour was required. It was India's representative who attracted to IMCO the application of the rule of unanimity. The draft resolution might not have referred to the rule of unanimity but it is a matter of common knowledge that there are talks and discussions in the corridors which sometimes reveal the underlying basis of the resolutions in addition to the language thereof. The Indian representative as pointed out earlier, had not given up the position that the declaration was not a reservation.

The questions of validity of reservation regarding payments of financial contributions or voting procedure do not arise in the present case at all. The report of the Secretary-General states that the General Assembly cannot fix a rule for determining the question of membership of another organization nor take a decision on the interpretation of treaties and that that would amount to the modification of the Convention. With this statement we do not agree. The question before the General Assembly is one of the powers and functions of the Secretariat and in the discussion of this question no modification of the Convention would be involved. The question is not really one of interpretation of treaties and in any event a decision on the interpretation of a treaty does not amount to the modification thereof. In the view of my delegation no complication can arise if the General Assembly expresses its view on the subject and makes suitable recommendations to IMCO. In doing so, the General Assembly will not assume the role of a Court of Appeal.

It remains for me to place before the Committee the objections raised against the instruments of acceptance by France and by West Germany. Unlike the USA, France has, without considering the question whether the declaration amounted to reservation at all, raised the objection on the ground that the unanimity rule applies and has said that the reservations are valid only if they are accepted by all the State parties to the treaty. Objections are raised to the wording of the Indian declaration on the ground which I read as under :

"It is in the first place impossible to accept that the governing parties' convention should itself decide unilaterally that any measures which it might adopt in the future with regard to the subjects covered by the Convention, shall automatically be deemed consistent with the Convention."

The declaration made by any government in the instruments of acceptance has to be from the very nature of the case unilateral. I have already dealt with the true meaning and purport of the Indian declaration. The declaration as it stands must be accepted and the question of compatibility would be judged on the footing that the declaration is true. But this again is a question, as stated above, which can only arise if the declaration amounts to a reservation. The objection then raised is that the declaration is not precise and is strictly limited. No Govern-

326

ment other than that of France has put this interpretation of the declaration and I hope I have been able to clearly demonstrate that the declaration is clear and is nothing but a restatement of purposes mentioned in Article 1 (b) of the Convention.

The latter parts of the declaration do not impose any conditions. They are founded upon the basis that the functions of the IMCO am consultative and advisory and the objection raised by France omits to take notice of this aspect. The objection raised by the Federal Republic of Germany is annexure 4 to the Secretary-General's report and it is submitted with respect that it is not based on a correct reading of the Indian declaration.

In the end, I would submit that the legal effect of depositing the Instrument of acceptance by India with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, is that India became a member of IMCO, because -

(a) there was no reservation, and

(b) even if there had been any, objections raised by France and the Federal Republic of Germany could not and did not prevent India from becoming a member.

And ever since the date of deposit of the Instrument of Acceptance by India, India has

been a member of IMCO with all the rights belonging to such membership.

We have confidence in the goodwill of the member States and we believe in the principle of international cooperation. We are grateful to the courtesy and consideration shown to us, and we hope that this Committee will-

(i) express itself in favour of the Indian point of view,

(ii) make suitable recommendations to the IMCO, and

(iii) give appropriate instructions to the Secretary-General.

There may be some matters in the Report of the Secretary-General, or arising out of the report, which I may not have touched and which I shall deal later, if necessary. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to intervene at a later stage in the debate.

INDIA USA SWITZERLAND UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE GERMANY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. S. Pathak's Statement in Legal Committee on Report of International Law Commission

Shri Gopal Swarup Pathak, Member, Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Legal Committee (Sixth Committee) of the 14th session of the General Assembly on October 6, 1959 on the Report of the International Law Commission.

The following in the full text of the Statement :

Mr. Chairman:

I wish to make only a few brief observations. My delegation has listened with great interest to the presentation made by Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, the distinguished Chairman of the International Law Commission, of the report of its 11th session. We are, indeed, fortunate in having a detailed account of the progress of the important work that is being done by the International Law Commission, given to us by a jurist of Sir Gerald's distinction and eminence.

We have read with care the report that is before us, and are in general agreement with the methods adopted by the International Law Commission in the performance of its arduous task. In particular we endorse the view of the Commission contained in paragraph 13 of its report. The various sub-divisions of the Law of Treaties, although inter-related in certain respects, are to a large extent self-contained. And, therefore even though the work on the different branches will have to be reviewed and adjustments made, the various sub-divisions could be dealt with separately. As the Articles presented in the report are provisional, and may require reconsideration at a later stage, we feel that comment on the text of the articles at this stage would be premature and, consequently, we prefer to wait until all articles dealing with the entire subject have been codified.

We have also noted the suggestion of the distinguished Chairman, mentioned in paragraph 18 of the report that a code on the Law of Treaties is more appropriate than a draft convention on the subject. While we do not wish to prejudice any future decision by the International Law Commission, we ourselves are inclined to agree with this suggestion.

327

As regards the subject of Consular Intercourse and Immunities, we would like to pay tribute to the work done by the International Law Commission and the distinguished Special Rapporteur Mr. Zourek in this matter. We appreciate the reason which prevented the completion of the consideration of this subject by the Commission, and we are glad to note that the Commission will give priority to this subject at its next session. My Government reserves its right to comment on this matter at the appropriate time.

We regret that it has not been possible for the International Law Commission, so far, to have an observer present at the meetings of the Asian-African Legal Consulative Committee, and we hope that it will be possible for the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee to make such arrangements as would facilitate closer consultation between the two bodies. As there are present in this Committee some members of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee as well as the distinguished Chairman of the International Law Commission, perhaps, by informal consultations, some arrangements might be arrived at.

Turning now to the first draft resolutions, i.e., A/C.6/254 which is before this committee, my delegation is very happy, indeed, to support the joint draft resolution which takes note of the report, and commends the International Law Commission on its work.

We shall support the resolution submitted by the distinguished delegate of El Salvador with regard to the Right of Asylum. My delegation agrees with the distinguished delegate of the United States that the question of when this matter should be taken up by the Commission should be left to the Commission itself. This matter of Asylum, as has already been stated by a number of delegations, is already before the Human Rights Commission. Considerable discussion took place during the last session of the Commission on Human Rights on this subject and the delegation of India participated in that discussion. We feel that there is close inter-relation between the work on the subject done by the Commission on Human Rights and the International Law Commission, and we have no doubt that the latter will take into consideration the result of the efforts of the former.

The Bolivian draft resolution is receiving our consideration and we shall make a statement, if necessary, later.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EL SALVADOR BOLIVIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Venkataraman's Statements in Fifth Committee

Shri R. Venkataraman, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made two statements in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee) of the United Nations on October 15 and 19, 1959. The following is the text of the statement he made on October 15, 1959

Mr. Chairman,

Several delegations have expressed appreciation of the gallant efforts made by the Secretary-General to keep down the costs of administration and keep up the efficiency of operation and level of the services to the members. My delegation joins in the tribute paid to the Secretary-General and to the members of his staff.

We have been accustomed in this Committee to receive expert advice and guidance in our examination of Budget Estimates from the thoughtful Reports of the Advisory Committee. These Reports are the result of hours of silent toil and scrutiny of figures and estimates of activities spread over the entire globe. I must confess that without these invaluable Reports our examination of the Budget Estimates will be superficial and unsatisfactory. My delegation has expressed its deep appreciation year after year of the work of the Advisory Committee and its wise Chairman Ambassador Aghnides but we feel that our words have always fallen short of what the Committee and its able Chairman deserve.

My delegation is unable to share the complacency of the Secretary-General with regard to the Budgetary situation of the Organisation. In para 33 of his statement before the Committee Doc. A/C. 51782, the Secretary-General stated that the assessment base for the year 1960 would be 3 million dollars lower than in 1959 and that itself was a pleasant prospect before the Budgetary Committee. While not denying the arithmetic, my delegation desires to point out that the comparison obscures the fact that the situations are not comparable and that the abnormal political and security situation of 1958 necessitated supplementary appropriations of over 6 million dollars in the year 1959. On the contrary, as pointed out by the Advisory Committee in para 9 of Doc. A/4170, the real increase in 1960

328

initial estimates over 1959 appropriations is 2 million dollars and there are further Prospects of increase in the estimates arising out of

(a) revision of the initial estimates

(b) additional expenditure arising out of decisions of the current session of the General Assembly, and

(c) possible unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure during the Budget year.

The need for vigilence and economy is therefore constant and compelling.

Many delegations have drawn the pointed attention of the Committee to the ever increasing costs of the Secretariat. My delegation shares the concern expressed by others in this Committee regarding the mounting cost of staff. In the face of the rising cost of maintaining even a stable establishment, it is imperative that every effort should be made to make the maximum use of the staff so that any necessary expenditure of programmes could, as far as possible, be accomplished with little or no additional resources. We must also ensure that, in addition to well-qualified staff, we have an administrative organisation and machinery which will facilitate a greater output and more efficient performance on the part of the Secretariat.

We agree with the Advisory Committee that consideration might be given to the need for an over-all review of the organisation of the Secretariat. We know that the Secretary-General himself is of the view that the organisation of the Secretariat must be subject to constant scrutiny and adjustment in order to meet changing requirements, and to achieve maximum economies and sound administrative practices.

In our own national system such continuing scrutiny of organizational questions is performed by an organization and Methods Division. In addition, of course, there are also periodic overall reviews by appropriate groups. The time may have come for such a fresh over-all look at the Secretariat of the United Nations, nearly five to six years after the last occasion when we had a somewhat similar review.

In the view of my delegation, any group which is charged with the responsibility for such an overall review should be composed of persons outside the Secretariat or, at any rate, include such outside elements. I wish, in this connection, to refer to the management survey which was undertaken in the F. A. O. some two or three years ago. That survey was performed by experts from the Organisation and Methods Division of the British Treasury, and it is my delegation's understanding that the survey proved beneficial to the F. A. O. My delegation is confident that there is enough expertise in the Governments of Member States which might be used to explore ways and means of improving the organisation and methods of the Secretariat.

From the very beginning my delegation has not been enthusiastic about change in the form of the Budget. At the 522nd meeting of the Fifth Committee the Chairman of the Delegation of India who participated in the general debate on the Budget 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 the members to scrutinise the estimates given in all the details.' Again during the 13th Session of the General Assembly my delegation expressed its grave doubts about relative advantages of the new form of budget. At the 644th meeting of the Fifth Committee my delegation stated 'that a consolidation of the amounts such as travel costs or salary and wages is not likely to give a clear picture of the costs involved project-wise and the advantages of the new form would be negligible". My delegation has since carefully examined both the Report of the Secretary-General and the comments of the Advisory Committee and it regrets that it has not

been convinced of the advantages of the new form of Budget. On the contrary, my delegation feels that all the information that were available to the Committee in 1957 in the Budget presentation in the old form is not now available to the Members of the Committee and that the examination of the estimates, therefore, does suffer at least in certain sections. For a brief comparison my delegation would refer to Section 3 of part I of the Budget Estimates for the financial year 1957 Doc.A/3126 dealing with the Economic and Social Council its Commissions and Committees. In old presentation the total expenditure in respect of Economic and Social Council, its Commissions and Committees together with the break-up of expenditure for each of the commission and committee, with separate figures relating to the cost of travel of members of staff, of the expenses for consultants, have all been given under separate chapter. The same information in the new presentation of the Budget will have to be pieced together from Chapter 3 of Part I of the Budget and from Section 8 of Part III of the Budget rendering comparisons difficult if not impossible. Let us take again Section 21 of part VI of the Budget Estimates for the year 1957 Doc. A/3126 dealing with the Eco-

329

nomic Commission for Asia and Far East. Detailed information was available in the old form regarding cost of establishment, costs of consultants, of temporary assistance and over-time relating to the Secretariat of the ECAFE, etc. All this information is not available in a consolidated sum in the Budget presentation in the new form though it is possible to call out some information regarding established posts from several sections and annexes.

A national delegate is not particularly interested in knowing that the expenditure on Section 6 Salary and Wages would be 31.5 million dollars and that on Section 7 Common Staff costs 6.9 million dollars. They carry no particular significance to him. The budgetary decision which the delegations desire to make are broadly related to the functional activities of the Organization. They would like to know how much is being spent on economic and social activities, on trusteeship or public information and how re-allocation of the funds among the different appropriations would affect the programmes. My delegation feels that in the long run the present system will weaken the budgetary control of the fifth Committee and reduce it to the position of merely discussing the differences between the Advisory Committee on the one hand and the Secretary-General on the other. Economies in departmental expenditure can be enforced only if expenditure is shown department-wise and in comparable form. Comparison of departmental expenditure over a period of say five years will reveal the trend in the department and will help in the analysis of proposals for economy. Such information will never get collected under the budgetary form now in use. After a few years it will be almost impossible to compare the expenditure of the Economic and Social Council and its related activities in say 1965 with those for the year 1960 since the relevant information will not be available in any consolidated form. My delegation will deal with this question in greater detail when this item comes up separately and will offer its suggestions for consideration by the Committee.

Another matter which causes concern to my delegation and which I am sure is being shared by a number of other delegations in this Committee is the prospect of increasing the Working Capital Fund. The Secretary-General has stated that in June-July 1959 the cash position had deteriorated to such an extent that he had to borrow from the special accounts in his custody in pursuance of resolution 1341 (XIII) dated 13th December, 1958. My delegation was one of those who promoted a clear decision last year to enable the Secretary-General to utilize on a temporary advance basis cash from other funds under the custody of the Secretary-General. We are naturally gratified to note that this provision has enabled the Secretary-General to tide over a serious situation in June 1959. However, this is only an ad hoc remedy and cannot be a permanent solution to the problem of low cash balances at certain parts of the year. We are apprehensive that an increase in the Working Capital Fund may lead to increased defaults in payments by Member States and instead of solving the problem we shall only be magnifying them. My delegation would, therefore, venture to make a suggestion for the consideration of the appropriate authorities and the Committee. I might make it clear at the outset that what I am going to mention is probably of a long-term significance and is not intended as a solution to the immediate problem

in the United Nations which has been accentuated by certain special difficulties.

The Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency have among them Working Capital Funds which total some 14 million dollars. In most cases the primary purpose of the Fund is to finance expenditures pending receipt of contributions. It is my understanding-and here I may invite the attention of members to paragraph 21 of Doc. A/4032 which is thirty-third Report of the Advisory Committee to the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly-that relatively little recourse is made to withdrawals from the Working Capital Funds in the case of most of the Specialized Agencies. Happily they seem to be better placed in regard to earlier receipt of contributions. In other words, a substantial part of the total amount of some 14 million dollars remains unused at any given time. It seems to me that there might be some advantage in studying the possibility of having a combined Working Capital Fund for all of the United Nations Organization covering the United Nations, its Specialized Agencies and Atomic Energy Agency.

The Working Capital Fund in each organisation is a creation of the legislative body of the organisation ; it is not a provision which is written into the constitution of the organisation. There should, therefore, be no serious difficulty from a constitutional point of view in setting up a single fund from which advances could be made to the several organisations as and when necessary. This fund might be placed under the custody of the Secretary-General of the United Nations with appropriate provisions for the necessary advances to be made to the several organisations as and when necessary.

330

Even as we have a Joint Staff Pension Fund, we may have a common Working Capital Fund for U.N. and its Specialized Agencies.

I should like the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the Specialized Agencies to consider this question as a long term solution to the recurring problem of low cash balances.

My delegation has always maintained that peace is the concern of all the nations of the

world and problems like disarmament are not confined to Major Powers. In financial terms this must include a readiness to share the legitimate costs emanating from such actions initiated by the United Nations. At the same time my delegation would voice the apprehension of ours as well as other delegations against the increasing burdens of such obligations. My delegation is aware of other thoughts in the Committee regarding the sharing of costs of operations connected with the U.N.E.F. All these ideas have to be carefully scrutinized before endorsed and since the question of U.N.E.F. contributions is coming up as a separate item later in our agenda, my delegation will refrain from commenting on this question further.

My delegation would like to reiterate the suggestion my delegation put forward during the general debate on the Budget last year with regard to the need for examination of the frequency of meetings of the subsidiary commissions and committees of the organs of the United Nations. I would draw the attention of the Committee to the observations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 8 of Doc. A/4223. The Advisory Committee while concurring the proposal to increase the membership of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities has stated "the committee trusts that the frequency of the sessions of the Sub-Commission would also be reviewed when the Economic Council next examines the periodicity of meetings of its functional commissions". In paragraph 35 of Doc. A/4170 the Committee has also stated "a pattern of meeting which is too frequent not only involves substantial expenditure in terms of meeting costs but has a greater disadvantage as it might leave insufficient time for adequate preparatory work and careful and unhurried study of the problems in question within the Secretariat". In the interest of efficiency even more than economy, such appraisal seems to be called for.

My delegation would briefly refer at this stage to the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the resolution 1335 (XIII) on Public Information Activities. Though the Secretary-General's report reflects some limited progress my delegation regrets that after the serious and time consuming efforts of the expert Commitee and the extensive discussions in the Fifth Committee the Secretary-General did not find it possible to implement or accept even a number of important recommendations of the Expert Committee. While it seems that certain suggestions and recommendations which implied added emphasis in certain areas have found an echo in the Secretary-General's report, other recommendations which asked for curtailment or adjustments in other areas have not found the same response. My delegation has no doubt that the Secretary-General has given serious thought to the various problems and proposals ; at the same time my delegation is disappointed at the progress achieved or intended to be achieved in the field of implementation of the recommendations of the Expert Committee. The senior officials who constituted the Secretariat Committee entrusted with this task of implementing the resolution of last year are undoubtedly men of great ability but with very heavy load of their own normal and in fact very important work and it would not be entirely fair to expect constant, continuous and uninterrupted attention on their part to the public information matters. My delegation will go into details when the separate item on Public Information is taken up for consideration and will content itself at this stage by stating that the absence of an official responsible for implementating the programmes and policies adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution last year has robbed the report of the Secretary-General of much of its value which it would otherwise have had.

Appropriation for the Economic Commission for Africa has tipped off a needless controversy. In the understanding of my delegation the Advisory Committee has not (repeat not) declined the appropriation requested but has estimated that the expenses in 1960 were likely to be below the amount requested and has provided for what, in its opinion, is likely to be reached in the year 1960. The Advisory Committee has further stated that in the event the building up of Secretariat went faster, it would review the situation and authorise additional funds as necessary. Along with the delegation of U. A. R. the delegation of India took an active interest in the project for the Economic Commission of Africa and is deeply interested in its growth and development. Since it is not the intention of the Advisory Committee to suggest any cut in this item of expenditureand this was abundantly made clear in the interventions of the Chairman of that Committeeand as the delegations of the Region feel more

331

assured by restoring the appropriations; my delegation will be very happy to lend its support to the same so that the place of economic development of the African Region may be accelerated.

My delegation will conclude by expressing its appreciation of the munificent gift of 6.2 million dollars by the Ford Foundation for the construction of the United Nations library.

On October 19, Shri Venkataraman said:

As the Fifth Committee is aware, the Indian Delegation has taken a particular interest in public information about the United Nations. At the 11th Session my delegation sponsored the reference to the Advisory Committee for recommendations to conduct an objective study and appraisal. At the 12th Session we supported the appointment of an Expert Committee. At the last Session we participated fully in the discussion of the Report and supported the Resolution which expressed the consensus of this Committee. We have since followed the work of the Office of Public Information both here and in our country.

Mr. Chairman, this sustained interest of my Government arises from our conviction that the promotion of public understanding of the United Nations is indispensable for the success of this Organisation. Let me add quite frankly that for several years we have felt uneasy with the results achieved and the working methods employed by the Department of Public Information. We regarded an annual vote of the order of 5 million dollars as a substantial expenditure and we were not satisfied that this Assembly was getting the best value for the monies spent.

Our uneasiness was strengthened by the Report of the Expert Committee. The main findings of the Report indicated that there was little over-all planning, that production was not related to actual needs, that much of the output was wasted especially abroad and that the Department was not putting to good use the millions of people and agencies able and willing to help the United Nations.

The Resolution 1335(XIII) was simply a

request to the Secretary-General to give effect in 1959 to the extent practicable, those recommendations of the Expert Committee or to any other means which, in his opinion, would further the objectives set forth in the resolution with maximum effect at minimum cost. Thus, the Secretary-General was given a set of objectives and requested to take what practical means he could to achieve these objectives. The Secretary-General's report on implementation Document A/4122 must therefore be appraised by the criteria we gave him in Resolution 1335(XIII).

What are these criteria? Paraphrasing the preambular clauses of the Resolution these are the tests we should apply in this examination of the implementation during 1959:

- 1. Has the O.P.I. made available objective and factual information ?
- 2. Has priority been given to the use of media of information?
- 3. Has greater emphasis been laid on enlisting the cooperation of Member governments, media of information, non- governmental organisations and educationists ?
- 4. Has greater emphasis been given to the operations and effectiveness of Information Centres ?

My delegation is happy to take up these objectives or criteria in their order of enumerationbecause we would like to go on record as expressing satisfaction with the implementation of the first requirement. The objectivity and factual content of United Nations information has been fairly maintained. And this information has been made available freely to the media of information. This is true particularly of the output of the press section but it is also substantially correct with respect to the output of radio news. In all such matters there is room for differences on the degree of attention given to the coverage of one or other subject but the content has always been sound and informative.

The second objective of Resolution 1335(XIII) calls for "priority to the use of all media of information which ensure maximum effectiveness

at minimum cost". Satisfaction of this objective, as the Secretary-General rightly points out, calls for "strengthening field operations without impairing the present facilities for the servicing of mass media of mass communications at Headquarters". Putting aside field operations for the moment, we note with satisfaction that Headquarters Services to media representatives are being maintained at last year's level. The Secretary-General anticipates in para. 31 of Document A/4122 an increase in the number of press and radio representatives at Headquarters. If this increase materializes and if the services required as reasonable demands from established journals and radio networks, additional facilities should be

332

considered. For the present the Indian Delegation notes with satisfaction that Headquarters facilities are adequate and managed by the Press Division to the apparent satisfaction of its rather demanding clientele. My delegation would like to add also that the facilities provided by O.P.I. are put to good use. Over the years a corps of reporters and interpreters thoroughly conversant with United Nations work and principles has been built up. We do not always agree with their judgment of news value or their interpretations but, on the whole, the ideals of the organisation are well served by these competent, and critical but devoted friends of the United Nations.

My delegation feels that the services and facilities made available to mass media of information not represented at Headquarters are not satisfactory but this matter we shall take up in examining overseas work generally.

The two other objectives of Resolution 1335(XIII)--greater emphasis on enlisting cooperation and greater emphasis on the Information Centres-are closely related and might therefore be taken together in our evaluation of Document A/4122. They are both concerned with what is referred to as "field operations" the "field" being the Member States.

In examining these aspects, my delegation would like to recall to the Members of the Committee the basic principles cited and reaffirmed in our Resolution last year. Resolution 1335(XIII) reaffirmed the prior directive of the General Assembly to the Secretariat to use fully, to exploit, if you will, official and private assistance including those of mass media of information and in doing so to give special attention to the needs of the less developed countries. Renewed emphasis was given to these directives by the Expert Committee and in our repeated references to the basic principles in last year's debate. Against this background, Mr. Chairman, let us examine the practical measures taken during the year to strengthen the field operations, since it is mainly through the Information Centres that Governmental as well as Non-Governmental and private owned media of information can be better utilised.

Paras 36 to 47 of Document A/4122 bear a poor record of implementation of the basic principles. Of the eight officers who will be outposted to certain capitals, two will go to Geneva an Washington. Nothing is mentioned about the duties of these officers nor has any reason bee adduced as to why it is necessary to give priority to strengthening Geneva and Washington. Again as the distinguished representative of Japan incisively put it at the last meeting, there is no analysis of how the increased allocation of 90,000 dollars over 1958 expenditure is utilised in various services such as radio, film, television and publications.

The question of improving library facilities at the Centres on which the Expert Committee laid so great emphasis is only under "consideration".

The recommendation of the Expert Committee regarding the interchange of personnel between the O.P.I. and substantive departments so that there may be a continuous flow of new blood and fresh experience, has escaped the attention of the Secretary-General.

Again the choice of Geneva and Washington for strengthening cooperation with non-governmental organisations cannot enthuse this committee because the non-governmental organisation in other continents which struggle along with very little or no resources should have received a kinder consideration at the hands of the Secretary-General in priority to the well developed centres of Geneva and Washington.

As regards the field programmes, my delegation feels that adequate attention has not been paid to the views of the majority of the members regarding the publication of the Reviews in English, French and Spanish. It was urged that these Reviews should be vehicles of adequate factual information of use to those who followed U.N. activities closely and desired to utilise them as basic material for their own productions. The English Review, however has continued to remain more or less the same with some factual features added, but still largely a feature magazine printed on heavy glossy paper and priced 50 cents a copy -a substantial sum for other than fashion magazines even in this country. My delegation ventures to suggest that a more appropriate format for an essentially factual magazine, one more suitable for air transport and overseas distribution may be adopted by the O.P.I. For identification of the format, my delegation suggests the weekly Manchester Guardian or the Weekly Hindu from my own country. Such format will enable the public and overseas readers to obtain information quickly and at a reasonable price.

My delegation desires to reiterate the importance of regular annual publication of the very useful book of reference namely the Every-man's United Nations. My delegation notes with regret

333

that the latest English edition is dated 1956 and that the French and Spanish editions are much older.

Let me now turn to another important subject namely, the increase in the number of information centres. On this subject there was general agreement in the Committee as stated by the Rapporteur (Document A/C. 5/L. 555) that O.P.I. should study the present geographical situation of the centres with special reference to the areas of less developed media; that the policy should be shaped with due regard to new member states, the still unfulfilled needs of other Member States, and the unfavourable position of some States served by Centres in other countries with different languages and traditions. Now, document A/4122 is content merely to state that consideration will have to be given to this matter. At the 11th Session we adopted Resolution 1086, which drew attention to "the desirability of the establishment of information centres on the basis of the regional and linguistic distribution referred to in

the Basic Principles and recommended favourable attention to the establishment of centres in the new Member States. But very little progress has been achieved in that direction.

Let us consider the regional distribution of Information Centres today as shown in the Annex to the Expert Commitees' Repart (A/3928). Making allowance for the new Information Centre in Burma there are :

8. Centres or offices in Asia and the Far East

(Bangkok, Djakarta, Karachi, New Delhi, Sydney, Tokyo and Rangoon.

3 in Middle East and Africa

(Accra, Cairo and Tehran)

5 in Latin America

(Bogota, Buenos Aires, Mexico, Rio de Janeiro and Santiago (Chile)

11 in Europe and North America

(Athens, Belgrade, Copenhagen, Geneva, The Hague, London, Moscow, Paris, Prague, Rome and Washington).

If we note that Tokyo and Sydney are not in less developed areas, the figures show that 13 of the 27 offices are in advanced countries and 14 in the areas to which O.P.I. is directed to give special attention.

Nor do the figures of the number of Centres tell the whole story. An analysis shows that of the 57 officers in Information Centres and offices some 31 are in advanced countries and 26 are posted to the less developed areas.

My delegation submits that this situation of the number and distribution of Information Centres is not very satisfactory. The meaning of Resolution 1086(XI) and of the opinion in this Committee last year was clear-that new centres must be added especially in the regions of Asia and the Far East, the Middle East and Africa and Latin America without additional cost to the organisation. How feasible that is will be clear from the study of Headquarters arrangements to which I now turn.

These arrangements are described in the Sections of Document A/4122 headed Changes in Organisation at Headquarters and Programming at Headquarters to strengthen Field operations and I shall confine myself to two significant points deserving careful consideration in this Committee.

The first of these relates to the organisation of the External Relations Division, a matter to Which the Expert Committee rightly gave the greatest importance in its Report. Their conclusions were that the Division to be called a Bureau should be responsible for the planning of the entire work of the Department in accordance with the needs of the various regions. The second point made was that the Bureau should be organised largely on a regional basis each regional section being composed of a senior officer and an assistant both of them with special knowledge of the regions they serve.

The Secretary-General in his written A/3945 doubted the desirability of placing over-all planning under one division of the Department. In his present report A/4122 it is stated that after "very searching exploration" the organisational changes suggested did not prove feasible. My delegation feels that in a matter such as how overall planning in a Department should be done must be left to the Secretary-General's direction. So long as there is systematic and continuous planning we shall accept the Secretariat decision on this matter.

However, we attach the greatest importance to the structure of the External Relations Division because of its effect on overseas work. If this division is to be really sensitive to the needs of the Centres and the areas they serve it must be patterned on a regional basis with area officers whose responsibility it is to keep the closest touch

334

with the needs of the regions they serve. It is important that the officers of the External Relations Division like the Centre Directors themselves should have a reasonable competence in all aspects of the work. The essential qualificaction of the External Relations Division is that it should be able to speak with intimate knowledge and authority on the needs of various regions and to bring this knowledge of practical requirements to bear effectively on the planning of information work. Unless this is done we know that the needs of the less-developed regions will go by default as it has done all these years.

Mr. Chairman, while on this matter, my delegation draws attention again to the geographical composition of the O. P. I. In doing, so I wish to emphasise that we are not here concerned with the general equity of fair representation for all Member States. We are concerned with the necessity for a department charged with worldwide public information responsibilities being sensitive to the requirements, interests and reaction of all Member States. A sound knowledge of the most effective and least expensive techniques is essential, as also judgment based on the political, economic and social outlook. Unless the Office of Public Information at Headquarters has at the policy-making level a really representative character, in broad regional if not national terms, it will continue to miss many opportunities for effective work.

The Expert Committee in paragraph 127 which was singled out for special mention in our resolution last year was most reasonable in its comment on the subject. The Committee said.

"It is recognised that within the narrow field of a single department of the United Nations Secretariat, it may not be possible to obtain a balance staff representing in due proportion the various Member States. The Committee, however, attaches great importance to ensuring that the O.P.I. reflects broad cultural regions in its staffing pattern."

Mr. Chairman, mere figures for various nationalities at all levels will be no answer to the criticism. But what we need is an adequate diversity of culture at the policy-making levels in the Department. While we do not doubt the complete international integrity of these officers, we insist that it is impossible to be effective in the work of planning information work for the whole world with a limited budget if there is no representation at the policy-making level of all streams of culture.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to complete

this study of information work without referring to a medium of the greatest value all over the world-the film medium with its immense potentialities for education as well as information.

On this subject the Expert Committee's recommendations were short, explicit and thoroughly practical. The Committee defined the primary responsibility of the film unit as film coverage of United Nations activities with field operations being covered as far as possible through facilities of the Governments. It envisaged production of documentaries not by the United Nations but with its help, by independent producers and government film units, the Information Centres stimulating local production.

This recommendation is in line with the experience of all governments and inter-governmental agencies. The main function should be to provide news-reel and documentary material and thus enable outside producers to make their own feature and documentary films. The immensely expensive problem of adequate. prints and effective distribution for longer films cannot be tackled by an official agency with limited resources.

Nevertheless, the film unit has gone on producing on its own. Not discouraged by the fact that in 1958 a sum of 34,000 dollars excluding staff costs was spent on a film of the Suez Crisis entitled Blue Vanguard the Division has this year produced a much more ambitious feature film entitled Power Among Men running for no less than ninety minutes. A documentary of an hour and a half's duration is almost a contradiction in terms. We learn from press releases that the film is of high quality and we are prepared to believe it, but it is not reasonable to expect that the considerable costs of a feature film could be recovered by commercial exploitation. To the production cost much naturally be added staff time and travel expenses over several months.

Another example of film activities was seen in our country when two film officers arrived to explore production possibilities. This type of activity, exploration of locations for possible films, belongs to Hollywood not to the United Nations. All the information required was readily available from the technical assistance experts, the Centre Directors and the Government. I have said enough, however, to show how entirely misconceived the whole film programme is. This, Mr. Chairman, is a very sizeable item of expenditure and my delegation cannot see its

335

way to approve these costs unless we receive assurances that the monies will be spent for the proper purposes of covering United Nations activities and meeting educational requirements like film strips and slides.

Document A/4122 makes a special plea for a Television Studio arguing that the expenses would be rapid by earnings. My delegation feels that the alleged revenue will prove illusory if one takes into account the real costs, namely, staff costs, costs of operation and equipment. Considering again the comparatively limited area that television would serve, my delegation is reluctant to authorise heavy expenditure on this media at present.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a reference to one other matter which engaged our attention last year, the possibility of setting up an Advisory Committee to advise the Secretary-General. This proposal was acceptable to the Secretary-General last year it being understood that the body proposed would be advisory on the pattern broadly of the UNEF Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee on Public Information may give their pointed attention to the implementation of the broad mandate given to the O.P.I. in the Resolutions of the General Assembly the implementation over a period of the useful recommendations of the Expert Committee and generally bring the Regional requirements to the notice of the O.P.I. for more effective coverage. Besides, Mr. Chairman, the Fifth Committee need not devote such a detailed consideration of the Office of Public Information year after year if it is adequately served by an Advisory Committee. My delegation will, therefore, support any proposal for the consideration of such a committee.

The distinguished representative of Japan has asked some very pertinent questions on the interne programmes, a subject of special importance to the less-developed countries far away from the many services of the Headquarters. As he pointed out the Expert Committee's recommendations (para 168 of A/3928) call for a planned programme to cover teachers of secondary schools, and active workers in essentially educational nongovernmental organisations and coming mainly from the under-developed countries. The selection of candidates was to be made by joint consultations between the governments concerned, the non-governmental organisations and the Information Centre Directors. Funds for 1959 were approved by the Advisory Committee on condition that the programme would be prepared in the light of the Expert Committee's recommendations. My delegation would like to have full information covering all these points more particularly as to the proportion of internes from less-developed countries and other countries, as compared to the previous year, as to the steps taken to consult governments and non-governmental organisations in their selection and the selections from which internes have been chosen this year, so that we could examine as to how far there has been implementation of these recommendations in 1959 programmes.

In conclusion my delegation desires to state that though some limited progress has been achieved in the implementation of the Resolution 1335 of the 13th Session, constant and continued attention is still required over a period of years to this very important section of the U.N. activities. My delegation cannot, therefore, take the report A/4122 as the final conclusion of Secretariat action on either the resolution passed last year or on the recommendations of the Expert Committee. We would accept the position taken by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom that document A/4122 represents only an interim report on the implementation of the resolution passed last year and look forward to further reports from Secretary-General with regard to the progress of the implementation of the various recommendations in the field of Public Information activities.

INDIA USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND JAPAN BURMA INDONESIA PAKISTAN AUSTRALIA EGYPT GHANA IRAN ARGENTINA COLOMBIA MEXICO CHILE DENMARK GREECE YUGOSLAVIA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM CZECH REPUBLIC ITALY

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Special Fund Aid

A Standared Agreement between the United Nations Special Fund and the Government of India was signed in New Delhi on October 20, 1959. This agreement embodies conditions under which the United Nations Special Fund will assist the Government of India in respect of all projects already approved or to be approved in future.

The Agreement was signed by Mr. James Keen, Resident Representative in India of the United Nations Technical Assistance Board on behalf of the Managing Director of the Special Fund and Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, I. C. S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, on behalf of the Government of India.

The Special Fund was created under a United Nations resolution in October 1958 for large scale technical assistance projects designed to have

336

immediate impact on economic and social development of under-developed and semi-developed countries.

During the first year of its operation, the Special Fund has already sanctioned in favour of India one project and approved three more projects covering about \$4 million in foreign exchange. The project of an Industrial Instructors' Training Institute to be set up near Calcutta has already been sanctioned. The projects which have been approved in principle are : Power Engineering Research Institutes at Bhopal and Bangalore, a Central Mechanical Engineering Research institute at Durgapur and three Regional Labour Institutes at Calcutta, Kanpur and Madras.

The Government of India contributed in 1959

the equivalent of \$ 590,000 to the Special Fund, and for 1960, would be contributing upto an equivalent of \$ 2 million i. e. four times last year's contribution if the total resources of the Special Fund reached the 100 million dollar target, as originally planned. If the total resources of the Fund do not reach this figure, India's contribution Would be proportionate.

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

ITALY

Trade Agreement Signed

A new trade agreement between India and Italy was signed at Rome on October 6, 1959.

The agreement was signed on the Indian side by Shri K.B. Lall, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and on the Italian side, by Ambassador Casto Caruso, Director-General of Economic Affairs in the Italian Ministry of External Affairs. The Trade Agreement - between the two countries concluded in July 1954 expired recently.

Underlining the need to increase the exchanges between the two countries, the new agreement lays stress on greater economic and commercial cooperation for mutual benefit. To this end a commission has been set up to facilitate consultations between the two Governments and to adopt practical measures' for promoting and extending cooperation between industrial enterprises, commercial organisations and banks on both sides.

The agreement comes into force immediately on signature and will remain valid until June 30, 1960. It will be renewed automatically for another year unless either party gives three months' notice of its intention to terminate it. Two lists of commodities available for export from India to Italy and from Italy to India are annexed to the agreement.

ITALY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Border Talks.

The Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, issued on October 24, 1959 the following communique after the conclusion of the Ministerlevel Conference on border disputes between India and Pakistan held in New Delhi and Dacca from October 18 to 22, 1959

At their meeting on 1st September, 1959, the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India agreed, in pursuance of their desire to promote good neighbourly relations between their two countries on a rational basis, to an Indo-Pakistan conference at Minister level to devise measures to end disputes and incidents on the Indo-East Pakistan border. This Minister-level Conference, with Sardar Swaran Singh and Lt. General K. M. Shaikh. leading their respective delegations, started in Delhi on 15th October, 1959, continued its deliberations at Dacca from 18th to 20th and had its concluding session at Delhi on 21st and 22nd October.

The Delegations approached the various questions discussed in a positive and constructive spirit and, while they had full and frank exchange of views, the objectives of arriving at agreed decisions and procedures to end disputes and incidents and establishing and maintaining peaceful conditions on the Indo-East Pakistan border regions throughout guided the deliberations of 337 the Conference.

The fact that there has been no settlement of the respective claims of India and Pakistan in the areas of the Patharia Forest Reserve and the Kushiyara river in accordance with the Radcliffe Award in spite of these disputes having been referred to an international tribunal which gave awards in 1950 has been one of the principal causes of conflict and tension along these Indo-East Pakistan border areas. The leaders of the two Delegations agreed that these and other disputes between the two countries should be resolved in a spirit of give and fake in the larger interest of both countries. With a view to avoiding dislocation in the life of the population of these border areas and promoting friendly relations, the following agreed decisions have been reached in respect of these disputes :

(i) The dispute concerning Bagge Award No.. III should be settled by adopting a rational boundary in the Patharia Forest Reserve region.

(ii) The dispute concerning Bagge Award No. IV in the Kushiyara river region should be settled by adopting the thana boundaries of Beani Bazaar and Karimganj as per notification No. 5133-H dated the 28th May, 1940 as the India-East Pakistan boundary.

(iii) The status-quo should be restored: in Tukergram.

It was also agreed that detailed procedures should be worked out to maintain peace on the Indo-East Pakistan border and to bring immediately under control any incident that may occur.

Detailed ground rules to be observed by the border security forces of both sides, which among other things, provide that no border outpost will be located within 150 yards of the border, on either side, and other procedures laid down in the ground rules regarding frequent contacts between those in charge of border security forces and other officials of the Governments concerned at various levels, will secure maintenance of peaceful conditions on the Indo-East Pakistan border and ensure that immediate action is taken to re-establish peace should any incident unfortunately occur. Detailed procedures for expediting progress of demarcation work and for orderly adjustment of territorial jurisdiction, due regard being had to local agricultural practices and the interests of the local border population, have been worked out. It was also agreed that, in their quarterly review, the Governments of East Pakistan, West Bengal, Assam and Tripura will ensure that the target dates for progressing demarcation work are observed.

Both Governments re-affirmed their determination to resolve border disputes by negotiation and agreed that all outstanding boundary disputes on the East Pakistan-India border and the West Pakistan-India border, raised so far by either country, should, if not settled by negotiation, be referred to an impartial tribunal for settlement and implementation of that settelment by demarcation on the ground and by exchange of territorial jurisdiction if any.

Both Governments agreed to appeal to the press to exercise restraint and assist in the maintenance and promotion of friendly relations between India and Pakistan. In furtherance of this objective, both Governments agreed to take early action for a meeting of the Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee which is being revived.

Both Governments are resolved to implement, in full and as expeditiously as possible, the Noon-Nehru Agreement and the present agreement on Indo-East Pakistan border settlements and to that end to devise expeditiously the legal and constitutional procedures necessary for implementation. Both Governments agreed to maintain contact with each other continuously on the progress of implementation of these agreements and to carry out periodical reviews of the working of the procedures adopted to maintain peaceful and friendly relations in the border regions.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Ground Rules for Border Guards

As instructed by the leaders of the two delegations the Military sub-committee met on the 17th October, 1959. In pursuance of the directive, this joint paper was written by Major General Umrao Khan, S. Pk., G.O.C., 14th Division, East Pakistan, and Lt. General S.P.P. Thorat, DSO-G.O.C.-in-Chief, Eastern Command, India. From the Pakistan side Mr. S.M. Koreishi, P.F.S., Under Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and from the Indian side Brigadier Ghasi Ram, Commander 181 Inf. Bde. also attended the meeting.

For the sake of clarity the paper is divided into two parts - part I deals with the basic

338

requirements which will have direct bearing on the implementation of the "Ground Rules" which are outlined in Part II. We earnestly feel that unless the basic requirements are fulfilled, the implementation of the "Ground Rules" will not be as effective as we would like them to be.

The Ground Rules formulated in this paper deal with the Indo-East Pakistan border.

PART I

2. During the general discussions between the two delegations held from the 15th to 19th October, 1959, it was agreed :-

(a) That legal provision must be made for effecting the exchange of territories after demarcation has taken place, wherever it becomes necessary.

(b) That the boundary should be demarcated as early as administratively possible. The progress of demarcation should be reviewed every quarter by the Government of Pakistan and India with reference to the field programmes settled by the D.L. Rs and necessary action taken to resolve difficulties, if any, and to expedite progress of demarcation work. In case of a dispute, the disputed portion may be left out, the dispute being reported cartorgaphically and in writing to the Chief Secretaries of the Governments concerned who would resolve the, dispute or refer to the Central Government concerned and the demarcation should proceed from where the disputed area ends.

(c) That following demarcation, exchange of territories in sizeable stretches of the border should by agreement take place without waiting for the entire length of the border to be demarcated.

To implement this it was agreed that the transfer of territorial jurisdiction should take place on an agreed date which All not be later than the 31st of December of the year in which demarcation has been, completed by the 31st of May. The State Government shall make every attempt to speedily transfer the territorial jurisdiction of these areas in respect of which the following processes have been completed :-

(i) The mechanical part of the process of demarcation would be deemed to be completed when the final traverse has been done after construction of pillars and the position of the pillars has been jointly checked and proved by the D.L. Rs concerned;

(ii) Necessary time should be allowed to the farmers to harvest their crops before the transfer of territorial jurisdiction; and

(iii)Before the transfer of territorial jurisdiction, the authorities on the two sides should collect data on the populated and farm areas and on properties held by individuals. This will enable the Governments concerned to exchange these data and ensure that special responsibility is placed on the local commanders and/or police and other officials to provide full protection to the person and property of the people so that their interests are not prejudiced by the transfer of jurisdiction on the agreed date.

PART II

3. On, the Indo-East Pakistan border the security forces of both the countries are located in close proximity of each other. Owing to a variety of reasons there have been occasional

firings across the border. The causes which usually lead to firing are :-

(a) Often, border security forces on both sides do not know where the International Boundary lies on the ground. Therefore, when nationals of the other country cross into what they think is their territory, fire is opened to prevent the ingress.

(b) Where the boundary in the riverine area is crisscross and portions of land on the home side of the river are owned by the other country, fire is opened when these lands are cultivated or attempts are made to dispossess their rightful owners.

(c) When a char land is formed after the floods, whether in the bed of the river or as an accretion of the mainland, attempt is made by nationals of both countries to seize the newly formed char lands. This leads to claims and counter-claims as to which side owns the char lands. Firing is resorted to support claims of the respective sides.

(d) When the river falls on the international boundary, fishing and navigational disputes occur and fire is opened to stop cattle lifting or other raids by local inhabitants on either side.

(e) Occasionally fire is opened because of suspected movement in the vicinity of border security posts-this happens usually at night.

(f) Sometimes a build-up of border security forces leads to a race between the two countries and

339

tempers are frayed. A "trigger happy" person lets off a round and this develops into a shooting match.

4. The problem is how to prevent such firings.

Most of the causes for the firing can be eliminated or at least considerably lessened if the security forces on either side 'keep out' of each others way. (This does not apply in the case of commanders as stated in para 6 to 8 below).

5. We think that the possibility of fire being

opened will be considerably reduced if border security forces on both sides observe the following simple rules :-

(a) Where the international boundary is not properly demarcated by pillars, a "working boundary" which can be easily indentified on the ground should be decided between the commanders of the border security forces of both sides. The working boundary will be decided upon as under :-

(i) Assam/East Pakistan Border : Between D.G., E.P.R., and Commander 181 Inf. Bde.

(ii) West Bengal/East Pakistan Border Between D.G., E.P.R. and I.G.P. West Bengal Border.

(iii)Tripura East Pakistan Border : Between D.G., E.P.R. and I.G.P. Tripura.

(b) The working military boundary may or may not coincide with the International boundary and its acceptance by both sides will not commit the two Governments in any manner in respect of their de jure claims. The working military boundary should, if necessary, be marked in some simple manner and the demarcations should be shown jointly and recorded on one inch maps.

(c) After an identifiable boundary line whether real or working has been demarcated, neither side will have any permanent or temporary border security forces or any other armed personnel within 150 yards on either side of this line. Also no permanent posts will be constructed till the final demarcation has been done.

(d) This will not prevent either side from patrolling up to the 'real' or 'working' boundary provided :-

(i) Where possible adequate warning is given to the other side;

(ii) Patrols are small in numbers, i. e. not exceeding a section (1 & 10); Patrols will invariably move with flags.

(iii)Nothing but non-automatic small arms are carried by the patrol.

(e) If defensive works of any nature includ-

ing trenches exist in the stretch of 300 yards (150 yards on each side of the working boundary) they must be destroyed or filled up.

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

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

(h) Wherever the boundary "real" or "working" runs through mid-stream of a river, the facilities to use the main channel will be provided by both sides. The following procedure will be adopted to regulate traffic and ensure that the nationals of both the countries are not harassed.

(i) Joint check-posts will be established on the bank if possible or in the main channel where it leaves or enters the mid-stream boundary.

(ii) A check will be made and manifests of commodities will be prepared at the Joint Checkpost. Manifests signed by Joint Check-posts will be accepted as the permit to use the main channel for navigation purpose only.

(iii)The boats using the main channel in the other country will not be allowed to touch the bank or exchange goods or engage in any other transaction with the nationals of other side.

(iv) Border forces on both sides shall on no account participate in any quarrels between nationals of the two countries living on the border. If nationals of one country ingress the working boundary and enter illegally and commit or attempt to commit an offence, the border security forces would be at liberty to take appropriate action in the exercise of the "right of private defence" perferably without resorting to fire. In case fire has been opened the local commander will intimate his action to opposite commander and to his own higher authorities. (j) In case of inadvertant crossings, after satisfying themselves that the crossing was done inadvertantly, the border security forces shall immediately return the persons concerned to the opposite commanders at the officers level. Similarly, the cattle straying across the border will be handed over to the authorities on the border side.

(k) Certain bonafide governmental bodies, e.g. survey parties, forest guards etc. will be operating in the near vicinity of the international borders. Border security forces shall not interfere with their working-in fact they are expected to help. The existence of such parties will be notified to both sides, by the department concerned.

6. For the practical implementation of the above, the border on both sides shall be divided into Sectors/Sub-sectors. The existence of the Headquarters of these sub-sectors will be intimated to each other and attempt should be made to link the Headquarters of both sides with telephone.

7. The sub-sector commanders should be of the rank of Capt/Major or of equivalent ranks in the police.

8. The duties of the Sector/Sub-sector/Post Commanders in their respective areas of responsibility shall be as under:-

(a) They will maintain close liaison with their opposite numbers;

(b) They will pay frequent visits, make themselves known both to the Border Security Forces of the opposite side and to own local populations.

(c) They shall receive all complaints regarding territorial disputes referring to title to any land, immovable property lying on the other side of the border, char lands, navigation facilities and difficulty of harvesting. They will immediately hold a joint enquiry not later than 24 hours of the information report.

(d) They will immediately enforce a statusquo e.g. if a national of one country lays a fresh claim to land and takes any step in furtherance of that claim which is objected to by the other side, then the two commanders will hold a joint enquiry on the spot and restrain the person from enforcing his claim until the matter is settled at the appropriate level; (e) The two commanders shall be responsible for referring disputes to the appropriate authorities and for seeing that they are progressed with a view to bringing the disputes to a final settlement;

(f) Similarly the military Commanders on both sides will keep close in touch with the progress of survey parties working in their areas. Where in their opinion the progress is not according to the programme or work is stopped on account of difference of opinion or for any other reason, immediate reports by quickest means will be submitted to the G.O.C.-in-C/G.O.C. concerned who will report the matter to their respective Governments with a copy to the Chief Secretary concerned.

9. We suggest that the tension on the borders will be greatly minimised if there is close personal touch between commanders of the two border security forces particularly military commander on either side. We recommend that they should meet periodically to discuss matters of mutual interest. Sector Commanders or their senior representatives will normally meet each other at the time of routine DMs/DCs' meetings. The brigade commanders shall also meet as and when the situation demands and whenever they consider it necessary. In any case when it is apprehended that trouble is likely to occur they must meet. We further recommend that in case the situation is likely to become serious, the G. O. C. 14th Div., East Pakistan and G.O.C.-in-C., Eastern Command or their representative of sufficiently high rank should meet to discuss the situation and evolve means of eliminating the tension.

10. We attach great importance to such contacts for we feel that they will contribute substantially towards the good relations between the two forces, and help in removing misunder-standing about moves by both sides.

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

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

13. Telephone : G.O.C.-in-C., East Command and G.O.C. 14th Div, East Pakistan, should be able to talk to each other directly without

341

any formality. Similarly, D. G., E.P.R. and Comdr. 181 Inf. Bde, I.G.P., West Bengal and I.G.P., Tripura, should, be able to talk to each other whenever necessary. Telephone between the two opposing Coy/Wing Headquarters and between important border posts of either side should also be installed, which will be done as early as possible, in any case, not later than January 1960.

14. Communication by Flags : In the absence of telephone conversation/contact whenever any Comdr. on either side wishes to meet his counterpart, he will wave a flag, of the specifications given below and will proceed to the border unarmed without any escort to a prearranged place. The opposite Comdr or the Senior Officer present on seeing the flag hoisted, will acknowledge the signal and proceed to the place of meeting, also unarmed and without escort. The use of flags shall be introduced by 15 November, 1959.

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

| Pickets | | | Р | Patrols | | |
|---------|-------|---------|---|---------|------------|--|
| Р | ole | Cloth | Р | ole | Cloth | |
| Size | 7 th. | 4x3 ft. | 3 | ft. | 2x2 1/2ft. | |

Colours Indian: Orange.

Pakistan: Blue.

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

17. In the past, tension has mounted on false rumours and exaggerated reports to such a

pitch that the movement of extra forces and reinforcements to the affected areas was undertaken. Repetition of such moves in future is inadvisable from all points of view. To prevent such contingencies in the future, it is necessary that whenever there are reports of concentration and build up of forces on either side, Military Commanders of all levels, including the G.O.C.in-C. Eastern Command and G.O.C. 14 Div., East Pakistan should meet and ascertain the authenticity of the reports if necessary even by a visit to the affected area. Similarly joint inspection will also be applicable to any fresh digging which is likely to create unnecessary misunderstandings.

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

19. Finally, we think that much harm is caused by alarming reports which are occasionally published in the press. We recommend that the press on both sides be persuaded to exercise restraint and not to publish material which is likely to inflame the feelings of the population on both sides. Should incorrect reports be published we recommend that contradiction on a governmental level be issued at the earliest opportunity.

| Sd/- | Sd/- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Lt. Gen. S.P.P. Thorat | Major-Gen. Umrao Khan | | |
| D.S.O., | S. Pk., | | |
| G.O.Cin-C, Earstern | G.O.C., 14 Div., | | |
| Command, India. | East Pakistan. | | |
| | | | |

20 Oct. 1959.

20 Oct. 1959.

PAKISTAN INDIA LATVIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

³⁴²

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Trade Agreement Signed

An agreement on economic collaboration between the Government of India and the Government of Czechoslovak Republic concerning the establishment of certain industrial plants in India was signed in New Delhi on November 24, 1959 by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister for Industry, Government of India, and Mr. F.Krajcir, Minister of Foreign Trade, Czechoslovakia.

According to this agreement, Czechoslovakia will make available to India long-term credit amounting to Rs. 231 million within the framework of which Czechoslovakia will deliver machinery and equipment for the third stage of foundry forge, Heavy machinery building plant, heavy electrical plant, and for other projects included in the Third Five-Year Plan.

This credit will be for a period of eight years and will bear an interest of 2 1/2 per cent per annum, the first instalment becoming payable one year after the completion of the last delivery against each project. The credit will be repaid by deliveries of Indian goods such as pig iron, chemical and engineering goods, non-ferrous metals, processed and other ores and semi-finished products.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on General and Complete Disarmament

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Political Committee on November, 2, 1959 on the 82-Nation Resolution on Disarmament calling for measures, aimed at world wide total disarmament.

The following is the text of his statement :

Although it is many weeks, Mr. Chairman, since you have occupied the chair of this Committee, along with the other officers, it does not diminish our desire or pleasure in congratulating you on your unanimous election. We therefore would like to convey these feelings to you and to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, who were also unanimously elected.

My delegation would also like to express its feelings of sorrow and sympathy, which have already been expressed in this Committee, in respect of the sad demise of His Majesty the King of Laos-a country that is so close to us both geographically and otherwise.

We come today to the latest stages of the debate on disarmament. For various reasons, including the one that my delegation may not have many opportunities of intervening on this subject in the course of this session, if nothing else on account of the developments that have taken place, I ask the Committee's indulgence to be able to deal with this problem in the context in which we see it, its past history and what we believe may be its progress in the future.

I can do no better to place this subject in its context than to read out to the Committee the most recent statement of our Prime Minister, after this item was placed on the agenda :

"There are few problems that call for more calm judgment than the issue of war. Yet, the approach to, and consideration of, this problem is more often than otherwise in the context of emotion, passion or prejudice, or at best in terms of pious virtue and sentiment. This is true whether it be of its causes and, as some argue, its justification, or, as humanity ardently desires, the abolition of war."

It goes on to say :

"It is unrealistic, and indeed perilous, to rest in the belief that this world of ours will be rid of the scourge of war and that war will be abandoned as a method of settling disputes and problems, merely because there is a general desire for peace. Too often this desire is coupled with placing the onus of existing tensions and threats to peace and of their calamitous prospects on others-individual national leaders, nations or groups of them. The plea for peace has thus become inseparable from political acrimony, and almost the language or war is used to promote peace! All this

343

is part evidence that possibly the desire for peace, though well nigh universal, is not yet an informed and instructed desire, nor is it free from some of the very factors that threaten civilization with a holocaust.

"We have to use our informed thinking to understand and assess these causes, and their relation to war and war institutions, their place in national and international politics, economy and thought, and seek to adapt and orient them in terms of our evaluation in relation to war or its avoidance".

It is in the background of this way of thinking that my delegation seeks to present its views to the Committee.

For two years prior to this session there was no discussion of disarmament in the organs of the United Nations proper, since the Disarmament Commission was not able to meet except to perform its formal functions or to pass on whatever there was. The item for the Disarmament Commission is not before us. I shall refer to that in a moment. But although there had been no discussion in these buildings or in what is called the narrow context of the United Nations, there perhaps has not been any period at which more intensive discussions have taken place than in the last two years between the people who are in the best position to deliver the goods. This is not to say that disarmament or the establishment of peace is the responsibility of a few Powers, however great or small, or however important in one way or another. But it is to point out that the method of direct discussion represents, on the one hand, the realization that one way or another, irrespective of the channel through which communications take place, results must be achieved.

As a result of this, there have been talks in Geneva, as we all know, on various items and aspects of this problem, and some practical agreements or progress to agreements have been reached. This progress, the pace of it, quick or slow, as we look at it, and what has not been reached, are all reflective of the present state of the problem and its difficulties.

I would like to say however-and from the point of view of our delegation it is very important-that the present debate, that is to say, the debate on the item that we have now, procedurally does not emerge from the Geneva talks. That is to say, we are not discussing either the progress or the report of the Geneva discussions. They proceed procedurally and therefore on merit from the item put before the Assembly by one of the delegations, the delegation of the Soviet Union, after the Assembly met and after it was thrown together with another item, and therefore it has political meaning. That is to say, we are discussing an item which has arisen from the context of factors that emerged after we met here. In other words, we in the discussion of this matter may not water it down back to our old controversies and also forget the newer elements and approaches imported into it.

But at the same time, I think it would be wrong to suggest that this main problem of a warless world, as my delegation termed it in the discussion in the general debate, is a new thing to the world or indeed in the context of modern debates. One can go back to antiquity and refer to theological phrases :

"They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift sword against nation. Neither shall they

learn war anymore."

That is in the modern world, the last 2000 years. But if we go further back there are references in the same way. But for the purpose of our present controversy, apart from the history of the previous age in Europe, even in recent times, that is since the Disarmament Commission was set up, there have been definite proposals placed before us through the various organs, principally by the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Now, if I will not tax the patience of the Committee, I should like to read two or three of these small extracts-and perhaps go a little backward. It is usual in these halls to speak rather cynically about what has been called the "Geneva spirit". That is because we approach things with a spirit-like approach in a desire to count the material advantages that come out of them, or we are unable to assess the effects of that spirit upon action.

On 28 July 1955, President Eisenhower, speaking on war at Geneva said :

"I came to Geneva because I believe mankind longs for freedom from war and rumours of war. I came here because of my lasting faith in the decent instincts and good sense of the people who populate this world of ours. I

344

return home tonight with these convictions unshaken and with the prayer that the hope of mankind will one day be realized."

He went on to say about the same time

"I want to give you a few reasons for hope in this project. First, the people of all the world desire peace ; not a peace of the mere stilling of the guns, but a peace in which they can live happily, tranquilly and in confidence ; in which they can raise their children in a world of which they, will be proud. That common desire for peace is a traffic force in this world., and one to which I believe all the political leaders in the world are beginning to respond."

If I may say so, with great respect, we do not pay adequate attention to that last sentiment in this extract which I read out to you.

Now, we come to a more recent statement of the President of the United States, that is, only a few days ago on 17 September 1959, he said :

"The basic principle is that we have the conviction, first of all, that mutual disarmament, universal disarmament is really the one great hope of the world living in peace in future years."

The following day we heard the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union say to us :

"The peoples are thirsting for peace they want to live without fear for their future, for their destinies, without fear of losing their loved ones in the conflagration of a new war." (A/PV. 799, page 17) "For centuries the peoples dreamed of getting rid of the destructive means of warfare." (Ibid.)

"We say sincerely to all countries : To counter-balance the slogan 'Let us arm', which is still current in some quarters, we put forward the slogan 'Let us completely disarm.' Let us rather compete in who builds more homes, schools,... for his people, produces more grain, meat, milk, clothing and other consumer goods ; let us not compete in who has more hydrogen bombs or more missiles." (A/PV. 799, page 38)

At the end of their historic interview, which is not merely a matter for the United States and the Soviet Union, but for the world as a whole in view of the subject, they stated :

"The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States agreed that the question of disarmament"--which we are discussing-"is the most important one facing the world today. Both Governments will make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem."

I will not read these any more because the Members of the United Nations are familiar with most of them.

There have been statements of this kind right through history, and our effort in the establishment of peace is still in the midst of a mental conflict and confusion. Taking the modern world, and if I may briefly survey, going back to the time of the Roman empire, they established what Mahatma Gandhi called "the peace of the grave". That is, they conquered the empire of the Greeks, then they went on to conquer others, and conquered Britain and Gaul, even though the Teutons and Asiatics united against them. And they said, "There is peace". That kind of peace is the peace that comes out of a doctrine of balance of power. That is the kind of peace established by negotiation from strength, as it is called--a very badly coined phrase. Also, that is the kind of peace where we regard powerful instruments of destruction as deterrents and agents of peace. Here again if I may go back to Mahatma Gandhi's ideas, you can never get peace out of war. We are to equate means to our ends ; and out of wrong means we never get good ends. So from that time onwards, there have been attempts.

Coming near to the statements of President Eisenhower and Chairman Khrushchev, and the others, about a world that is rid of all arms, and we live in a condition, I hope, where disputes and problems between nations shall be resolved not by the instrument of war. There have been many attempts at peace making. In modern times-I will not give the chronology of it-right down, shall we say, if you take the very recent times and of 1648 and the Peace of Westphalia-after the Baruch Plan, there have been about twenty attempts. "And each time the establishment of peace has been based upon the balance of power. Introduced it is one of those doctrines that appeals to the national spirit of people and also the desire to survive, the doctrine that is called

345

"self-defence" which has appeared in our time

by, in our opinion, a misrepresentation of the Charter and Article 51. Self-defence will exist only in conditions where nations, fully armed, are living in a state of peace by some sort of uncomfortable agreement. Self-defence in the conditions of a disarmed world would become unnecessary because the defence of any part of the world will become the competence and the obligation of the entire world.

I intended to go through these various attempts, which have failed, because reference has been made about the sentimental character of this approach-and the Briand-Kellogg Pact, for example, was quoted as one of those attempts that became abortive. Well, first of all, just bemuse we have tried and failed, is not a reason not to try again until peace is established. But what is more, conditions have changed so much, not merely in degree but in kind, going to the basic quality of it. The current of history, beginning with the Peace of Westphalia to the various treaties and conventions resulting in the Hague Conventions and the establishment of the League of Nations, all that was based upon the previous ideas. But now we have this situation: Right through modern history, in between two wars, the statesmen of the world get together and say "Let us have peace". And they spend the inter-war years preparing for the next war-quite unconsciously, perhaps-in case peace does not come. So much is their faith in removing mountains that they open their windows in the morning to see if the mountain is still in front of it. Therefore, while it was possible in past years that in the intervening periods of the wars we could discuss peace in order to establish it, and do it again after the next war, we have different circumstances now in that we will not have the facility to discuss peace if there is another war in modern times. That is to say, there will be no ruins to repair in the same way.

This, of course, has changed the entire situation, even discussing peace. My country is convinced that there is no half-way house between peace and war. That is why we want to devote some of the time that we take at this meeting to point out that there is a fundamental difference of approach in these matters, and while it is necessary to talk about control and disarmament, the size of guns and the reduction of troops-we shall have something to say about all these things-it is equally necessary to understand that the objective we have in view is not the balanced limitation of armaments. The balanced limitation of armaments is only a method of being able to throw away all arms. There is no possibility of achieving any of the things we have spoken about unless we have a world in which there are on national forces for so-called national security. This is not again either a new thought or something that we managed-my delegation or my part of the world.

On 24 April 1952, the United States of America-which I suppose represents in a very typical way Western civilization-presented a document in the Disarmament Sub-Committee. It is marked Document DC/C. 1/PV. 3 24 April 1952. Since the document is available, I will not read it all out. But it says here :

"The goal of disarmament is not to regulate but to prevent war by relaxing the tensions and fears created by armaments and by making war inherently, as it is constitutionally under the Charter, impossible as a means of settling disputes between nations." (DC/C. 1/PV. 3, paragraph 20)

My delegation submitted the same type of thing in so many resolutions and also made its appeal on behalf of the Government of India in our commemorative session at San Francisco. But it is one thing for a comparatively underpowered nation-economically, politically and militarily-to speak about this ; it is another for the Heads of two Governments of the most powerful countries, to put forward that as a problem of political policy.

"To achieve this goal," said the United States, "all States must co-operate to establish an open and substantially disarmed world; (a) in which its armed forces and armaments will be reduced to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no State will be in a condition of armed preparedness to start a war, and (b) in which no State will be in a position to undertake preparations for war without other States having knowledge of such preparations..." Again, it goes on to say :

"To reach and keep this goal, international agreements must be entered into by which all States would reduce their armed forces to levels and restrict their armaments, types and quantities necessary for (a) the maintenance of internal security, (b) fulfilment of obligations of States to maintain peace and security

346

in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

"Such international agreements must ensure by a comprehensive and coordinated programmes...."

My delegation does not necessarily agree with all the details set out, but we have read them out in order to point out that from the beginning of time there has been this attempt to try to talk about the bringing down of arms. Even conservative statesmen such as a British Conservative Prime Minister said years ago :

"Is not the time come when the powerful countries of Europe should reduce their armaments ... when they should be prepared to declare that there is no use in such overgrown establishment" .-This is very relevant for us to consider today-"What is the advantage of one Power greatly increasing its army and navy? Does it not see that other Powers will follow out its example ? No increase of relative strength will accrue to any one Power ;"-that is to say, an arms race is not likely to give anyone a preponderance.-"The true interest of Europe is to come to some accord so as to enable every country to reduce those military armaments which belong to a state of war rather than of peace."

This was said as early as 1841, and we are still discussing the same problems.

To come nearer to our time, with regard to the First World War, which was the war previous to the last one, the British Foreign Secretary, who had the responsibility of declaring war at that time, said a few years after the war :

"What was the underlying cause which had been working for years to bring about War ?.. It was, in my opinion, the great growth of armaments before the war. Before the war, it was often said that great armaments were a protection against war. Now, if we were wiser after the event"-this is 1922 after the 1914 War-"we should never say that again ... The moral of the last Great War, and the state of Europe before it, was that great armaments did not prevent war; they brought war about. That was one lesson. Another lesson was that if war came on a modern scale no victory would enable the conqueror to escape from the awful suffering which war caused. And the next war, if it ever came, would be far more terrible than the last."

All this looks elementary today in the context of atomic destruction.

I think it was the representative of Greece who, in speaking to us, said :

"It is necessary for us, while discussing this matter and speaking about a world without war or even universal disarmament, to look at the thing in a realistic fashion and consider what are the reasons."

But before we do that I would like to refer to the fact that we are discussing this item in the context of a draft resolution sponsored by eightytwo countries. It is a good newspaper story. I am sure it warms the corners of our hearts to feel that for the first time the co-sponsoring of a draft resolution by all the countries of the world represented here is on this subject. But it has more than one effect and more than one reaction. When everybody co-sponsors it, it may become nobody's business. Apart from that, it is likely to be regarded that the whole of this debate is a kind of shadow boxing or going through the motions of debate.

So far as we are concerned, the universal support of this draft resolution is not without precedent, and a precedent which did not have the consequences we desired it should have. In 1957, we had a resolution in this Assembly, after an acrimonious debate which, even though it was not sponsored by the eighty-two countries, was carried unanimously. After 1957, the result not of the resolutions but of the general turn of events was that there had been no progress in the Disarmament Commission. Therefore, this resolution should not be merely dismissed by us with the thought that here is a universal agreement. In that case, we need not discuss anything at all. I submit that it represents, on the one hand, the anxieties of Governments and States in regard to this problem. It represents also encouragement, support. If it were the beginning, I would say that it represents a good sendoff, a good push to the ten-Power efforts that are being made, to the discussions that are going on at Geneva, to the coming together of two great countries with their friends on either side. All this is represented by this draft resolution.

Therefore, we do not approach this merely

347

from the point of view that we are one of the eighty-two countries and, consequently, the result must be a foregone conclusion from the point of view of obtaining a vote. In fact, we have hardly ever made speeches here with a view to influencing votes. They are decided in other ways. But in this particular case, the decision of the Assembly is a foregone conclusion. This is the opportunity for us, for those who are outside these discussions in their narrow context and those who may not have had the opportunity to present their views in the course of the discussions in this Committee, to express our views. Repeatedly in the speeches of the Great Powers or the participants in the ten-Power meeting and indeed in all the other speeches, it has been said that whatever is said here may be communicated to the ten-Power meeting. Of course, this is an old story. This also indicates that world Governments, large and small, have become very concerned.

But if we could be satisfied with a resolution of this kind, we could go back to the history of the United Nations in regard to the disarmament business. As early as 24 January, 1946, this Organization, at its first session, passed resolution 1(1), the first resolution that was passed. It appointed an Atomic Energy Commission and said that it

"shall proceed with the utmost dispatch and inquire into phases of the problem, and make such recommendations from time to time with respect to them as it finds possible."

These were the concrete things it had to do exchange of scientific information, control of atomic energy, elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and other major weapons of mass destruction, effective safeguards against violations.

In resolution 41 (I) of the same session, the Assembly recommended to the Security Council

"that it give prompt consideration to the working out of proposals to provide such practical and effective safeguards in connexion with the control of atomic energy and the general regulation and reduction of armaments."

Resolutions have been passed in this way. Similarly, smaller delegations, less significant delegations like mine, have repeatedly submitted proposals. While one has no desire to refer to them from any point of view of selfish nationalism, it is as well for the Committee to be reminded that the Disarmament Commission was repeatedly asked by resolution 704 (VII), resolution 715 (VIII), resolution 808 (IX) and resolution 914 (X) to consider proposals made in this Committee in their Commission. So far as we are concerned, resolution 808 (IX) and resolution 914 (X) of two separate sessions were specifically referred by name to the Disarmament Commission. The only result it produced was a certain amount of encomium and praise from leaders of the disarmament movement like Jules Moch, who said that they were very good, but we heard no more about them. What is more, it took two years before the Disarmament Commission found out that there were now procedural difficulties in allowing the delegation of India to present its proposals.

This is not said by way of complaint but only to point out that these proposals, proposals of the character made in this Assembly, have taken several years in order to reach a point of more practical consideration. Since there is no time, I will not read them but merely state what they say. These resolutions referred to an armaments truce, a United Nations peace fund, the enlargement of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, the cessation of tests, budgetary reduction, the stopping of the dissemination of nuclear weapons and a ban on the use of fissionable materials for military purposes. So it is not as though the topics were not discussed. All this has been referred to. But we approach this from a different point of view as well and, as I said a while ago, I will come back to it.

My Government desires attention to be drawn to some of the problems that have been discussed in this debate, largely with a view to presenting our view as to their inapplicability or applicability. Reference has been made to the fact that only if we remove these causes to a considerable extent would it be possible to take effective steps. We are not attempting any psychological examination or academic discussion of this matter. But the main problem, as the representative of Greece pointed out, was the problem of national security.

So long as this problem of national security is considered as an exclusive concern or, very largely, of national concern, then we are bound to have the problems of keeping arms, increasing those arms, as said by Lord Grey, and afterwards making those arms themselves the cause of war. In our opinion also, this lack of security arises on the one hand because of the egoistic feelings of nations with regard to their cultural, racial or other superiorities, or the conception that some

348

people are born to rule and others are not, and that great nations and small nations are to a certain extent eliminated by the composition of the United Nations itself, in status but not in function. It also arises from the fact that nationalism often outflows its national frontiers and, not satisfied with flying aloft the flag of that country in their own territory, they desire to plant it in others. That is why people like ourselves are unashamed to repeat, time after time, that empire and colonies are the cause of wars, even in their attentuated state, because of the desire for expansion, the desire and search for other land ; what is more, the necessity to raise the size of national arms, not merely to protect their borders but to protect territories that are far away from them, calls upon them to demand more and more armament. We shall refer to this matter later.

Thirdly, comes what is now very fashionable and more current, and that is the ideological conflicts. These ideological conflicts are not new to us. In more modern times there were the Crusades in the Holy Land against the Infidel. The Infidel is the fellow whom you do not like, and the Holy man is one's self. Ideological conflicts, therefore, are not new. But in the view of my delegation, the ideological conflict is largely a propaganda instrument, largely a motive power perhaps to already other existing factors and very often used by those who want to retain certain ideas or interests in order to get mass support.

Ideological controversies will disappear only when we begin to respect the human mind and realize that there is no conquest of an idea, bad or good. If it is a bad idea, as we see it, it must be counter-balanced not by another bad idea but by a good one. Therefore, we are likely in this time, largely on account of the propaganda that has gone on from either side, to give a place to the ideological controversies which to the future historian will appear rather exaggerated.

Then, of course, there are the economic conflicts. The economic conflicts, in old times, regarded part of the world as the producers of raw materials, and other manufacturers, where it was thought that the invisible exports from a country in the way of services would in some form be used as an economic hold on the others, where in order to retain one part of the world as prosperous, another part must remain poor and, what is more, those positions being stabilized or buttressed by the building of heavy barriers in the way of trade; coming in the way of traffic between nation and nation, euphemistically called "tariff walls". All these things have been responsible for creating rivalry between peoples. However,-and we may congratulate ourselves in so thinking-there is one course which nobody now speaks of in respectable society, and that is what is called "War muscle"; that war is necessary in order to make people what they are. I remember seeing a show some years ago in New York where the father tells a son that he must be a cannibal. And he said, "I will not eat a man". Then the father says : "What has happened to you ? You cannot eat a man ! Have you gone soft ?" So the wars must have appeared to Mussolini, He is no longer prevalent and that is one great advantage we have gained.

We say, therefore, that security must not merely be a national affair. It should not merely be a question of, in the name of self-defence, getting together in order to form great war groups and accumulating arms to cause further wars. The idea of expansionism must go, and where large areas of the world are today in the possession of groups of people, which on the one hand creates controversies and, on the otherpurely from this point of view-makes necessary the retention of arms either to suppress unwilling populations or in order to prevent the territory from being taken by somebody else, that will also have to go.

Therefore, the emerging action, in order to be possible, must accept this view of a warless world.

It is not possible to give commands to national States' sovereignty unless you can back it with the power of sanction, and if the power of sanction is present in some one, that power must effectively be greater than those against whom the sanction is exercised. If there are groups working together, other groups come in. Therefore, in the submission of my delegation, so long as it is thought that peace can be established by methods of war, there will be no peace, there will be these arguments about disarmament. It they are successful, they will lead towards the goal.

The new item which is called "general and complete disarmament", which as I have said, has respectable support from all quarters, in our view means a world without war, which lives under a world law where it is possible not only to bring down the size of armies, but to abandon them altogether. This calls for a degree--not an absolute one--of economic equality as between peoples in the world, looking upon disarmament as a significant step towards peace and, what

349

is more, not using the resources of a nation in order to arm countries which do not require arms for their own defence but only require them for purposes of alliances and what not.

This attempt has a rather sordid history in the past. Nowadays we talk about arms that will fire only in one direction. When we say to our friends, "These war alliances are threatening to us", they turn around and say, "They are not intended against you". Our answer is that the guns that fire only in one direction have not been made. But then, in older times, it was even worse. If one looks at the Patent Office Library in the United Kingdom, one will find that there was a gentleman who patented a weapon in 1870. He said : "I have a new type of gun which is a gun that fires automatically and prevents invaders from boarding ships". The Turks at that time were a powerful people and he claimed great advantage for this war-like invention. He said that it was :

"A new type of gun or machine, called 'defence' that discharges so often, and so many bullets, and can be so quickly loaded as to render it next to impossible to carry any ship boarding."

Its peculiar virtue lay in the fact that it was constructed with two sets of magazines, one for round bullets for fighting Christians, and the other for square bullets, with sharp edges to be used against the Turks.

This was the old days. I read this not because of morbid interest, but because we have moved on. We are not after all so bad as humanity; we have moved on to the idea that there must be some equality in offensive weapons and, therefore, we have banned some of these things, and introduced new ones, of course.

Then there is also the idea that if weapons are made, they must be sufficiently respectable for innocent people to carry. Therefore, it is interesting to recall that one of the armaments which were wielded by soldiers in this olden time was an old mace made of iron or steel, capable, in skilled hands, of breaking the strongest body armour. A point about this mace was that it might be properly used in war by Priests and Bishops instead of a sword, so that it might conform to the canonical rule against their shedding of blood. Apparently, if you knock your head, you do not shed blood.

I well remember my history master explaining this difference and pointing out with ironic gusto that Bishops and maces could take effective part in hand-to-hand warfare by breaking a limb or battering out a brain. So that humanity has gone through all this foolishness of trying to camouflage something.

The alternative to the mace today-and I hope that nobody will take offence at it-is a clean bomb; that is, instead of a dirty bomb, you have a clean bomb; instead of a sword, you have a mace. All this leads to the following. It is not, as a great man said, a matter of physics, but a matter of ethics. How well arms may be abandoned, so long as war is not banished from the world as an instrument of policy, depends to a certain extent on individual minds. To the mind of my delegation the main purpose of this debate must be, as we shall point out later, to create a change of climate where we are no longer aiming to be killed by nine-inch guns and not by nineteen-inch guns, but already to avoid the whole purpose of killing.

Therefore, in the modern version there are various humane weapons where radiation does not come out and, what is more, there is the idea that these instruments are not intended for the purpose of war. I beg to submit, I presume to do so, that if children have toys they will play with them. Unfortunately, the vast capacity of man in the field of technology, particularly between the days of 4 October 1957 and today, has advanced beyond all known limits and has not been matched by his growth in culture or imagination or even by the idea that if he hurts somebody he will hurt himself. It always reminds me of what the great British General, Lord Montgomery, once said. He said that the safest place in the next war would be that nearest to the enemy because the radiation would go away from him and not towards him.

Therefore, this problem as it is presented to us and as we must present it before the world, has a different orientation, that we are not looking to a number of people who will be like a protection squad in order to use physical force, and unless this is done we are not likely to get anywhere.

Apart from anything else, the reason, of course, is this. With modern weapons, and I do not only mean atomic weapons, to a certain extent the danger is greater when it is agreed that we rely only upon molecular weapons, because we may go back to the wars of those times. In modern times, even without any deliberate attempt at waging war, the mistaken judgement of somebody, the machiavelian policy of someone, or the

350

conveying of wrong news, purposely or otherwise, can lead to difficulties.

I will not refer to any more recent instances because it might arouse feelings, but it is possible today, for example, that an aeroplane which is carrying atomic bombs for practice purposes may pick up phenomena in the sky on the radar screen which might be mistaken for an aircraft of some other country, yet it might be a large bird or a meteor, and the pilot would drop his bombs somewhere. Again, there may be such a situation as that which precipitated the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, when King Frederick William of Prussia, aided by Bismarck, was endeavouring to ensure that Prince Albert would go to Spain in order that France might be beaten out of the business. What be did was to edit a press telegram so that it appeared as something different from what it was. He thus created a war mentality and precipitated the war, even though Napoleon Bonaparte might have waged war without that. Therefore, we have to create this climate of peace if we are to get anywhere.

We have before us the Soviet proposal which contains this main objective, which is what moves us the most, in spite of what is called "the lack of realism", to which we will refer in a moment. It has talked on to it certain proposals which some may think rather vitiate it, but, on the other hand, the Russian claim that they are being realistic. And there are certain specific proposals, all of which we have heard about in this room so many times, but since time is going on, my Government desires its views to be expressed on these matters, not in order to have a premature discussion, but because we will have no other opportunity of presenting these views in this way.

I will first take the United Kingdom proposals. Now, as is known, the United Kingdom is very close to us and usually there are consultations, not on matters of defence, but generally speaking. At least we know their mind and they know ours, which is a great advantage. What is more, the British people, as they would all admit, have a very pragmatic view of things, what Lord Dickenson called "a sense of fact". Therefore, I am personally rather disappointed that my good friend, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, has put forward these proposals on which we have to make remarks and observations which he might not accept.

The programme is divided into three stages, and we would say that these three stages would only take us to the beginning of disarmament. That is the first point. The second point is that the first stage and the second stage really does not carry us far at all, because we are told that we must find methods of cut-off, and then there is some talk about outer space, something about nuclear weapons, which is already being discussed and something about surprise attack. My delegation does not say that all this is not necessary ; all we do say is that the first stage, as a milestone even as conventional type of disarmament discussions, does not take us very far, but it does represent an attitude and an approach which desires to see a beginning made. We therefore hope that this first stage will be taken as something that is already taking place or has taken place.

Next we come to the position where it is sought to implement this. Here we have certain observations to make, particularly in regard to proposal D, and I hope the United Kingdom delegation will try to appreciate our point of view in this. In the first stage, under proposal D, we would pursue the idea of handing over specific quantities of designated types of armaments to the custody of an international organization. I find it difficult to describe my consternation at this proposal that Mr. Hammarskjold must have a large armoury where all these weapons that other people have discarded, not because they are useful, can be placed. Field Marshal Hammarskjold will be in charge of this large quantity of arms to convert him into a new Napoleon. This is not a laughing matter ; it is a very serious matter. This is going the wrong way. The orientation is wrong. It is the way of trying to establish peace and abandon war by a collection of arms.

What are these arms of specific quantities and designated type? They would include the hydrogen weapon, the atom weapon, flame throwers, napalm bombs and what not. Presumably they would include all the poison gases in the world and all the bacteriological weapons and I fear, also the instruments of psychological warfare. While this is not the time to analyse proposal D in detail, my delegation wishes the Ten-Power Committee to take this particularly into account. This is not a question of difference or of variation in detail. It is an entirely different and in our view an erroneous method of approach to collect these large arms and place them at the disposal of an international organization. That will become clear when we speak about the international police force.

With regard to the question of outer space while we hope that a study of that will be pursued, it does not come in the way of progress in what

351

is called the first stage.

I turn now to the French proposal. As usual, Mr. Moch presents novel ideas with great sincerity, and everybody would support anything that would stop the use of weapons. But we are not looking at the matter purely from the point of view of disarming an individual. What we are told is this : if the vehicles, the carriers, which deliver all these terrific weapons were made difficult to obtain by their non-manufacture. if we tackled the problem of the carriers, then we would get somewhere. My delegation was at first impressed by this idea when we heard about it, but then we i thought about the matter and we found that while the highest speed vehicle that today carries atomic weapons would be out of the way, we would still have passenger aircraft travelling at 1,500 miles an hour, and, to start with, that would be adequate. After a couple of days, others would be produced. The history of Germany in the interwar years and its capacity to, put Messerschmidts and what not and, ultimately, their V-bomb into the sky is an indication that a cutting out of these vehicles would not be sufficient. What we want is not to abolish the carrier, but the carried. It is the atom bomb that is carried which must come off. We would not make any objection to the abolition of vehicles intended for this purpose but we say that this should not be regarded as being effective enough to prevent the delivery of bombs because there would be vehicles fast enough for this purpose.

Another aspect is that among the vehicles must be included the bases because the base is probably the most potent carrier. It is from there that these intercontinental or other weapons would go out ; and now we are told that these base may well be under water and, therefore. unless these proposals are viewed from that point of view, we shall be in difficulties.

Then there are the Soviet proposals, which are well-known to this Assembly. But here we want to say that my country stands fully for the necessity of organisation, of inspection, control and all those things that appear, unfortunately, essential in an imperfect society like ours. But at the same time, this controversy as to which should come first has always appeared to us as unreal-the chicken or the egg. We think that any disarmament proposal carries within it the whole machinery of control. One could agree with the idea that a control machinery should be established and left there in the hope that disarmament will come afterwards. In our view, therefore, whenever any disarmament, however small or large, takes place, it should not even wait for the control machinery ; the progress towards it should not be lax or slowed down because the other is not ready. It was for that reason that, several years ago, we suggested that the Secretariat might draft, even if it were not accepted, the blue print of a disarmament treaty so that discussions would be on specific problems instead of saving which should come first and which should not.

To a certain extent we have discovered, by

Mr. Lodge's phrase, built-in systems, and when he explains that you will probably understand. If it properly goes along with the disarmament proposals-that is to say, if we are abandoning guns of such and such size and this is the way we shall inspect it-then I do not think that any reasonable person can object to it.

Mr. Lodge has asked us three categorical questions. They are not quite in place here, but, since my time is getting on, I shall take them out of turn. One is with regard to the international police force.

To a certain extent, my delegation has expressed its views in a statement before the General Assembly. The Government of India is totally opposed to the formation of an international police force by allocating units of a national force for that purpose for these various reasons.

First of all, a police force that functions in the context not of a warless world, but of a world with national arms, would have to have at its disposal all that Mr. Selwyn Lloyd would give to Mr. Hammarskjold. That is to say, this police force would at least have to be as big or powerful as all the national armies put together. Therefore, we would have to create a superleviathan for the international police force, which would be a menace to mankind, apart from its heavy cost ; and it would also try to improve its weapons, so that the competition, instead of being between the Americans and the Russians, would be between the international community of the United Nations and the Americans and Russians put together. That is a very fine spectacle. Therefore, the idea of an international police force composed of a lot of soldiers and equipment and everything else, and this great project of peace converted into an armoury with all that goes with it, is not an idea to which my Government can lend its support. I submit that an international police force is what it says. It is not only international; it must be police and its force must be used for that purpose.

352

A police force by definition is a force that is used against people who are under certain common law and, what is more, are not people whom one faces with the same arms, unless they are brigands. Even then, a burglar or housebreaker --- or whatever you have these daysprobably has much smaller weapons than a policeman. So, an international police force, on the one hand, can function only in the context of countries which have subscribed to international law-that leads on to Mr. Lodge's next question-of some kind where there are no national armies. For these national armies, small as they may be, if put together become very big and, what is more, these small national armies will be tempted, as they are now, to intervene in the internal affairs of other people, either in order to make them good people or in order to assist them against bad people. Whichever it is, if you have all the problems of war in as small a context, nothing can be saved.

The proposal is made that each country must set aside units of its own national army to create an international police force. That would be at least the best way to make it international. Then as we have here, the geographical representation, canvassing, arm-twisting and what not to be able to see whether a Patagonian or a Laplander would be the Commander-in-Chief, would follow, and international rivalries would come in. So, with the rivalries in the international police force, they would agree like the international civil servants of the international community.

Therefore, we are against national units being kept in reserve for these purposes by law-abiding nations ; and, of course, whether law-abiding or not, it would be decided by the majority of people here, who may or may not be law-abiding in all circumstances, as we have seen in recent times.

Secondly, it is not a practical proposition. I have some acquaintance with this matter. How do you keep units of a national army ear-marked for a certain purpose ? And if the Secretary-General cannot find a special job for them, what do we do with them ? We would have a lot of soldiers or equipment earmarked for this purpose -obviously paid for by the United Nations-and what would they do in times when there was no trouble anywhere?-which always tempts Secretariat officials to find some trouble somewhere in the world in order to make use of an international police force. Therefore this idea of earmarking units in a particular country is entirely impractical. We found it impractical in having to send out units to Gaza or anywhere else. The only way to find the units is to take them out of the regular army as it stands and replace them by other forces, or by territorials, or go without them. Therefore, the conception that you can have an international force of this kind--a super-force armed with all the traffic weapons of international war, on the one hand, or having units in a particular country, not international but still national in character-and I would like to see the superman who would command these forcesthat is, in our opinion, out of the question.

Secondly, they would be of such a size as not to relieve the world. The Secretary-General finds it difficult to persuade the Assembly to provide the \$ 60 million, the large fortune that is required to run this Organization. We still have trouble in dealing with the outgoing in regard to commitments which we have undertaken; so, in a warless world, if the preparation for war is going to cost so much, then the disarmament and the peace are not worth much. And that is why you cannot obtain peace by methods of war.

Then Mr. Lodge asks : what sort of international law would prevail ? International law has been described-some people say inaccurately -as international morality. This international law would not be enforceable in the municipal courts of any country. The international laws that would govern the police force would have to be above the national laws of various countries. At the present moment, if Indian troops go to Gaza, as far as they are concerned they are governed by Indian military law, which may be totally opposed to the law in Israel or to the law in Egypt. Supposing, for example, in our military law there were punishments which offend the conscience of these countries in which they are living, then a serious situation is created. Therefore, in my opinion, the international law that pertains to the international police force would have to be a law equally accepted by every country, and not as in Korea during the last few days and not as in Gaza. What is more, in these international police forces, being composed of units drawn from different countries, under the command of a particular national, usually the national of a country that has a smaller army and has probably not used it for a long time, the

administration would be found very difficult. But that is not really Mr. Lodge's question. His question is : who is going to enforce this law, and will they conform to certain difficult standards? This, I think, is a problem in which the Disarmament Commission, the United Nations and everybody, as we shall find out later, should do some work in research and find out how these forces would be governed.

353

In hour humble submission it would be much simpler when the element of sanction becomes as low as in the case of a policeman. If, even in a municipality, all the citizens are armed and are permitted to take the law into their own hands, then, in the enforcement of the law, the case of even a burglar would become a civil war., That is because the offender is not armed, on the one band, and people around are willing to support the authority of the police force, even though sometimes one may give succor to a hunted criminal. But it is because of that that enforcement becomes possible.

My country does not believe in security forces for the purposes of internal order. What does it mean? These security forces are for the purpose of maintaining internal order. If it is suggested that armies are necessary in order to obtain the assent of citizens to a government, then that kind of government should not have international sanction. Security forces of national army character become necessary only in the context where they are going to be used against people across the border. If security forces are only for the purpose of dealing with civil tumult with drunks or other offenders, then it is not necessary to have security forces. Therefore security forces to the extent of international armies, in our opinion, have no meaning. But that is tied up to another problem, and I can understand most of these countries raising the question of security forces because national armies today are not over-sized and, in a great many countries, are not intended and necessary for the defence of their frontiers only, but in order to keep the whole of 4 or 5 million square miles of land in other parts of the world because they are, by some strange logic and by some interpretation of law, made part of the territory of the mother country, so-called. So then, if

security forces are intended only to keep order in the homeland of a country against their own people, then, if in any community it becomes necessary to use the army to rule-that is, if there is no consent-then they are not security forces ; we are discussing and giving support not only to a police state, but a state that is unarmed helotry. Therefore, security forces in that way are not something that we can support. To talk about an international police force being organized in the way often suggested in these rooms is to put the cart before the horse. The police force comes only after there is a law. Police are intended to enforce the law and not to make the law. Police are not governed by anything which they think is necessary at any particular time, and they are not under the command of commanders. Therefore, for an international police force to emerge, we must first of all establish the international community.

This is not an argument for delay, but rather the reverse. Since we think that international wars-wars between nations-can be avoided by the use of forces which are neutral, or which are objective, or which have no interest in the matter, then since we all want to establish such a force, I think national armies must go. As the minister of defence, I would be the happiest person in the world if I had the work of demobilization.

My Prime Minister has a reputation of being extremely realistic, and this is what he said about the Soviet proposals :

"It seems to me as a proposal a brave proposal, which deserves every consideration. Whether humanity, that is, various countries concerned, is brave enough to put an end suddenly to armies, navies and air forces, I do not know. But the time will come, will have to come, when something of this kind will have to be adopted, because in this era of atomic and hydrogen weapons and ballistic missiles, war has become an anachronism."

My delegation says these things because, if humanity is to survive, it would have to have at least intervening periods of abandoning arms. In other words, to put it in rather an exaggerated way, disarmament to a certain extent is inevitable today. Because for one thing, people cannot afford to pay for it, big countries are afraid of small countries-they have rivalry in that wayand what is more, even if more weapons can be built they are not necessary, because each of these atomic Powers presumably has enough weapons to destroy the world ten times over, so why should they destroy it an eleventh time ? Therefore, the whole problem of disarmament from that point of view, to my humble mind, has an element of inevitability.

But having disarmed, we will go back again, and this is where we want to mention another factor which we have in mind. Let us suppose there was disarmed world, by which we mean a world where there is a limitation of armaments. That is the same kind of idea which one of the countries concerned put forward some time ago, that both the Soviet Union and the United States have a limited number of atomic bombs in order to protect the peace of the world. Let us also suppose there should be a limitation of armies to this size, that size, and the other size. Now, we say that if there are molecular weapons in the

354

world, enough to start a small war, that war carries the momentum to become a big war. A small war is started, and each side wants to improve its weapons, and those weapons will keep on improving. We may throw away, we may dismantle and destroy-I am told we cannot destroy-but we may dismantle and prohibit the present deadly weapons, but the people who make them would still be there, because no one is suggesting that all these great geniuses and technicians of science should be destroyed. Even if they were, others would come in their place. So that if you start a small war with small weapons, mankind having known the great advantages of civilization and having the capacity to make these deadly weapons in a short time, from the molecular weapons we will proceed to other weapons. This has been the experience of wars in the past.

Even if countries who have armies were disarmed, as they were after the First World War, this situation could arise in the normal course of industry. Let us take the example of Germany after the First World War. Happily, there was a Nuremburg trial, to which I shall refer in another context. Let us take case number ten. In December 1947 the head of the Krupp organisation and his eleven co-defendents were indicted by the Allies, who won the war, with the crimes of planning, preparation, initiation, and waging of aggressive war. A company is waging an aggressive war I They were also indicted with plunder and spoilation, crimes involving prisoner of war and slave labour, and common plan or conspiracy to commit crimes against the peace, but that is not material. Captured documents proved that after 1918 Krupps duped the Allied commissioners into believing that their products were such peaceful objects as padlocks, milk cans, cash registers, carts, motor cars, and locomotives. In a memorandum of Gustav Krupp it was said that after the assumption of power by Hitler he had the satisfaction of reporting to him that Krupps stood ready shortly to begin the re-armament of the Germans. Krupp made it clear that because of his conviction that Germans must again fight to rise, his companies had from 1918 onward maintained at their own cost-they are a patriotic people-developments in production of war material, and that they had to maintain these activities for the future. It was boasted that the demolitions consequent on the presence of the Inter-Allied Control after the armistice were not real but only apparent. The most important guns that were used in 1939 to 1941 were already developed in 1933, having been tested secretly, and the ordnance organization had stood ready for mass production on Hitler's orders.

The Krupps, not satisfied with this, wanted to export his enterprise into the neighbouring and the peaceful country of Sweden; but the Swedish Government came to the rescue, and as soon as they discovered it, in less than two years they passed laws prohibiting the employment of foreign money in armament concerns. This is one of the things we will have to consider with regard to preventive measures. The Krupps also, by ingeneous financial accountancy, were prominent among those who enabled Germany to conceal expenditure of 12 billion marks, extending over a period of several years. Therefore, if any attempt is to be made to cut down the size of these arms and say "You shall not do that", and so on, unless the treaties are observed, in the case it is better to abandon arms totally. That is to say, if you are relying on the ethical quality in man, there is no reason why the ethical quality should stop

short of a capacity of killing. Therefore, you either take it as a whole or we play at this business.

The Soviet Government had examined the situation and had come to the firm conviction that the way out of deadlock should be shown along the road of general and complete disarmament. Even at the risk of being called not sufficiently non-aligned, my Government would say that was a correct statement. But it is also supported by the Government of the United Kingdom when Mr. Ormsby-Gore tells us:

"But I assure you that this single adjective 'comprehensive' has the same meaning for us as the two adjectives 'general and complete'....."

There is for my Government nothing novel in the concept which lies behind the formal tittle of the item. This thing we cannot agree with, because if we try to water this down after there is no new entry in the new field, then we shall be discussing the same old thing we have been discussing before.

The United States Government told us that the road to complete disarmament is long and that the United States will be happy to travel to the end of it. That is what we would like to see. Mr. Jules Moch, the doyen of this moment, said that the plan is a straight and narrow path leading to total and controlled disarmament, which the people certainly dream about, but which cannot be total unless at the same time an international force is created among the States to play the same role that law enforcement agencies play among citizens. We subscribe to this. We certainly agree on the general considerations underlying

355

the Soviet plan and with the advantages that all peoples will receive from total disarmament. Whatever may be the immediate necessities for finding formulas for the various problems put forward with regard to partial measures, the objective of our discussions should be this world without war which alone can sustain a world without war. A world which relies on war, however limited, will become a world laden with war, knowing the experience of mankind. Therefore, we must not say with Milton;

"The remedy ; perhaps more valid arms, Weapons more violent, when next we meet May serve to better us, and worse our foes, Or equal what between us made the odds."

This doctrine we must discard, and adopt the other one.

We are told-and my delegation likes to face this as far as it can-that this idea is a dream, that it is utopian. If it is utopian. no thought is necessary; in Utopia there would be no war, and therefore it would be unrealistic. Now, I ask you, is it more realistic to spend a hundred billion-so we are told; in some other book it will say more than that-on the manufacture of weapons which we are told will never be used ? - a doctrine with which I do not agree, since they are being used, if only for practice purposes, throwing them away, which is war use because these instruments of war, almost the moment they leave the drawing-table become obsolete, and they go on to something else. Therefore, this hundred billion of war expenditure is being used for war purposes, except for the fact that it does serve to promote technical developments, and so on. So, is it more realistic to spend a hundred billion a year, to keep the whole world keyed up to conditions of war, to seek safety only in the machines of destruction, and to say that you cannot trust your neighbour even when your neighbour is untrustworthy? Or is it more realistic to take away the weapons of war? We are asked, how can this be accomplished at this time? I would like to submit, in all modesty, that if demobilization is possible in a short time, why should not disarmament be possible ? The United States of America-and I do not vouch for these figures as they have been published; the Americans do not let me into their secrets-the United States of America had a peak strength of 12,300,000 men under arms during World War II. That was presumably at the end of the European War in 1945, when the United States army numbered 8,300,000. In 1946 the army had been reduced to 1,900,000, and four years later, in 1950, it had been reduced to 591,487. So it was possible, without any particular attempt at disarmament in this sense, in the normal course of administration to demobilize 8,300,000 people

to 591,487 in less than five years ; and what is more, practically all weapons of war used at that time were dismantled or thrown into the scrapheap or put into Cellophane to be sold to people who are less sophisticated in the arts of war, and so they were withdrawn from commission. Therefore it was possible for the United States of America-not the most perfect people in the world in regard to organization ; and I do not say that we are-but the United States reduced their strength from 12,300,000 to 591,487 in five vears. In two years, from 1944 to 1946, they reduced their forces from 12,300,000 to less than two million. They reduced by ten and a half millions in two years, and in another two or three years the 1,900,000 became 591,487.

It maybe said that demobilizing men is a very different proposition from demobilizing establishments. Even with all the organization that has gone on, if there are no men these weapons will not be used, and what is more, the people who produce them will go into other things.

Referring again to documents which are public and available, the Soviet Union had a peak strength during World War II of 12,500,000. I hope the representative of the Soviet Union will not join issue with me on these figures, and that if he does he will supply me with other figures. But at the end of World War II they had a peak strength of 12,500,000. In 1946 this had come down to 6,000,000 and in 1950 to to 2,800,000.

France, it is reported, had armed forces of 5,000,000 at the end of World War II. In 1946 this had come down to 835,000 and in 1950, 659,000.

The United Kingdom-usually but quite wrongly considered very slow in everythinghad an army of 5,120,000 during World War II. Whether that figure includes the army of the Commonwealth, I do not know. This figure was reduced to 800,000 in 1948, and to 725,000 in 1950.

These figures are telling in more than one way. When they really wanted to demobilize vast millions were demobilized in two years. But between 1946 and 1950 the figures became smaller not because more could not have been demobilized but because it was not the policy

356

to do so.

So I submit that it is not so fantastic to think that it is possible to dismantle the weapons of war. I do not say it should be done in four calendar years or five years or six years. That really does not matter. Time is not measured since Einstein's day by the calendar. but by events. It is occurrence that makes time, and as occurrence goes forward time will be bridged.

I also wish to repeat that once the process of demobilization and dismantling and discarding starts, it acquires its own momentum. It overcomes resistances, political, psychological and mechanical; it will have produced devices whereby these things can be quickly done, the psychology of dismantling and demobilization of resources in this way would become the accepted law of the world. I believe the slave owners of two or three hundred years ago must have said, "When these slaves are liberated what are the 'poor devils' going to do ? They will be out of work. They do not want to leave their jobs and homes, and what is more, it will take a long time to send them away." But the decision was made, and if today anyone were to suggest keeping slaves, he would not be regarded as a person fit for decent society. Sol that these problems which we think impossible to solve or unrealistic, are more realistic.

I should like to ask, since the weapons of yesterday have already become obsolete, is it more realistic to make bigger, more efficient, "more beautiful" bombs than those that fell during the war years? Is that more realistic? Is it more realistic to contemplate the possibility of every country in the world making these deadly weapons ? This seems to be the case, if you read the investigations conducted by a group of American scientists under the chairmanship of the American Mr. Davidon, where a number of countries, including my own, are listed as having the capacity to make atomic weapons within two or three years-as though. we would make them. But how do we know ? I say we will not make them, but I may not be there in two or three years.

Therefore the possibility of demobilization is more realistic than the capacity for massing arms. We take time over this because it is the hope of our delegation that, if not the United Nations Organization, then world public opinion will set in motion this idea, that we contemplate not merely less arms and less expenditure, but a method by which we outlaw war as an instrument of policy, a method through which differences between neighbours would be settled by invoking the councils of nations, by the impact of opinion, so that, since both sides would be without arms the actual precipitation of a large-scale conflict would be largely and remotely delayed. It is quite true that there are smaller problems, unresolved problems, in the world, but they would fall into their place.

And here we must all take courage from the fact that, while there have been failures during the last two years in the sense that we actually have no solution for the most troublesome problem of surprise attack, the main cause of war, apart from what I said before, is the reverse of the security idea, and is the fear that people have. That is why Yugoslavia, in company with my delegation, sponsored a resolution last year asking for the study of this question at Geneva. Actual studies are going on, and though no results have been reached we have received very welcome news from the leader of the United States delegation offering to resume these talks. When the element of surprise attack is removed, there will be some advantage.

Similarly, we have made no progress in regard to co-operation in outer space, but developments have gone ahead in outer space. There has been no progress likewise in the matter of a suspension in the increase of arms, as was asked for in the resolution submitted by my delegation some time ago for an arms truce. Likewise, as we must be reminded by the rumours-I don't know the facts-of further nuclear explosions, in the Sahara Desert, there has been no progress in stopping what is called the "nth power" problem, or the "fourth power" problem.

With regard to chemical warfare, we are told by a research student in America that the ancient Hindus were probably the originators of chemical warfare. I do not take any responsibility for that. The beginnings of chemical warfare are lost in antiquity. References to particular nations are not intended to point the finger of blame ; we are in the company of friends. Incendiary chemicals -I suppose the poor Hindus threw only a little bit of a candle, or something-incendiary chemicals have been known to be used since at least 1200 B.C. in Greece as also in India and by the Romans. Greek fire was invented in 600 B.C., with the property of spontaneously bursting into flame. (All this sounds very modern.) Smoke also has been used since early times to screen movements, so when in the First World War they created smoke-screens they were not being very modern, apparently.

357

Tear gases for harassment purposes were used by the French in August 1914, followed by the Germans and British later. The first American use of gas was phosgene against the Germans in June 1918.

This is not what should worry us.

In the total, both sides employed about 17,000 chemical troops and caused 1.3 million casualties, but only 91,000 were deaths. About one-fourth of the ratio was wounded and dead, as compared with other weapons. Something like 9 million shells filled with mustard gas were fired, producing 400,000 casualties, nearly five times as effective as shrapnel and high explosives.

So these days we are rather inclined to think that chemical warfare is no longer a danger.

I would request the United States delegation not to regard the next quotation as chosen with a view to making an attack of any kind. This is the purely military point of view. It was reported in the New York Times, under dateline 8th August

"Leading military officials are trying to overcome public horror of chemical, biological and radiological warfare.

"Pentagon strategists fear that unless a formidable programme of public education in this field is carried out the country may suffer as significantly as if it were behind in nuclear-armed missiles.

"What the public must know, according to the highest Defense Department authorities, is that many forms of chemical and allied warfare are more 'humane' than existing weapons."

This is one of the ideas which we must get, not only in America but in every country : this idea of humane killing. It is rather a contradiction in terms.

In the New York Times of 30th August it was reported from Pugwash :

"Twenty-six scientists from eight countries who have been discussing the danger of biological and chemical warfare to humanity, animal and plant life, concluded a one-week-long session here today. They warned the world that only international control of such agents and weapons could ease heightened distrust among nations and eliminate the amnesia of secrecy'."

"It was emphasized that while control of nuclear weapons is proving difficult, control of biological and chemical weapons is more awkward. The cost of the latter is infinitely less than that of the hydrogen bomb and so places much less expensive instruments of mass annihilation in the hands of small nations."

So I should like to point out that limited agreements on non-use of this weapon or that weapon are not going to get anywhere. What is more, chemical warfare was not employed during the last war, my advisers tell me now, largely because it was ineffective in a system of roundthe-clock bombing. But the great countries in possession of arms are still storing these chemical gases. I beg to submit that an agreement of an international character, though it has now lasted nearly thirty-four years, is not the most effective way of doing it.

In 1925 there was a Geneva protocol, to which some nations had subscribed and others have not, but I remember-I was a scholar in those days-that on 13th August 1914 the Germans published in Berlin that the British were using poison gas, and on 14th August, the next day, the British published that the Germans were using poison gas. So somebody knew about it. I do not know who started it first. So these gases will be used. The same applies to bacteriological warfare.

Taking all these rather diabolical weapons of various kinds, which are inexpensive and may be secretly concealed, there is no answer in the modern world except matching the power that is exhibited by man in so-called conquest of nature in this rather complex world, other than to refer to the ethical problem in the context of social organization ; as my Prime Minister rightly warned, not in terms of sentiment, not in terms of pious intentions.

I have said : "Where no progress was made". But it would be very wrong for us not to refer to where progress has been made. One area is in regard to a subject prohibited in the United Nations : Antarctica. My delegation had the temerity to bring it up two or three years ago and upset the whole of the Latin American continent. But I am glad to hear by rumour-for nobody has told us-that in Washington on 15th October the twelve nations active in Antarctica pledged their determination to keep that continent free of war :

358

"Mr. Kuznetsov said the convening of the Conference 'indicates that its participants agree that a regime for Antarctica should be established on an international basis with due consideration to mutual interests and rights'."

While we have no desire to go into the details of this conference, even if the elements of it are true, we have made the first step towards finding a place in the world-I believe it is about 6 million square miles of ice-which at any rate would not be a theatre of war or a base for operations.

The success of the Geneva talks is another area. We come now to the crux of this problem: the establishment of the ten-Power Committee. My delegation does not support this by saying that we cannot do anything else. We think it is a development of great importance, and we raised this problem about seven years ago in the United Nations and repeatedly stated that direct negotiations between the Americans and Russians were the only beginning that would bring about effective talks in this direction. So we regard this ten-Power Committee mainly as direct talks between those who can deliver the goods.

This ten-Power Committee is nothing new. It is merely an expression of the diplomatic capacities and diplomatic facilities existing in people and it is in no way opposed to the purpose of this Organization. But we think that if we agree, as we have, and wish this ten-Power Committee well, then we must leave it to make its own procedures and arrange its own composition, not upsetting the balances, because, if it is to reach a successful conclusion, no impediments should be put in its way.

It is for us to devise ways and means by which the United Nations as a whole may be able to express its concern and make its contribution in other ways, but we regard the ten-Power Committee as self-sufficient, as coming into existence as a result of the Geneva agreements, as having potency for good. At the same time, in our humble submission, the usual diplomatic channels should not be confined to communications between these ten great Powers. They have their own representatives and chancelleries, and the world-not in this building, not in our committees, but in terms of Governments-should have some knowledge of what is going on--I shall not say "should be informed", for that is the wrong word-depending upon the discretion, the desire and the willingness of these people to have communication with them. That must be left to them. In that way the problem would not be isolated.

I shall not quote the Eisenhower-Khrushchev communique, which everybody has read. I am sorry that so much time has gone by that I must omit many of the things I wished to say and come down to the actual proposals we should like to submit for consideration.

I have already spoken a great deal about the climate that should lead to the solution of this

problem. We should like to see the people appreciate the difference between cutting down the size of armaments and coming to agreements with regard to their size and so on, and we should like public opinion in the world- not so much Governments and chancelleries, but public opinion in the world-to realize that there is no alternative for survival in this world except a world free from war, where war is no longer an instrument of national policy. Since I have spoken so much about this, I shall leave it for the moment.

The second suggestion I should like to make is that this ten-Power Committee, we hope-we are not proposing this, but we hope-will function generally under the umbrella of what is usually called the summit. That is to say, if it gets into • deadlock, the world will not hear merely about • deadlock, but the great ones will step in and try to resolve it, so that it is not isolated from what is now called the new atmosphere arising from the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting, the visit of Mr. Macmillan to the Soviet Union, and the impending visit of the Soviet Prime Minister to France and so on. If in this more or less specialized technical committee there arise difficulties, either because the meetings are too long or the speeches are too long, or because of getting involved in previous history-and we must not forget that out of the ten Powers on the ten-Power Committee at least six or seven will be the same that have been dealing with this for ten years and know each other too well, sometimes knowing what is good and sometimes knowing what is bad-and if there is a conflict of this kind, we hope that the ten-Power Committee will resort at once to asking the bigger powers to step in to resolve the particular problem.

Then I want to make a suggestion, which at the present moment I will make on my personal responsibility because it involves many matters of principle on which I have not been able to consult my Government. Often it is asked : how do we enforce agreements? How are agreements in regard to violations implemented? The Nuremberg trials do put forward ideas which are worth

359

considering. suppose there was in the world a code in regard to scientists, shall we say, or in regard to soldiers or in regard to statesmen-whatever it may be-the violation of which would

be regarded as a violation of a peace treaty. Suppose, for example, technicians and scientists together made an atom bomb in secret. That would be a violation of an agreement. There is no way now to enforce that agreement, except by going to war or making the country adopt some other method. It is worthwhile considering, and we put it forward only as a suggestion, whether the Nuremberg method in this matter, of making the individual violator subject to penalty under the national laws of his own country, again by treaty, would not be the right thing to do.

That is to say, if a scientist is hired for the purpose of violating the law in regard to the banning of weapons, that scientist-apart from the country- becomes individually liable for an act of the kind I read out a while ago. Therefore, if individual responsibility can be fixed by way of agreement in an international treaty, then it becomes obligatory on the part of the municipal power to execute the law of that country or to hand the individual over to an international tribunal, as the case may be.

Whatever may be the controversy about the Nuremberg method, it brought to the forefront for the first time the idea of fixing individual responsibility for crimes against humanity. A crime against humanity cannot be prepetrated by a nation in the abstract. It is morally responsible, it is politically responsible, but the actual hands and the brains must be those of individuals. If, as in the case of Nuremberg, punishment hangs over people who violate the laws of men, as set forth in a treaty and sanctioned by this Organization, that may well serve as a deterrent.

Fourthly, we would suggest that the deep secrecy which is spread about, which really leads to the leaking of information to a considerable degree and to espionage, and, what is more, the spreading of erroneous scientific knowledge in order to mislead one's opponent, is not only against the laws of civilization but also contributes to all those fears of disguised experiments and what not.

I have already said that the ten-Power Committee, in our opinion, while it should be entirely the master of its own procedure, will have diplomatic connexions with various Governments, and the use that it may make of any party on its own responsibility, to resolve matters would be a very healthy way of dealing with some of these problems.

Then we would suggest that there should be a ban placed by the industrially advanced countries on the export of capital equipment and technicians to other countries, which are not manufacturing arms, for the purpose of establishing arms industries. We read in the newspapers the other day that these things were beginning again. I read out the extract about what happened in the mid-war years. If, therefore, arms industries are to be established in countries which are not members of the United Nations or are not properly represented here by the government whose writ runs in the place-if in those areas, if that situation should unhappily continue, arms establishments were to arise-then there would be a leakage which would make any agreement useless. Therefore, it would be a point of honour, a point of international understanding and agreement, that the promotion of this particular kind of enterprise and traffic is not in the interests of humanity.

Finally, I should like to submit that the world today spends billions and billions of dollars, of roubles and of pounds in research on weapons of war. I think that the Secretariat should submit papers and we should consider whether the time has not come, and whether it is not urgent, to do some research in the other direction-not to make policy, but to give facts-instead of war research an inquiry into peace research problems. This may well be a part of the work of the Disarmament Commission. It should include the great scientists of the world, who, in their public pronouncements and in the efforts they make when they are not strictly employed by Governments for this purpose, are very emphatic about all the matters we have been speaking about. The great scientists of the world, perhaps the main statesmen of the world, should participate in this vast organization, so that the money that may be available for this purpose may be spent on other things than investing methods of war. Suppose, for example, that we were told, as we were told two or three years ago that it is possible to explode an atom bomb in one's pocket and that therefore any suspension is of no value. Then the scientists who would be international servants. with no particular allegiance to national policies,

would be able to come forward either to contradict that or, if that were the case, to find some other method.

The same applies to the resolving of certain disputes. No one is suggesting the establishment of a new machinery of conciliation. Some vast research of this kind is called for by an Organi-

360

zation whose main purpose is to rid the world of the scourge of war and to be a centre for the resolving of disputes.

If this Assembly makes no other decision than to turn our hand to this more constructive purpose, it will have accomplished a great deal.

My purpose in making these submissions is in no way either to anticipate what the ten-Power committee will do or to advise it. We trust its competence in these matters, we wish it well. Even though the representatives on. that committee will represent their countries, by the very fact of our endorsement of their establishment, by the functions they have taken in hand and the great hopes they have aroused, and, what is more, through the faith that this Organization places in them, they have really become the custodians of the pursuit of truth and the establishment of peace.

While, therefore, the ten-Power Committee is not a sub-committee of the Disarmament Commission and owes it no organizational responsiblelity--the only organizational connexion we will have with the committee is that it will be serviced by the Secretariat in many ways--I hope it will take into account the fact that, while there are great national loyalties, there are even greater loyalties to the idea of peace and to the purpose of this resolution. The resolution should be the charter of that committee. It is a resolution not only endorsed, but sponsored, by the eighty-two Members of this Organization. It is a resolution which has evoked great hope in the minds of men in every part of the world.

Finally, my delegation would like to suggest that the Disarmament Commission of eighty-two nations, which did not meet last year except to pass on information, will meet around the middle of the coming calendar year, in order to be informed and educated and equally in order to give encouragement to the ten-Power Committee. That, in our submission, would be a very good way to keep the United Nations well informed and intimately concerned with this matter, apart from the referral to chancelleries. We would like to hope that the great Powers themselves, those who are involved in this and who must be the deciding factors in this matter, will give consideration and lend their support to this suggestion, so that the Commission would meet again in six months or so. It would not be a matter of sending out a notice overnight to the permanent representatives to meet in New York-distinguished people though they may be. The meeting would take place at governmental level, after the difficulties had been considered by Governments in the chancelleries. Thus, when we gather here, we will not be putting forth our own ideas-bright as we always think our own ideas are-but there would have been a real delegate conference, and the disarmament business would have become much more broad-based and with roots striking deeper into the people. It would also be a method whereby this controversy would be carried from council halls and chambers into the market place and would become part of the national, politics of every country.

It is our hope that the suggestion we have made will not be thought of as intended to displace other ideas or to constitute a reflection on the ten-Power Committee. But to have a target in this way, and a comparatively near one, where proposals would be considered in this vast world assembly by delegates accredited for that purpose with their technical advisers, would be a great step forward.

We believe that the proposals we have submitted are not unrealistic. We firmly believe that it is possible to disarm this world. We firmly believe that it is possible for man to throw away his arms. For thousands of years, men have talked about turning their weapons into ploughshares. But the time has now come when, if they do not turn them into instruments of peace, they will no longer be here to turn them into anything.

We must therefore recognize that, as the poet said :

"The moving Finger writes, and having writ

Moves on : nor all thy Piety nor Wit Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line Nor all thy Tears wash out a word of it."

That should be our outlook in this matter.

INDIA USA LAOS SWITZERLAND OMAN GREECE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA PERU SPAIN FRANCE GERMANY LATVIA ISRAEL EGYPT KOREA SWEDEN YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on French Nuclear Tests in Sahara

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Political Committee on November 6, 1959 on the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara. He said :

The item that we are discussing this morning is one of a series that relates to tests of nuclear weapons, having reference either to explosions that have occurred in the past, those that are projected and those that may occur in the future.

361

While these items have some relationship, my country, in common with a large number of others, and finally by the whole Membership of the Organization, agreed for a separate discussion of this matter. That is due to the urgency of this issue and also because of the terrain on which this explosion is taking place.

If I may introduce a personal note in this matter, though my delegation will take full part in the item that stands in our name and has submitted resolutions along with others, I myself may not be able to be present here, and if I overlap into the general problem I hope the Committee will forgive me.

We make no apologies for the importance we attach to this project of the Republic of France in regard to entering the field of atomic explosions. Before I address myself to this subject, may I say that on behalf of the French Government. Mr. Jules Moch has been the exponent. This does create a great deal of embarrassment because of the great respect in which he is held in this Committee, the well-known devotion he has to the cause of disarmament and his great knowledge of the subject, which does not always mean that all the available data on a particular point comes out in a statement. It is part of the rights of an exponent of a case to present the aspects of the problem which naturally advance his argument. This applies to all of us. It is for the Committee to place the arguments side by side and to come to its own conclusions. I am not for a moment suggesting that the representative of France has become the devil's advocate in this case, but simply to say that there are other aspects to these matters.

Secondly, we are all glad to note that both the representative of Morocco and the representative of France have found it possible to pay each other compliments with regard to the way this problem is being tackled. That probably is due to the facility of the French language of their long association with each other and their hopes of friendship in the future.

So far as my country is concerned, we have been interested in this problem and indeed brought before this Assembly in 1954, after a statement by our Prime Minister in our Parliament on 2 April of the same year, the idea of the suspension of nuclear tests, the tests of these weapons of mass destruction, these nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. During the years it has gained gradual currency and countries that thought that this did not belong to the disarmament problem, that it does not affect humanity very much-and indeed at one time it was argued that it was in their interests that there should be explosions of this kind in the worldand we are at last moving to a situation when at Geneva, largely by the process of direct negotiation, the main Powers concerned, popularly called the nuclear Powers of the members of the "Nuclear Club", have made some progress towards agreement. While this Committee has

no cognizance of the advance reached by any communication to it, so much is published and is not contradicted that we find in magazines relating to this matter that seventeen points of agreement have been reached. While at first one thought that these were insignificant ones, looking through the contents of them they do represent substantial advance, and what remains is with regard to the staffing on the control posts, on site inspection and the veto. While these are formidable subjects, the very fact that agreements have been reached on other matters gives one the hope that progress is being made. This is a very relevant consideration.

The application of France to join the "Nuclear Club" comes at a time when we hope the club will be wound up. Therefore, the idea of giving oxygen to this particular animal is not so welcome to everybody concerned. The delegation of India at a later stage introduced in this Committee a resolution which it thought would assist the advance of this project of the cessation of nuclear tests by suggesting that there should be talks on a technical basis because the United Kingdom delegation at that time, with the knowledge it had at its disposal, advised the Committee that while it had a great deal of sympathy with this idea, with the hope of suspending nuclear tests, the question of detectability was difficult and therefore the suspension must wait or could not be carried out, apart from other objections.

It was at that time in 1957 we proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.176/Rev.4, Annex I, that a scientific committee should be established, and requested the States concerned. In view of the doubts expressed about the detectability of explosions and the need to dispel those doubts and also to provide against possible evasions, to agree forthwith to the nomination of a scientific-technical commission consisting of scientific-technical experts representing the differing views together with other eminent scientific-technical participation to be agreed upon by the aforementioned representatives.

The Assembly in its wisdom did not find it possible to carry this draft resolution, but its fate was 38 against, 22 for, and 20 abstentions. But the ideas were incorporated, as usual, in a little more anaemic resolution which was adopted-we voted for it-by 79 to 2, on the general principle of getting the best we could in the hope that it would be improved, and that is resolution 1148 (XII).

So, various aspects of progress have taken place, and it is at this time that the question of the explosion in the Sahara arises. Now, I think the simplest and the briefest way of dealing with it would be to look at the presentation of this subject by its sponsors on the one hand, and the reply given by the representative of France.

We have, for the purpose of brevity again, tried to summarize Mr. Jules Moch's answers to them. He says, first of all, "the matter is exaggerated." Now, here we want to place this, so far as we can, in its proper context. The issue here is not the exploding of one bombwhether if be a baby bomb or other bomb-because in the context of the Hiroshima bomb, the present bombs are giants-and that was a small one. But it was a small bomb that released all this trouble, that created the whole chain of development in this direction. So, when the representative of France says "the matter is exaggerated" we are going to take the following things into account.

First of all it has to be taken from the point of view of those who are against the explosions on general grounds, and as a danger to the world. It has also to be taken from the point of view of the people who live nearby. Indeed the Indonesian Government at one time made serious protests with regard to the explosions in Christmas Island, in which they were more concerned than the explosions in Siberia. Therefore, we cannot agree with the fact that "the matter is exaggerated" because any more development at all in this field is something that must be regarded as deplorable. But over and above that, is it suggested that the Government of France is going to explode just this one hundred thousand ton bomb, and no more ? If that is so, then this problem assumes an aspect which is even more deplorable because the experimentation is merely for the purpose of letting off one firecracker as a demonstration. Then, all that it does is to excerbate feelings in the African continent, and the worst part of it, to reverse the process which this Assembly has at last set in motion and accepted by the Powers concerned, and the process which has made some progress in Geneva. Therefore, small as the bomb

may be, limited to one as it may be-it has not been so stated-and with all the precautions the French Government proposes to take-the very idea of taking precautions implies that there are dangers-and therefore, however small it is, it is a move in the reverse direction. And this argument that the French test would be negligible in quantity of fission energy is therefore one we cannot accept.

We also have the repetition of the usual arguments, already introduced by the then representative of the United Kingdom at that time that there is plenty of natural radiation, and therefore a little more does not matter. My delegation has always answered it by a parallel. We merely pointed out that normally the human body carries on it, for every square inch, about 300 pounds of weight. For that reason, would any one of us agree to carry another square inch? That would be a burden. Therefore, it is not correct to argue that there is plenty of natural radiation, and that proportionally to that radiation a little more does not matter. Nature makes allowances for that; we have grown accustomed to that ; our genetic conditions and processes are all adapted to that. So this argument which has been put forward over and over again by the United Kingdom in the past, before they became active participants in the processes of disengagement in this matter, is now adopted by France.

But, as against that, since it has come from such a distinguished source, it is necessary for the Assembly to repeat that we cannot agree to the minimization, the presentation of these facts as though it does not matter. Any explosion of this kind, anything that leads to more ionizing radiation, is harmful to the people around, to those who are handling it, and to the world as a whole.

I make no apologies for again quoting documents which have been published and which have been released since our last meeting. The first of these is from the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States:

"It was generally agreed that in considering acceptable exposure limits in the context of worldwide environmental contamination from fallout, the best assumption that can be made at present concerning the relationship of biological effect to radiation does is to assume that any dose, however small, produces some biological effect and that this effect is harmful."

Nothing could be more categorical than that :

"The testimony made it clear that much difficulty now exists in evaluating the hazards of environmental contamination from

363

fallout. This is because of the difficulty in attempting to apply to whole populations exposed to fallout the concepts behind 'maximum permissible dose' and `maximum permissible concentration,' which were developed for occupational exposures to individuals under controlled conditions." (Fallout from Nuclear Weapons Tests-Summary Analysis of Hearings, May 5-8, 1959, page 7-Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.)

We get the same things from various other people. The National Planning Association of the United States refers to this and says:

"In problems of world-wide contamination, strontium-90 and cesium-137 are particularly important. Their half-lives are twenty-eight and thirty-eight years respectively, and so they do not die out in the long time required for distribution via the stratosphere. Strontium is similar to calcium and is therefore concentrated in the bones, where it can produce tumors." (A Special Committee Report, May 1958, page 13)

Another American authority on this states that if a thermonuclear blast such as the one on Bikini in March 1954 had exploded during the Crusades between 1080 A.D., and 1299 A.D. it would have taken until the present century for the genetic damage to be erased out of the human population.

Another source, dated 8 May 1959, published

in the Washington Post and Times Herald stated:

"A new danger from past atomic weapons tests was described at a Congressional hearing yesterday.

"It is radioactive-iodine which concentrates in the thyroid. It is an atomic fission product which loses fifty per cent of its radioactivity every eight days.

"Because iodine-131 concentrates in the thyroid, which is a relatively small gland, extremely small amounts can result in relatively highdoses..."

Then we also have one of these statements coming from Oak Ridge in Tennessee :

"Female fertility has been found far more vulnerable to radiations than has long been believed, it was reported here today.

"The tests with compartively low exposures to radiation sources, were done on mice. But there is no reason to believe the same sterilizing effects would not occur in humans, said biologist Liane Russell of Oak Ridge, Tenn."

Then we have the Russians, who take second place in test explosions.

"Professor Lebedinsky of the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences said human subjects who had received relatively small doses of gamma radiation from 'hot' cobalt for unspecified therapeutic purposes suffered observable depressions in their brain rhythms thirty seconds after the experiments began."

We come now to that source from which no exaggeration will come, that is, the British :

"It should however be evident," says Mr. Orbuck in Nature, "that in a matter like this-a matter of life and death for hundreds of thousands-one should act on the basis of the more pessimistic view until convincing evidence for the more optimistic one has been furnished. This seems also the opinion of the Medical Research Council ... In our view," said the Medical Council "it is not possible at this time to decide whether there is or is not a threshold dose concerned in the induction of leukemia and cancer, and the only scientific attitude to the problem at present is one of suspended judgment. Nevertheless, the significance of the alternative points of view in determining the ultimate assessing of risk should be clearly understood so that those who have the responsibility of acting on such assessments should be fully aware of the alternative possibilities that need to be taken into account."

I would like to say here that this is the most conservative British statement one can find. The bulk of British scientific opinion is far stronger than this. There are so many quotations that I do not want to read out at the present moment which refer to the harmful results that have already occurred and to the fact that these results are inevitable.

"The Inernational Commission on

364

Radiological Protection has issued figures -about to be made public-which indicate that the 'permissible' limit of strontium-90 in milk and food should be lowered about 60 per cent.

"The National Committee on Radiation Protection, which sets limits for the United States, issued figures last Thursday which when applied to milk and food, raises the strontium-90 limit 25 per cent."

I will not tax the Committee with further extracts from my outside sources, but I will go on to United Nations sources.

The Secretary-General is responsible for this although he himself has not written these reports. Mr. Jules Moch relies on the United Nations Scientific Committee. India is a member of this Committee. This is what Mr. Moch said:

"All the figures that I have given have

been taken either from the report of our Scientific Committee-which my colleagues will easily be able to locate..." (A/C.1/PV. 1043, page 26)

Then a part of this Scientific Committee's report is quoted, which incidentally, may I say, is already a year old. The Indian representative on this Committee made the following proposal, which is relevant:

"The exposure of mankind to ionizing radiation. at present arises mainly from natural sources, from medical and industrial procedures, and from environmental contamination due to nuclear explosions. The industrial research and medical applications expose only part of the population, while natural sources and environmental sources, expose the whole population. The artificial sources to which man is exposed during his work in industry, and in scientific research are, of value in science and technology. Their use is controllable, and exposures can be reduced by perfecting protection and safety techniques." (A/3848,page 41, footnote to para 54)

Now, if I may interpose here, Mr. Moch's argument is that protection can be introduced in other cases. But here the scientific people say that their use for research purposes is controllable.

"Radioactive contamination of the environment resulting from explosions of nuclear weapons constitutes a growing increment to world-wide radiation levels." (Ibid.)

This concludes

"...these hazards, by their very nature, are beyond the control of the exposed persons. The physical and biological data contained in the report lead to the conclusion that it is undesirable to allow any general rise in world-wide contamination because of its harmful effects and that any activity which produces such rise should be avoided. Nuclear tests are the main source at present which

produce such a rise." (Ibid.)

This was moved by the Indian delegation as an amendment to the resolution that was finally passed. The significance of it is that in favour of the amendment were Brazil, France, India, Japan and the United States of America. So the representative of France, in putting forward this view, is speaking against scientific opinion on behalf of his country submitted in the Scientific Committee by Professor Jammet, who was the Chief of the Isotopes Service of the Civic Hospital. He serves as an atomic, hydrogen and radio pathologist.

From France has come the greatest contributions in this field from the time the Curies first discovered radium up to the present time. We would not join issue with the representative of France about the scientific calibre or the place because he has said that he has consulted scientists and so on. My delegation still takes the view that in no circumstances can it be argued that the fall-out from the tests that have taken place, which now continues and will continue for many, many years, has not had just technical results but results in bulk on the populations and the generations to be born.

As against this report quoted, may we read another part of the Scientific Committee's report, which is in document A/3838 and is deted June, 1958, one year old :

"Many may prove to be unusually vulnerable to ionizing radiations (A/3838, page 39, paragraph 37)

"....the opinion seems justified that even a very small dose to the human foetus may involve some risk of injurious effects if received during a critical period of preg-

365

nancy." (Ibid., page 40, paragraph 38).

"Exposure of gonads to even the smallest doses of ionizing radiations can give rise to mutant genes which accumulate, are transmissible to the progeny and are considered to be, in general, harmful to the human race. As the persons who will be affected will belong to. future generations, it is important to minimize undue exposures of populations to such radiation and so to safeguard the well-being of those who are still unborn." (Ibid., paragraph 49).

"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. The committee concludes that all steps designed to minimize irradiation of human populations will act to the benefit of human health. Such steps include the avoidance of unnecessary exposure resulting from medical, industrial and other procedures for peaceful uses on the one hand and the cessation of contamination of the environment by explosions of nuclear weapons on the other. The Committee is aware that considerations involving effective control of all these sources of radiation"-including the cessation of the contamination of the environment by explosions of nuclear weapons-"involve national and international decisions which lie outside the scope of its work. (Ibid., page 41, paragraph 54).

In paragraph 55, the Committee definitely says:

"Even the smallest amounts of radiation are liable to cause deleterious genetic, and perhaps also somatic effects.

"It is clear that medical and occupational exposure, and the testing of nuclear weapons, can be influenced by human action, and that natural radiation and the fall-out of radioactive material already injected into the stratosphere, cannot." (Ibid., pages 41 and 42, paragraph 55).

This last paragraph that I quoted is important because Mr. Jules Moch refers to natural radiation. We cannot control that but we can control this one.

"Even a slow rise in the environmental radioactivity in the world, whether from weapon tests or any other sources, might eventually cause appreciably damage to large populations before it could be definitely identified..." (Ibid., page 42, paragraph 56).

Then this report gives a table, Table II, which says that an estimated total of 25,000 to 150,000 cases of leukemia will ultimately occur if tests are stopped in 1958 from tests already held and that an estimated total of 2,500 to 100,000 genetic effects will occur in subsequent years from tests already held. That is to say, the explosions that have already taken place have a progressively deleterious effect upon humanity.

From his own countrymen comes an appeal in regard to this matter.

On 30 July 1959, twenty-seven French scientists appealed to the French Government or made their views known in regard to the French bomb. This is what they said:

"Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the danger of nuclear war has been a source of constant concern to mankind. In France and throughout the world a very broad movement of opinion has developed to eliminate this danger. Hundreds of millions of signatures were collected to the Stockholm Appeal, launched by the World Peace Movement. Other groupings took action along similar lines and more and more scientists are speaking out."

This is part of the appeal made by these people that I am going to read. out. I cannot read out the whole of it because it would take too long. But these are the relevant parts of what was said by the French scientists :

"Continued nuclear weapon testing is doubly dangerous in that it is an important factor in the arms race and involves grave biological dangers. There are perhaps differences of appreciation on the importance of the biological hazards, but no expert disputes that they exist, and it may be said that every nuclear weapon test damages the health and life of a great number of people.

366

As new results are made known, it is becoming clear that the fixation of radioactive elements, particularly strontium 90 in the human body, takes place much more rapidly and in greater quantities than indicated by the initial calculations."

Another part of the statement of the French scientists says the following :

"Any act that tends to oppose the conclusion of an agreement on stopping nuclear weapons tests is a dangerous act. This would be true of the announced explosion of the French atomic bomb. It should, first of all, be pointed out that this would necessarily open the door to other tests, whereas one of the vital problems facing mankind is the stopping of these test explosions."

There we have scientific evidence from all the continents and all the countries concerned in this matter. I read out the French opinion not to pose one French opinion against another, but in order that we may not nurse in our minds a feeling against any particular people or any nation. There is far more opposition probably in France to this business than anywhere else in the world, because the sense of guilt might be greater.

As regards precautions taken about wind and weather, as I said, precautions always imply that there are dangers, and although science has advanced a great deal-it can burst clouds and make rain; it can split atoms and what not-we have as yet found no method of controlling the isotherms and isobars in the world which produce the movements of wind. When Mr. Jules Moch says something about the wind and that it will not move in that direction, it becomes extremely difficult to accept that position.

The uncertainty of the wind has been spoken of by American sources. On 28 January 1959-

and I am confinding myself, as far as possible, to the expressions of opinion since we last met-The New York Times contained the following statement :

"Several specialists in the study of atomic bomb fall-out agreed yesterday that it was impossible at present to predict the drift of fall-out clouds more than a few hours in advance ... R. Robert Rapp of the Rand Corporation, in Santa Monica, California, said that fairly reliable predictions could be made for only eight hours in advance. The uncertainty, beyond that point, is not merely owing to the whims of wind change, but it is also the lack of knowledge on diffusion of particles."

When we consider that it is not a question of eight hours or eight days or eight months, but perhaps eight or eighty years during which the results can take place, and the winds may change with regard to the particles that hang around in any part of the atmosphere, any suggestion that the winds will be in favour of the exploders, or, rather, not so much against them, would not be correct.

Then the next point raised is the question of the site in the Sahara. Here I want to say, first of all, that it is not the intention of my delegation to go into any political question. We have no desire to refer to the question of sovereignty, whether the Sahara is res nulles or French territory ; or even if it is French territory ; whether the sovereign Power has control over undefined miles of atmosphere, stratosphere, and the sphere beyond. That is a question which future international lawyers and international agreements must settle.

But the suggestion was that the site was one which was not likely to create much of the consequences that was feared by the African populations around there. The answer to this was given by the Moroccan delegation itself. But since they are the movers of the draft resolution, I think it would be safer for us to go to some French source. In the Observer of London of 2 August, a report was carried by a Paris correspondent Mr. William Millinship. This is what he says : "The 'atom city' built at El Hammoudia, south of Reggane, is not in the centre of a bleak desert".

Because the popular conception of the Sahara is that it is no man's land and that there is nobody there.

"The population of the Saoura Department, which includes Reggane, is close on 200,000.

"A French archaeologist, a specialist in Saharan research, informs me that the Touat and Tidikelt Valleys which converge on El Hammoudia from the north and east are among the most fertile regions of the Sahara. From Reggane

367

to Colomb Bechar in the north an almost unbroken avenue of palm trees lines what is known as the date-highway'. The string of oases has been irrigated for centuries by a complex system of underground channels known as 'foggaras'. The French have sunk wells to supplement the water supplies.

"The archaeologist feels that the oases may be contaminated by fall-out from the bomb, and that radioactive substances may be carried from well to well along the subterranean waterways."

I am not suggesting that an archaeologist is an authority on radioactivity, but he certainly knows about these other matters. Mr. Jules Moch said in this matter that, not contrary to the short geography read out earlier, the sector within this range is totally uninhabited. Either the representative has been misinformed, which cannot be the case, or there is this element. We should like some clarification. Both the Moroccan delegation and all the other independent sources speak of this area as being inhabited, and, if I may say so, as in the case, of the Marshall Islands, it is not necessary for the particular spot of the explosion, the particular platform of the explosion, to be inhabited. If it is inhabited within several hundred miles or thousand miles, still, it

would be inhabited. But our evidence is that it is one of the richer areas of the oasis in the Sahara.

The Times of London, on 17 July 1959 wrote an article about the Sahara bomb. The British are the allies of the French. The French are seeking admission into the nuclear club, of which Britain is a recent entrant. But this is what The Times says :

"Both the Ghanaian and Liberian Governments have protested to France, and Nigeria has requested the British Government to convey its apprehensions. These protests are undoubtedly genuine. And indeed these West African States have logical cause to protest ... the West African Governments are protesting against the setting off by a foreign Power of a bomb on their borders which to their mind, apart from any harm that may be caused by radiation or fall-out, is as likely to be used against them as for their protection. Throughout Asia and Africa the bomb is a white man's weapon, used, on the only occasion when it was used, by white men against Asians."

I did not say this, The Times said it. It goes on :

"...The Sahara is large, but it is surrounded today by States which are neither part of France, nor even part of the community. What are the effects of the bomb likely to be on France's neighbours ?"

Again, this last extract does not come from an Arab paper or from an Asian paper; it comes from The Times of London, with its aura of respectability.

The representative of the United Kingdom, Mr.Ormsby-Gore, speaking of this Committee, said the following :

"The United Kingdom has a very special interest in ensuring that no action which is contemplated could do harm to those peoples living in Africa who have not yet attained independence and for whose welfare my Government has a special responsibility. We have taken every step on their account as well as that of other nations to satisfy ourselves that the measures to be taken by France will ensure the safety of all concerned." (A/C.1/PV.1044, page 13).

Now what interests us is the first part, that is, that they have responsibility in regard to those populations that precautions have become necessary because there is danger. Nobody takes precautions unless there is anticipation of danger.

But the reaction of the Nigerian State and the African States not necessarily represented here are even more important. It has been stated that :

"The following views were expressed in the Nigerian Federal House of Representatives in Lagos on 14 July 1959 by the Federal Prime Minister of Nigeria : 'That the people of Nigeria had the right to protest against the explosion of an atom bomb in the Sahara by the French Governments'. The Prime Minister recollected that the House of Representatives on 24 February 1959 had clearly expressed the general feeling in Nigeria towards such a test. The text of the resolution then debated was subsequently sent to the Secretary of State by the Governor General with the

368

request that the apprehension felt in Nigeria should be brought to the notice of the French Government."

The document goes on to state

"The Prime Minister is most unhappy to learn from Press reports and from news bulletins that the French community at their meeting in Madagascar have proposed that the tests should be proceeded with regardless of the Nigerian protest and he hopes that the United Kingdom Government will renew their representation on the subject."

In the same assembly another Minister of

the Nigerian Federal Government said :

"It appears that efforts made by the Ghana Government to stop these tests have failed, and the appeals, genuine as they were, had fallen on deaf cars. And so it becomes necessary for all other West African countries to make their feelings known in no uncertain terms and protest most strongly against these atomic tests."

The Acting Prime Minister of Nigeria, who spoke at a later date, said :

"The Northern Government is strongly opposed to the proposed atomic tests in the Sahara. We urge the French Government to use its influence and see that this dreadful proposal is not carried out."

There are many other Nigerian protests and protests from Ghana that have gone to the French Government. A group of scientists of the Nigerian University warned that in a country like Nigeria

..."where much of the population live directly on cereals and vegetables, the intake of radioactive material may be higher than in countries where meat and dairy produce form the staple diet."

The Trade Union Congress of Nigeria stated :

"In the name of the working classes and on the mandate of organized labour in Nigeria, the undersigned hereby register strongest protest against France's determination to use the Sahara or any part of the African continent for the purpose or conducting her atomic tests.

"In the name of Nigerian workers and in the interest of future Franco-Nigerian relations, the workers of this country call through you, on General de Gaulle, as President of the French Republic and head of the Franco-African community, to use his authority to withdraw France's decision to use the Sahara for her proposed atom tests." I hope that organized labour in the world Will take notice of this strong expression of opinion from the African workers.

From religious sources comes the following. The Christian Council of Nigeria stated :

"Although the short-term effect on the inhabitants of Nigeria seems likely to be negligible, the Council feels concerned for those who live nearer wherever the venue of the test may be, and also for the long-term effects of radioactive fallout, particularly in countries whose main foods are cereals and root crops."

The Roman Catholic Church of Nigeria through its Archbishop, also spoke about the proposed test. He expressed the hope that it would be "as far removed from human life as the American test in the Pacific and perhaps farther than the Russian test in Siberia." But he says that does not matter.

I will conclude this set of quotations with another one from a French source, because my delegation is most anxious that this issue should not become a matter of political controversy and lead to a deterioration of relations in the African continent. With the problems in relation to Algeria and the difficulties in the transition of Trust Territories to independence, and with the continuance of colonialism. mainly by Portugal. on the African continent and the remains of the British and French empires which are progressing towards independence, it is our very fervent desire that, regrettable as this is and with the hopes that it will be abandoned, especially in view of the circumstances I shall later mention, this will not become an issue between white and nonwhite, between Africa and France, or introduce questions of a different character. Le Monde stated :

"In some months perhaps, one bomb will be exploded in French silence. It depends upon us"-that is, Frenchmen-

369

"to stop it. Because one has chosen an African desert for this explosion, shall we be slow ? Shall we leave only the unquiet voice of Africa to raise a protest In the middle of the suspicious silence of the big atomic proprietors ? Explosion without danger of contamination..... precautions taken....negligible risks..... We are being reassured. That which reassures us above all is that these atomic tests are to take place near Tamanrasset rather than near Dunkirk. The great France a little polluted towards its south, Europe a little dirtied from the direction of Africa, who should be disquieted by this ?

"Fourteen years ago, the bomb which we manufacture today for the prestige and the defence of the community' (speech of General de Gaulle) hit Hiroshima and then Nagasaki. In some seconds 300,000 died, men, women and children. They were yellow in colour it is true. We should thank Japan."

Those are not our statements. The article ends :

"If France carries out the tests that have been announced, she will only be speaking for herself, a mediocre atomic Power of the fourth order, detested by Africa, and responsible exactly with the same rights as the three others, for the poison. ing of the skies, the earth, the sands and the seas. France will be no more nor less than the victim of an improbable atomic conflict where there will be none other than victims, and France will simply be a non-innocent victim.

"The day when the blinding flash of Hiroshima exploded over Japanese soil. let us remember our horror, our anguish and later, when we understood it, our shame. The day France becomes, by her first explosion, an atomic Power, we will become at that instant, if we do not agitate now, the accomplices of Hiroshima."

These comments with regard to Hiroshima and France are not ours.

There are two other aspects in the argument

put forward by the representative of France to which my delegation wants to apply its mind. First of all, why does France want this test ? The main argument, put forward by. the President of the French Republic, is that of non-discrimination in terms of prestige, and this perhaps has been overstated by the Moroccan delegation. What did Mr. Moch say ? Mr. Moch is respected in this Assembly and would not be expected to give any support to the idea that arguments of this character should be enlisted in support of the promotion of weapon of mass destruction. Mr. Moch stated:

"We do not accept any indirect discrimination. We do not accept any tacit monopoly. Our precise, permanent and fundamental objective is nuclear disarmament for all, for that alone will bring about the full equality of peoples. If the fact that France is the fourth State to liberate the explosive energy of the nucleus of the atom-if this fact should cause the other three Powers to turn towards the necessary and urgent elimination of nuclear weapons, then the present efforts of France and the research of its scientists would, without fear of the verdict of history, have served the cause of peace." (A/C. 1/PV. 1043, page 51)

That is one approach to it; the other approach of Mr. Moch is as follows :

"So long as there remains the agonizing insecurity of a world dedicated, as it is, and despite ourselves, to the arms race, each State has the right-and each Government the duty to ensure the protection of its country, France as well as all others." (Ibid, page 46)

He went on :

"During nearly ten years we have been faithful to that declaration, hoping thus to set an example which, alas! has not been followed. Ought we, in the insecure world of today, to remain without modern weapons ?" (Ibid)

Without any disrespect, I should like to

apply myself to that paragraph. I am sure that Mr. Moch did not mean what is implied by his statement. The first part of it is an appeal and a sanction to all the Powers of the world to become nuclear and thermonuclear Powers, because he states that each Government has the duty to ensure the protection of its country by this weapon; it was said in that context. It is said that for ten years France has desisted. That is quite true;

370

France, with its great scientific abilities and resources has not produced the atomic bomb. That is all to their credit, but it cannot be said that in ten years the contribution made by France in the Disarmament Commission, despite Mr. Moch's great dedication, has been of a character which has not been the same as the other Western or Eastern Powers, that is to say, it has not contributed to progress until the meetings in Geneva began.

I now come to the argument that France must proclaim its determination to have no discrimination ; the law must be the same for all ; it must be the same for the Africans as well. If everyone is to conform to it, since France is not creating any risks for the rest of the world, nor is France creating a risk for Africa, is France, from the point of view of its own interests, right or wrong. in equipping itself with nuclear weapons ? This I believe, is a matter which concerns only the French, which Frenchmen discuss among themselves, on which they alone have a right to hold different opinions-but which is a matter that has no place in a debate of this nature.

What I am going to try to do is to restore to its true perspective a matter emotionally exaggerated by the propaganda of people making capital out of the nervous state of public opinion. I shall be as restrained as possible in my comments on this matter.

First of all, it is raised for the first time; in the history of the General Assembly a delegation has raised Article 2 (7), by implication, in regard to nuclear tests. Never has anybody contended that the United Nations is intervening in this matter just because tests were taking place in Siberia on Russian territory, or in the Pacific, which the United States has claimed is under its administration by the Trusteeship system, or in Australia, which is British territory-none of them has argued on the . basis of Article 2 (7), partly because, I suppose, of general world opinion and the recognition that the effects were not confined to the populations among whom the explosions were taking place. But, in all humility, I should like to address this set of arguments to the representative of France.

How can this question be posed on the basis of discrimination ? Does France desire to be equal to all other people in all matters? Does France, with its great level of culture, with the contribution which it has made to the volume of liberty in the world, want to be equated down to the others who have not risen to that level?

Secondly, is the restriction that the General Assembly likes to see enforced in regard to what is necessary evil a discrimination ? Does liberty lie in the capacity to inflict harm equally ? That is the issue.

Discrimination cannot apply to these matters. It can apply to the advantages that accrue if it proceeds from racial or other circumstances. To argue on the appeal to the Assembly, on the one hand, and the protests of the African people or others-and my delegation denies that this is particularly African business ; it is everybody's business-is not acceptable on the ground of discrimination. It is not only misplaced, it is entirely misconceived and I hope that we may pay no attention to it. There can be no question of discrimination.

That takes us to the other point : what is the purpose of this ? Mr. Moch has been good enough to show the Assembly that just one little bomb is involved-by implication, there will be no more of it. If that is so, it would not add to the atomic prowess of France from the point of view of equipment. In the power alignment of the world at present France is aligned with the United Kingdom and the United States, both of which are in possession of plentiful stocks of atomic weapons. For the defence of the frontiers of France, or even for waging colonial war in Africa, it is most unlikely that the atomic bomb would be used. Therefore, the possession of this bomb really is merely a way of finding a place in the atomic club. That is all therein to it. And if the representative of

France is going to tell us that because France projects the explosion of the bomb, thereby, it may have an influence on the three other atomic Powers to come to some agreement, that is a very specious argument.

Are we to suppose that France has no influence other than this on its two close allies, the United Kingdom and the United States, and, by the power which those two hold, could not exert the same pressure on the Soviet Union ? Therefore, the argument put to the Assembly that it is a blessing in disguise, that if the French explode the bomb it will speed up the talks in Geneva, and that is the argument that is put forward somewhere, that if it is exploded it will be a good thing -if we start exploding these bombs there is always a hullabaloo going on here and, therefore, the talks in Geneva will be speeded up-that is a very specious argument to put forward : that France would have to use that kind of pressure factor as against the United States and the United Kingdom to achieve the intimate and close alliance. And what is more, in the whole disarmament dis-

371

cussions, not only has France participated, equally but France-and Mr. Moch especially-has been the spokesman of the West.

If the argument applies to the Soviet Union, then, of course, it should be considered whether the combined capacities of the United States, on the one hand, and the United Kingdom, on the other, of the explosions which have taken placein the proportion, I believe, of 130 for the United States, 55 for the Soviet Union and about 23 for the United Kingdom-should be of far more pressure than this baby bomb that is to be exploded in the Sahara.

Therefore, as far as we can, we have tried to apply to the various justifications produced by the representative of France, largely out or our respect for him and his desire to assure us that there is no ill-will, no last words in the matter.

We are told that France will give up tests if all the other Powers agree to give up tests. How can it be that when the General Assembly, France itself, the world as a whole, want three Powers to give up tests, that a fourth Power should emerge ? That is not a step in the direction of stopping tests.

I quote the following paragraph from Mr. Moch's statement of 4 November:

"I come finally to my conclusion. It is a repetition of my statements made in 1957 and 1958. France unanimously wishes for peace with disarmament. With enthusiasm, on the day that the first three atomic Powers renounce their nuclear armament, France will forego all military tests. Let these three Powers agree to halt, under international control, the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, to begin the reconversion of their stockpiles, to eliminate the vehicles for these explosives-in short, to renounce a monopoly in fact-and that very hour France will adopt the same measures. Seriously and solemnly I reaffirm this stand." (A/C.1/PV.1043, page 48-50)

We are grateful to the French representative for at least implying that if there was an agreement on suspension of nuclear tests, there would be no difficulty in France in acceding to it. But when we read the latter part of this paragraph it is not so clear because what is said is, we will stop these tests when production of fissional materials will be halted, stockpiles reconverted, and the vehicles for these explosives elimanated-that is to say when war is outlawed. It will be difficult for any country, in those circumstances, to be the lawbreaker. Thus, on the one hand, one welcomes the first part and, on the other hand, the second part is a little bit of a double-edged weapon.

My delegation would not like, even by implication, to express disagreement with those who have spoken in opposition to this, but we should like to disassociate ourselves from any statement which says : if you want to explode it, why do you not explode it in France ? That may be rhetoric. In so far as it is rhetoric, one does not object to it, but we stand quite clear on this matter. Whether these bombs are exploded in Siberia or in the Pacific or in Australia or in the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, or in these buildings of the United Nations, the issue is the same. The explosion anywhere is an explosion against humanity, against humanity present and of generations to come. Therefore, if, apart from the rhetorical side of it, if there is implication in this that the objection is because of the fact that it is in the Sahara, the urgency is there, but we should not like to say that if it is exploded somewhere else we do not mind. I am, however, instructed by my Government to disassociate ourselves from any idea that this particular menacing evil, this diabolical weapon, is more acceptable in one part of the world than another. In fact, perhaps to a certain extent we would have reason to be more sad if it were to be exploded, as suggested by a French newspaper, in France itself, because, apart from committing mass murder on a large scale, France would also be guilty of suicide.

Another suggestion that is made is that, instead of exploding the bomb, France could be consoled by the allies sharing their atomic secrets with France. That is a matter between them. We do not know what they share-we know that they share a great deal, but that is a matter between those allied powers-but certainly it would not be a step in the right direction because what the Assembly seeks to do, what world opinion seeks to do, is to restrict and to end for good and all the menacing qualities of this weapon itself and, therefore, any idea that it may be done somewhere else or that, instead of having one yourself, you may borrow someone else's-that is no answer to this problem.

In the short time that is left I should like to say a word about this draft resolution. We have co-sponsored this draft resolution; we make no apologies in regard to this. In fact, considering the enormous amount of feeling and

372

emotion to which Mr. Moch has rightly drawn attention, it is composed in the most restrained terms.

It is an appeal to the French Government, even at this late hour, to abandon this experiment, if it is an experiment. It is, not going, in our opinion, in any way to contribute to progress of the discussions at Geneva. It is a proclamation, in terms, by a great Power, that the current may be the other way. It comes too late to be more effective than at present in the negotiations themselves. As one of the great Powers concerned with disarmament, they have all the influence they can have in the Geneva discussions.

If it is suggested that these discussions are closely, confined to the three atomic Powers, then I believe the Sahara explosion, which will not take place tomorrow--or at all, if France willed itwill not have any great bearing, because it is our hope that these discussions at Geneva, which according to published information have already reached the stage of agreement on seventeen articles, will conclude with complete agreement. The three subjects which remain are important from the point of view of the general approach which is being made by the so-called two sides in this disarmament discussion ; but one expresses the hope that progress will be made towards agreement, or even if there is no agreement, that is neither the United States nor the Soviet Union and I am guite sure in my own mind the United Kingdom-will embark on any tests while these negotiations are going on.

I would like to call attention to the statement I believe of 29 October or so, from the Russian Prime Minister to this effect:

"The Soviet Union said tonight (August 28) that it would not conduct any nuclear weapons tests as long as the Western Powers did not resume theirs." The New York Times, 29 August 1959.

Britain announced on 27 August that its ban on tests would go on as long as talks among the three nuclear Powers on a general suspension of tests showed some prospect of success. The United States announced on 26 August, before the General Assembly commenced this session and before the two statements I have just mentioned, that the United States would not carry out new tests of nuclear weapons for the rest of this year. The statement goes on :

"The President has directed that the unilateral suspension of nuclear weapons testing by the United States currently in effect be extended throughout the calendar year. This decision was taken in the light of the agreed six-week recess announced today by the negotiating parties at the Geneva Conference on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. ... The United States wishes to allow a reasonable period of time for the negotiations to proceed"....".

But yesterday, the President of the United States further stated that it will not be the first to restart nuclear weapons tests. So that the process if I may say so-not with an attitude of "We told you so"-which led to the suspension of tests, namely unilateral, voluntary action, and which when it was submitted to the Assembly was not acceptable-it was treated with a certain amount of ridicule-is to continue.

We also have the correspondence that has gone on between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union in order to find interim ways of agreement in regard to the discontinuance of suspension. We all know that there are arguments going on with regard to underground tests, overground tests, and so on, but all of these circumstances point to some progress being made in this matter, and one prefers to be optimistic about this. It is all the more reason, therefore, this statement coming from such a source, almost a pacifist source, being the doven of disarmament in this Assembly and spokesman for the Western Powers, himself having suffered bereavement, as he tells us, in the wars, and having, what is more, the capacity today to call upon the nuclear Powers of our allies, it is all the more reason why, if the world embarked on this suicidal project, we cannot understand it.

My delegation refuses to believe that a country with a background of the French Republic, with its great humane traditions, would simply embark on a project of this character inimical to world peace, against the trend of world opinion and against the trend of progress being made in this matter, merely for the purpose of establishing prestige. There is no more prestige today in being in the atomic club than, I suppose, owning slaves in the twentieth century. That might have been the case two centuries ago. Therefore, no question of prestige arises. Our respect for France and her traditions, as well as for certain tendencies which we hope will come to fruition in Africa-we dare not say any more-will not be diminished. In fact, the prestige of France, certainly on the Continent of Africa, certainly in Japan

373

certainly in my own country, and in great parts of Europe which I have said nothing about, such as the Mediterranean-European countries closely related to France, would be affected by this explosion. There are large numbers of countries of one nationality or another on the Mediterranean borders who cannot but be affected by the results of this explosion, which is the explosion of a bomb, incidentally, five times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. Therefore, when we talk about baby bombs, let us not forget that; this bomb which is to be exploded is about five times the Hiroshima bomb.

Finally, my Government and my delegation would like us all to be aware of the fact that one of the greatest misleading arguments is about the minimal danger, as is the argument about "clean" bombs and humane killing. These arguments are far more ominous and difficult to meet than straightforward opposition. In any event, nobody wants to be killed humanely. It reminds me of a cartoon I saw once saying, "I want to cut your honourable throat". So just because the throat is called honourable, it is still cut. We therefore appeal to the French Government-we cannot appeal to the Government, but we express our hope-that the volume of opinion which will be expressed in the world is such that if they listened and responded to it, it would not be interpreted in any quarter-I am sure Mr. Moch wants no assurance of this-as yielding to pressure of any kind. It would be regarded as a very noble gesture, the response of a country of the traditions and responsibilities of the French Republic; and particularly in view, as I have said, of the attitude in regard to certain African problems which we hope will go in a particular direction, it would not be interpreted in any way as an attitude of submission, of yielding to pressure. It would be regarded as an attitude of recognition of the feelings of people in the world. What is more, in reply to Mr. Moch's argument that their attitude would perhaps speed the progress of discussion in Geneva, the fact that it is announced that the project has been abandoned would make that speeding even more speedy than otherwise.

For all these reasons, my delegation supports this resolution, not merely just to put it to the vote and gain a large number of votes. I have not the least doubt that the resolution will go through. But that is not enough, because this Assembly, with all its votes, cannot stop this explosion. The vote we require is the vote of France, and if France would vote for this resolution, then we can all afford to abstain.

INDIA USA FRANCE MOROCCO SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN INDONESIA MALDIVES RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM BRAZIL SWEDEN LATVIA MARSHALL ISLANDS GHANA LIBERIA NIGER NIGERIA MADAGASCAR OMAN ALGERIA PORTUGAL AUSTRALIA PERU

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Economic and Financial Committee.

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following Statement in the Economic and Financial Committee of the United Nations on November 6, 1959:

Mr. Chairman, I intervene in this debate with a great deal of timidity for many reasons. First of all, this is the first time I am addressing the Second Committee and though every delegate from many countries speaks for his Government, but more than that, you are a committee of experts dealing with problems with which you are thoroughly familiar, but with which I have only the acquaintance arising from a sense of purpose and of general approaches. Apart from all that there are some procedural difficulties. The observations which my delegation wishes to submit, probably go slightly beyond procedural limits to the item which you are discussing. On the Agenda is stated "The Development of Under-developed Countries." I am here, as far as I can with your permission and the indulgence of the Committee,

to have a look at this problem from the point of view of approach that my country makes to the world as it is today, from the economic and social point of view in the context of the tensions and the conflicts between nations and the slight tendencies which we see of their relaxation. And, what is more, at a time when, whether we achieve it or not, the United Nations has been faced with the problem of the essence of disarmament-that is, the disarmament but a step towards the establishment of a world that is free from war. That it has got not only political but social and economic consequences. For long, Mr. Chairman, we have been accustomed to speak of the economic causes of war. Often in postwar periods, especially when there is unemployment, recession, the difficulty of adjustment of industries, people speak about economic consequences of war. Now, the problem that I desire to address myself to is in a sense forecast in one or two lines of the Secretary-General's Report to the Economic and Social Council, set out in statements by my own Prime Minister, and there is nothing new about these matters. In fact, there is very little new that my delegation could submit. In his report to the ECOSOC, dated July 1959, Mr. Hammerskjold, says "The economic challenge which the United Nations has set for all mankind is a far reaching

374

one. It is nothing less than the balanced growth of world economy." Now, this is the slight procedural conflict I find. It would be a mistake, an error, today and certainly tomorrow, to look upon the balance of world economy as merely a problem of meeting the difficulties of underdeveloped countries. The world is not composed of merely underdeveloped countries. Underdeveloped countries would not become developed by the pumping in or the syphoning in of the surplus products of developed countries or by charitable or very intentioned or generous aid given to them though it is necessary for their development. And, what is more, we could not avoid the considerations that we must have in our mind in the changing circumstances of technical development, of social ideas, or the vicissitudes through which the concept of nationalism mutt pass. Mr. Hammerskjold goes on to say, the phrase "balanced growth of world economy" has been heard so often in the halls of

the United Nations that I sometimes wonder that the repetition may not have dulled our sins into many. If I may say so, Sir, there are so many words in these halls of recess which are matters of common utterance by different people with the contents deliberately not to mislead, but their mental approaches being different, understanding or analysis of problems being different, the contents of these words are sometimes not the same. It is beyond question that most ambitious, economical goal mankind has ever set itself, embracing in a sense, therefore, superseding all other objectives. Says Mr. Hammerskjold "It involves not only balanced economic growth within nations, that is one of the things that national governments try to do, difficult to achieve as the target is in itself, but even more balanced economic growth among nations."

This is our problem. And, if I may say so, with great respect, without any sense conveying the impression, and in all goodwill on the one hand, the spirit of sacrifice and the act of sacrifice on the part of giving nations, is not forgotten, but "among nations" means all nations and the nations that are under-developed have a contribution to make in this more than anybody else. I believe the time has come now, Mr. Secretary-General, to recognise equally that equilibrium in the balance of payments of under-developed countries, which would doom them to widening rather than narrowing gaps in per capita income and then of developed countries would also be a hallowed balance. In other words, even viewing this problem from the point of view of aid to under-developed countries, if these efforts finally developed into a system or an organisation of arrangements or relationships wherein the under-developed countries continued to produce the raw materials and became the consumers, not necessarily the markets, the consumers of developed products of other countries, standards of life would remain very much the same, and the problems, which have developed within the developed countries, to which I shall refer later on, would become more acute. My Prime Minister, in speaking on this matter in general, nearly a year ago, in a preface that he wrote for a book called "Paths to Peace" edited by an Australian, said "Happily, we, as though moved by some element and forces of destiny, move towards cooperation. Ours is a shrunken world. Science, trade and commerce, communications, in the back of ideas have made nations and

people, often despite adverse circumstances, belong more one to another. Sentiment the world over moves us in that direction despite all fears and inhibitions. In this scientific age both vistas, hitherto unknown and unimagined by man, and terrors not dreamt of by him, they cast the mirage of annihilation on him and his world. And our statesmen and governments must make conscious and intelligent efforts to solve those problems that tell on the survival of humanity and civilisation."

If I may interpolate here, these problems are not necessarily the problems of hydrogen bomb in a narrow context. The paths to peace are difficult, but pursue them we must. They alone enable survival and fulfilment. The journey calls for patience and tolerance and belief in our objectives. They demand more than all an equation of means and ends. They call for endeavours of us all. Now, the economic development of the whole world has, until now, shall I say from 5000 BC onward, rather been a hit and run business, that is, each country from its national point of view has to adopt policies to make either the powerful groups in them or the country as a whole, to balance its position. Inaccurately, but I hope for the purposes sufficiently, we may say our economic policies, whatever the form, our economic approaches, consciously or unconsciously, whatever their form may be-I am not now speaking of socialistic, non-socialistic, left, right, totalitarian or any other kind, have been largely conditioned by ideas of power rather than of plenty. In a world of prices, power, rather than plenty, comes in. So the products are destroyed in order to keep prices ; one country may be prevented, not necessarily by force, from producing in order not to affect someone else, broadly speaking in this modern world, from the era of mercantilism, it has been a policy of power as against plenty. That was correct in the days when democratic ideas had not become universal-and by demo-

375

cracy I do not mean necessarily any particular form of parliamentary congressional or any other government but merely the modem world-even the most totalitarian countries, the masses of the people have become important. They make their impact on opinion. Therefore, we address ourselves to that problem in that way and, fortunately for us, the great leaders of the world of the most powerful countries, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union, are not only conscious of this, they keep on, both from the point of view of disarmament and the point of view of world development, harp, or rather repeatedly make these statements. On the 14th of October, President Eisenhower, speaking in Kansas, referred to this matter. Many people of the world, once dominated and submissive are now and will continue to be involved in a great ferment, explosive in its potential. Everywhere knowledge and ideas, spread by modern communications, are routing the countries of ignorance and superstition. Peoples know that poverty and suppression are neither universal nor are they inevitable. Increasingly and insistantly they are demanding the elimination of human indignities of starvation, ill-health. They want independence, individual freedom and responsible government. These increasingly numerous periods of tomorrow's world will multiply those once and they leave at their disposal both more constructive and more destructive capacity. Obviously a programme for peaceful progress calls for intelligent, economic, educational and political cooperation. Economic cooperation which promises that peoples everywhere may by considered effort conquer hunger and disease, lift their levels of living ; educational cooperation to develop that genuine human understanding on which all other cooperative activity must be based ; political cooperation not only to settle dispute which continually arise in this imperfect world. Then speaking about underdeveloped countries specifically a few days later, in London I think, he says "I believe in the sense that the problem of underdeveloped nations, is more lasting, more important for Western civilisation, than this problem of Soviet-Western differences and guarrels. There are 1,700,000 people that today are living without sufficient food, shelter, clothing and health facilities. I believe that the biggest cooperative job that all the world that calls itself civilised, including the Soviet, ought to address themselves to-this problem on a cooperative basis-and help to solve it so that these people can achieve their legitimate aspirations." And that is a problem that everyone of us must address himself to and see what we can do and what our proper part is. When my delegation submits observations,

naturally there will be a slant of approach, however, slightly different from this, because these were statements on behalf of the problem of the underdeveloped countries.

Now, Mr. Khrushchev also, about the same time, spoke about, in relation to disarmament "the carrying out of a general and complete disarmament programme will provide the opportunity to switch enormous sums of money over to the building of schools, hospitals, houses, roads and production of foodstuffs and industrial goods. Economies may differ, that I have my own doubts about whether this money will be available, because it won't be there. Money is raised for a purpose. The resources that are released would provide the opportunities of substantially reducing taxes and lowering prices. This will create a beneficial effect upon the living standards of the population and will be welcomed by millions of ordinary people. Just the money spent by States over the last decade for military needs would be enough to build over 150 million houses to comfortably accommodate many hundreds of millions of people. And so on."

Now, I would like you to look at this problem as more or less a problem which my Prime Minister has referred to a 'shrunken world.' Our world presents contradiction, on the one hand being a 'shrunken world' on the other an 'expanding world.' A shrunken in the sense that we are nearer each other than we used to be, by communication and by the impact of ideas of and by the consequences of the action or the inaction of any part of the world or any section of the population upon the other. In that sense we are brought nearer. But equally we are an expanded and expanding world, in the sense that large numbers of millions of people, who were just a chattel, who were not human quantities, have come into life. Now that does not mean, that is not a political problem, it appears political in a narrow sense, but it means the release of aspiration. It means that wants have to be satisfied. People will not be denied. That is the modern position. Over and above that, it is an expanded and expanding world in the sense of the discovery of the new sources of resources; now application of resources; the advance of technology; the expanse, the dimensions of the world; and, over and above, basic to all this, is the fact that we, some twenty or thirty years

ago-when I say, we, or I mean the humanity or human being-resolved this apparent conflict between energy and matter. So that there is no longer any question, as some people seem to have expressed even in the United Nations Organisation a few days ago, of the lack of

376

resources in this world. Now, from there we go on to the 'shrunken world' on the one hand and the 'expanding world' on the other. The world today has a population of somewhere about 2800 millions. And if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of this discussion, we must look at this world as a whole and try to plan for its development and its service.

I will try, as far as I can, to put my observations in this respect. We have never, as a people within nations, or nations together, taken this longer view but merely tackled this problem as it arises. That is necessary because problems do not wait for the whole picture. But at the same time no single part or number of parts would ever make the whole. So, in this world today there are some 2800 million people and those populations have risen in the last 5000 years from 25 million to .2800 million. There are certain factors to be noted in this connection. The jump of population from 5000 BC goes on steadily more or less to the beginning of the Christian era. By the beginning of the Christian era, perhaps a thousand years before, populations have moved on from the stage of feeding themselves by feeding on berries or roots or animals or whatever it may be, into the approaches of the civilised. side of agriculture. So you find a jump of population from somewhere about 25 million to 700 million in the world after the lapse of millennium era. From there, there is a comparative steadiness and then comes the period of industrialisation, the period of industrialisation in early stages from the beginning of Christian era and afterwards some 300 years ago. So all these changes in, what you might call it, the terms of production and also the terms of transaction between nations and communities, have affected the rise of population. Now the main problem at every stage, for example in the beginning of the 19th century, when countries of Western Europe were moving from an agricultural to an industrial economy, and populations

were rising from a small number of somewhere about 40 million in the United Kingdom, at that time the cry was raised of population affecting on the move. Mr. Chairman, though it might rouse a great deal of controversy, I would like to submit there are no remedies to the increase of population if you want an increase. It is quite true there will be limitations of population ; but whatever limitation was imposed-and here you take the rate of increase of population, or a higher rate or a lower rate-there will be, at the end of the century 5000 million people in the world, at a conservative estimate. What is more, this population and its composition there will be large numbers of young people and large numbers of old people ; this is one factor to be taken into account. Therefore, our problem is the planning for these five thousand millions. Now, for the present, we look at it from the point of view of various resources. People would like to say that while there has been increase of population, while there has been an increase in production shall we say of food in the last ten, fifteen, twenty years, there has been no increase in the per capita consumption. In fact, in the postwar period people, taken the world as a whole are less paid than they were before. But whatever the population may be, I would like to submit that there can be, by definition, no stoppage of resources in the world, because whatever exists must exist in the universe. We cannot import anything from anywhere and, as I said a while ago, the very fact that science has now abolished the difference between matter and energy, and we happen to know that it is possible to extract more out of dumb resources than before. I am not only speaking about mechanical machinery but the vast storage of energy in the world that is responsible for production. But as we are now told that every gram of matter the energy, that gets that matter and the atom together is so much as we are able to provide for all the power that we require in the world. So there will be no shortages of power when human knowledge is able to release them. But let us take, instead of going into the abstract matters, the more concrete parts. Food is regarded as the basic proposition. If there are shortages in food how do we meet them? Are there shortages of food in the world? It is said that for a production of nearly 150 tons per head of food in the world the consumption that we require will be somewhere less than one ton per head. Now where will the remainder go?

When we talk about food, and I am not referring in this context to only the food that under the present conditions we eat, but what is edible. Now we can go further in the concrete realities. And if we take the production of the world we produce far more than the world can consume. The world can consume probably only about a third of what it produces. The remainder is consumed either by cattle, I mean by animals including pests-the uneconomic conveyors of energy to ourselves. But, anyway, that is one part of it. The other part of it-the great part of our food gets wasted, not on the table because we see it and we do not waste it being the cooked food that is served before us-that is another matter altogether. But, let us take for example a stalk of grain. It is only about one-fourth of it that we eat. The remainder goes out and becomes fodder. So if from that point of view the world expands to 5000 millions, or by the middle of next century to about 8000 millions,

377

there will be no shortages even on the present basis. This is on account of increase in scientific knowledge. So our purpose should be now not merely to think in terms of 1960 or 1961 and so on, but initiate studies to ensure what are these resources and where do they go. A large quantity of food is consumed by pests on the one hand and by the cattle on the other who are economic in ways of nutrition. So the carbon content that must go into the body, that would be Produced from a certain quantity of food at acertain time it is consumed whether the animal consumes it he passes it on. So that the animal in that sense is not merely a transmitter of all what he received, but about only 10 per cent, while all flesh is got. So what we do is this, the plant absorbs solar rays, which is our real energy and the animal consumes the plant, and so you consumes the animal; but in the bargain the animal is a stock broker which takes 90 per cent and we get 10 per cent only of nutrition. So it is. But seriously let us look at the problem in the plant world. What is the quantum of animals we can keep? For example, take my country. It halt about the largest cattle population in the world and is the most uneconomic element in our life. Then of course there are other kinds of animals, redents, and other pests, the locust from the banks of the Euphrates, getting on in India or China or Japan

or whatever it may be. Therefore, if you destroy the pest it would be no use. The United Nations, the United States, the Soviet Union, Australia, Canada, or whoever he may be, if it was time to feed, shall we say India, in this case, with grain, when at the same time the locust are destroying a great part of it, which in India we cannot deal with, because locusts fly over India and destroy crops in a few minutes, they were born on the banks of Euphrates-how are we going to deal with the locusts-then you must plan Wit merely for India but for plants in India. The Indian government or the Indian nation, taking as an example, cannot legislate as to how to control the locusts in the Persian Gulf or in those areas. That is one instance. So the whole of file control of the destroyers or what is required, has to be planned in this way. Here, a great deal of planning of populations, and there is no doubt that the figures that are now given 5000/5500 millions take into account the fact that there will be conscious restrictions in the increase of population by individuals all over the world, prejudices, edicts and everything apart, there will be great restriction ; But all that will not prevent the growth of population to this number if you look at the mathematics of it and if you try, it will be possible by mass insecticide, shall we say taking an absurd instance, or, by some method of nonproduction of the human species. Then what are the consequences? We will get a world that is not only neurotic; we will get a world of old people. What is more, everything we do to raisethe standard of life increases population. In whatever way we may try we have to limit them by family planning or whatever it may be, because when we raise the standard of life there is longivity of life. For example, in the United States the longivity of life is seventy years instead of sixty; in India it is thirty-four years- used to be twenty-four at one time. So the more we increase the standards of life the longer the expectation of life. Less people die out. Normally speaking the net increase in population is the balance between the birth rate and the death rate. In India we had a very high birth rate and we had a big death rate, Now with the adoption of family planning as part of national policy we have no difficulties in this matter. We had to bring down the birth rate as we did the death rate.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, the increase in population is not a phenomenon exclusive to

under-developed countries. People are born elsewhere, and I believe in this country the rate of increase is as much or more as elsewhere. So this mass population has to be planned before their food has to be found, and that would require the taking into account, substituting studies and inquiries that are necessary for the distribution of the present resources and also the reasons why some parts of the world produce more than others. I am speaking from memory, but I believe that in this country an acre of land would probably produce somewhere 4500 calories worth of food products in a day, the corresponding figure would be 7/8000 from Western 'Europe; the corresponding figure for Asia, exclusive of Japan, would be somewhere about 4000 and that 4000 is brought about by the big rice belts of Indo-China, Thailand, etc.; but if you go to Japan this figure goes up to 18,000. That is due to techniques of production on the one hand. And in regard to the United States the techniques are known but they are not used and they are not usable in present conditions because if the calories were to go up from 4500 to 18,000 in Japan the United States administration, as at present composed or conditioned, it provides larger quantities of money to pay for the support of the farmer. Therefore, as I said in the beginning, we produce not for the purpose of plenty, but for the purpose of meeting economical conditions as they are at present. I say all this, not in order to comment on the state of economy of different countries or their administration, but when we are planning for the world as a whole what we require is a necessary calorie content for 7000 people; and if 7000 people have to be fed, it

378

has got to come from somewhere and my submission is that it is here. As the world progresses the more people there are. There will be more pairs of hands and more stomachs and therefore energy goes into it.

At the same time, I have come, into a large number of questions of technology. Technology that is concerned on many things; technology in relation with meteorology. In a country like ours, for example, we are so dependent on the conditions of the weather. We do not speak about it as the Engilsh do, always, but our crop is dependent on rainfall. If the monsoon, so called comes fifteem days earlier then it destroys the crop. If it comes 15 days later it destroys, either the drought or the floods, whatever it is. It all depends, on the timing of this rain. But with the increase of technology it will come to an end. If you can do that only in the conditions of the world, and if there is to be improvement in technology we should be able to produce this rain, where and when wanted. Our Australian friends are going to say about it ! But supposing it has to be done, then you cannot do it on a national basis. It will lead to the same disputes as we have now with the riparian problems. That is, if one country pumps out the rain from the bearing clouds, which would have gone into the other, he may get the rain which the other fellow wants. And, therefore, it requires a world organization. The same thing applies to irrigation and other sources of warer. Now it was possible that a larger part of water that the rains bring in the world goes in the sea, and so one wonders why all these disputes for water distribution when the greater part of the water goes into the sea. That sounds very simple ! It goes into the sea and will continue to go into the sea until we can store it, and we could not have stored it in the world in previous conditions. But today a bomb of the megaton size of explosion of megatons, or something of that kind, could really create a crater which perhaps, would store somewhere about 67/70 billion gallons of water. So it was impossible in old times.

Then we have the areas in our country and in other parts of the world where the soil is unfit for cultivation because it is all lime. Now we are able to deal with this in the same way as other people should be able to deal with it. But in this matter, international connection or world planning becomes necessary, not for the reason I said in the beginning, that what we do for ourselves may hurt somebody else, but for the interchange of knowledge. Then there are areas like the Sahara, for example-but it is a very controversial place at the moment. What I mean, there are places near the sea and like Coleridge, you will have to say-"Water, water everywhere but not a drop to drink !"-sort of thing. But with the ability of atomic energy and with the knowledge that the energy contained in every unit of matter is releaseable and it is the multiplication of the mass by the square of the velocity

of light, which means that in every gram of matter we are told there are 26,000 kwts hours of powers. And that is why somebody wrote that the atom contained in the size of a railway ticket is sufficient to provide the power all over the world. Now, theoretically that is so. But when one puts it in an indirect way in order to indicate that there will be no power shortages in our world, whether that power comes from wind or from cowdung or from water, or from hydroelectricity, or from cosmic rays, or from any other source. So advance of technology on the one hand, and meteorological sciences can only be organised on a world basis. It is an exact science to start with and the investigations in the Geophysical Year have indicated to the world that world cooperation would be a healthy process in this respect.

Then we have the other problem, Mr. Chairman, which, perhaps in this country and some of the European countries may not have the significance, but of course a world significance. That is, humanity, so far as we know, for the past seven or ten thousand years, have been cutting down all the trees in the world. So you see, a problem of aforestation becomes one of feeding populations. We were taught at school that plants breathe out oxygen and that, apart from the supply of oxygen, for out sustenance, the plants breathe out oxygen and build up carbon. They absorb the carbondyoxide which is in our midst and that feeds us. So, unless in the course of the century we are able to embark on the whole problem of aforestation in the world, where our predecessors, our people, who before us, particularly in my country, for the last 5/6000 years have been shaving off tops of hills and thereby dying away the sustenance that was going into the carbon content of the people. What is more, the industrial societies with thier smoke and their crowding and the deprivation of fresh air the oxygen they breathe out becomes necessary from their point of view. Now, therefore, the plant world even in this era requires this sort of thing.

And secondly, in countries like ours and in the United States I am told there is a vast degree of soil erosion brought about by the deprivation of the capacity of the soil to be held together by the roots of trees. So the whole of this problem requires intense study from our point of view and not merely looking at it from the aspect of one country. That is why, when making this initial submission to the General Assembly of the United Nations, my delegation spoke in the way of planning for 5000 millions. And, unless we did that what will happen to us is this that there are under-developed countries, to a certain extent in some case in another every case, which partly reflect the mentality of what I hope no unhealthy people will misunderstand when I say you cannot build up an economy on the basis of laughing at a pint of milk. It used to be said. That is to say we cannot build on a soup kitchen basis. It has to be self-sufficient basis.

When I speak about the problem of the developed countries it would become even more clear. Now, there is a vast degree of production in the developed countries. The idea of our present piecemeal efforts is that these surpluses would assist other people who have not got enough. What happens to those developed countries who also become industrialized. Therefore, there is, of course, production in that part of the world, so in any world planning we would have to deal with the product of industry, which again would not present any problem, Mr. Chairman, when one realises that the total quantity, shall we say the basic thing like iron and steel, today, I believe, is somewhere about 200 billion tons, then the production of it has to be increased if every other country in the world has to have the industrial economy and social prosperity of the United States. The quantity of steel that would be required would be, I understand, about 300 times or something of what we now have. In our own country, for example, ten years ago we produced less than 1 million tons of steel and by the end of next year, I suppose, or the year after, we will produce probably five or 6 million tons. In another five years we will produce 15 million tons. At that rate of production, it is calculated, not by us but about us, at the end of the century India should be producing, for example, about 80 million tons of steel. Therefore, for the availability of power, the shifting the production of machines for other people and the recognition that the economy of these countries cannot be stabilized merely by the transmission of the goods that you make, that does give relief to the giving country and it gives succour to the

receiving country as well, provided it does help them to live in the long terms. That is the problem. And it is interesting to see that a nonpolitical person like Mr. Eugene Black has made references to this in an entirely different context. I don't think Mr. Black ever thought I would quote him in this way. Mr. Black cautioned tonight that the cold war eventually might be overshadowed by the growth of tension resulting in the wide disparity in the living standard of the developed and under-developed countries. The President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development said at a dinner given in his honour by the pilgrims of the United States, that the inequality was a source of frustration and tension. His prediction, he said, might seem farfetched at a time when "we are so much concerned with the relations among the great Powers." It is interesting that in very conservative quarters in what Mr. Khrushchev would call "capitalist world" and what is more, in rather rigid quarters in the Soviet World, we are now beginning to think that the soul of ideological controversy really does not go to the roots of our problem; because this planet is one and there is no escape from it. We cannot escape from the earth. We can escape from one nation to the other. You can be political refugees, you can be reformers, you can be invader, and so on. But where do we go from here ? I suppose, now more people will say, you can go to the moon ; but probably sometime hence. So this planet is a compulsory society and, therefore, we have to live here. Goes on Mr. Black, "But it is not really so far fetched as it seems. It seems to me, I have the supposition that the cold war itself may be the ultimate conflict of history to be resolved only by the complete triumph of one side and complete obliteration of the other. For instance, it has been the fashion for some time to try to use financial instrument in diplomacy-this is the important part-financial instrument in diplomacy as a method of winning or cultivating friends among nations for the purpose of maintaining or meeting international alignments in a time of world tension." By now, he thought, the limitations of this project are plainly evident. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad I did not say this because that would have been regarded as a highly political statement. But, here, we have the position that this mere idea of trying to balance economies in this way, while it has its short term value, does not meet the requirements. I keep

on saying that because otherwise it would look as though we had to tear everything down and start writing on a clean slate. Which is impossible Mr. Black goes on to say, even now it is marked by too many instances in which aid given to countries for the wrong motives and wrong objects has fallen far short of accomplishing what it should have achieved. In extreme cases aid purely conceived, far from improving the economies of the receiving countries, has actually added to the heavy burden under which they are suffering already. Far from helping to create partnership between nations, it has, on occasion, aroused

380

bitterness and even downright animity." Mr. Black stresses successful development of the underdeveloped world for the vital objective that it is worth pursuing for its own sake, steadily, unremittingly, and with astutely regard as is humanly possible for the fluctuating temperature of the international politics of the changing fortunes of international trade. Now this is the last part, you should take as mine, especially in this Committee, which by some artificial methods isolated certain political questions.

The economic issue will become very much more important when the Russian and the Americans have agreed to talk to each other-there is not much tension in the other room-and therefore the economic issues come to the forefront in this way.

Now from there we turn to what are called the "developed countries". The developed countries have both short-term and long-term problems. First of all, there will be competition between the developed country and the underdeveloped country, not as people think by the dumping of cheap goods produced by low-paid labourthat is a superficial problem which can be easily dealt with-not by that, but unless power is used, unless planning is taking place on a world scale, by studies initiated by the United Nations-they will have some work to do if you accept this !-By studies initiated by the United Nations; what happens? There will be competition for raw meterial. Now, raw material is short in the world-not short under the earth, because I believe even if you take elementary raw meterial as a whole, there must be sufficient

that everybody wants, for essentially at least, underneath, and I will soon refer to the increase of this quantity by technical application. But, as things are at present, and if there is no planning, there will be pressure on resources. Developed countries will compete for the same resources as the under-developed countries, which have been supplying them but now want them for themselves,-whether it be manganese, whether it be tungsten or anything else, on which developed countries are dependent for competition. When that competition in raw material comes, it has both a healthy effect and an unhealthy effect. Take an advanced country like the United States where-I am not in any way touching on internal matters-it is unthinkable that the industrial system can be based in the decade to come on the basis of eight hours, six hours, or even four hours a day; because the quantum of production would be such that shorter hours of work would not only be adequate but would be necessary if there is to be full employment. That again I am going to talk of in a moment as another problem or world planning. So that, when the number of hours worked particularly by a industrial worker, and we hope by agricultural worker, becomes less, this will pose, Mr. Chairman, the most difficult of all problems before humanity. That is the problem of human leisure. What to do with it.

At the present moment-for the last twenty years, I believe-we have got out of the idea the longer you work the more you produce'. That has disappeared with Labour organization, by the scientific study of the optimum production. by the increase of hours, and so on. But even now we do not envisage the position when in automobile factories, shall we say, a worker can work only three hours a day, because even if he did any more, there would be too much production-all over the world. If that situation of automation, the improvement of technical production, comes around everywhere, then the Labour Unions of the world would naturally, in order to protect the very legitimate rights and to prevent unemployment, want the available employment to be spread over the entire people; which means people must work less. And if they work less, even though during the period they work, they work strenuously, what happens to their leisure time? This leisure time is one of the important unstabilising factors in society. Now, the Secretary would probably know that

if his very department is over-staffed, less work would get done and there will be more complaints about conditions of work and how much better they all can run the United Nations than the Secretary-General. It is always that some mischief is found for idle hands.

This problem of labour which in the old days of a more leisurely society was met by pursuits of a character which we need not regard economic, would have in modern conditions to take some other turn. In the old days, this labour, or the surplus energy was absorbed by the industrial war. Now, when war and war preparation today of about 100 billions a year-95, I am told-100 billions of a year, it is not expended for storing things in peace time because every piece of equipment is used when there is no war, because either it is tested or it is used for practice purpose, or it used by being thrown away the next year, as every piece of war equipment becomes obsolete by the time it leaves the drawing table, and so it will go on to the next one. So when you say you have spent 100 billions it is not as though they are storing these weapons at the end of ten years-it will be 1000 billions worth of equipment. What I am saying is, this military expenditure is actual expenditure in military exercise whether

381

it be for practice purposes or whether you shoot off a blank guided or misguided weapon costing 4 or 5 thousand pounds a piece or fifteen thousand pounds a piece, as the case may be. What is really war without actual killing. That is, the process of war goes on the whole time and there is a replacement for the 100 billions every year. It is not as though it is stored and after ten years you can say 'Now we have got enough, we cannot have to spend more.' So each year you spend something, you spend more the next year. So that in the advanced countries when war production ceases the energy and the capital and the equipment, the material and what goes in the war production, would have to be diverted for other purposes. It is quite true that some of it would not be there at all, so far as money is concerned, but the 100 million people-there are millions of people that are engaged in war industry they would have to find other occupations and that occupation in the biblical sense of converting souls in the plough shares; but the difficulty

about plough shares is that if there are too many of them, they get in each other's way ! And, what is more, a model plough share does the work of 200 plough shares of old times! There again you are faced with this problem. The distribution of this population, in my humble submission, is a problem of world employment. Because if there are large parts of the world where people who are employable in one country may, without infringing upon the fortunes and the interests may go to some other country. In our days we would not permit it, even in spite of the best sentiment you may have. I remember in the war years when Hitler invaded certain countries I do not wish to mention the names of countries and the populations of those countries, particularly the mining populations who were resistors of Fascist tyranny, when they were pushed out of their own country went to a neighbouring country. They were welcomed as the people who were oppressed by Hitler; they were welcomed people as a whole as allies as the rest of us. But very soon came the problem of their competing with the local miners. That has been the position in the past. But in the conditions of planned world economy there will be adjustments of a character where there will be no difficulties in this way. But it will be putting the cart before the horse to refer to this problem unless we previously obtain a world without war and where there are no national armies and no hopes of national aggression. Now, Sir, from here we go on to other problems.

The world planning would require the scarcest of all commodities in the modern world. You remember when I called the world shrunken and expanding. The more scarce commodity is manpower. We are on one hand talking about the increase of population and on the other hand talking about the shortage of manpower; because manpower that is relevant to economic development today is technical manpower and that technical manpower for the first time in history there are not enough technicians to go around. The Russians are meeting this far more effectively than others because, as has been pointed out by American writers themselves, their economy, their methods, are so different to ours. They do not send people from the University to the factory for a little practice, but you send people from the factory to the University for a little study of humanity. But whatever it is, we

have not got the necessary number of technicians anywhere and it is believed that if the best effort is put in, in ten years time I think, I am speaking from memory, United States would probably have 17,000 technicians which, by the end of the century, would become 300,000 technicians; that would just meet the requirements of this country. On the same plan, if my country were to produce technicians they would have to produce 480,000 technicians a year. Today there is one technician or scientist in this country to every 200 of the population. There is one to thirty thousand of the population in India. This applies in various fields. For example, there is one doctor in our country to three thousand people. There is one doctor in this country to 170 people, and so on. Now, these contrasting figures I am not giving because I feel jealous or moved by it, but you must understand the situation. So the greatest shortage in the world is the technical manpower, because our world with all the scientific developments is an unsafe place for people to live in unless they are technical. Now, in a small way, we know even in our own households if the staff in the house, the people who live there with their masters, servants, or whatever may be, even the children in the house, even if they do not understand that electricity is likely to create trouble if they touch it in the raw, or if they cannot mend a fuse, or if they cannot do something, the whole of their life would be dislocated, if, for example, in all the building houses elevators were used and it was not known to the ordinary people how to operate them, there would be more deaths than otherwise. In other words, in this world we cannot function except by being intelligent. Increasingly this world will not suffer fools because we require intelligent man's guide to walk through this. Even a person like me-the only mathematics I know is simple multiplication and divisioneven I have to look into these matters in order to function and give an appearance of

382

being knowledgeable. So that this matter of technical studies would again be a matter of planning for 5000 millions because unless these studies were instituted, simply the older conception that you must find work for people even if we did go back to the 19th century conception of taking up from one pit and putting into another or building relief work, that is the whole idea of employment. This will not do. But today, if you have to have full employment that can only be scientific employment. Because the greater part of industry or greater part of our economic life will be, one way or another, scientific.

Now that applies to agriculture also. I referred a while ago to the differences in the yield in the case of different countries, but the caloric value I gave was not of the actual food we eat, but of the actual food that is edible. Now that is brought about largely by technical development. For example, in Japan I imagine they use somewhere about-may be very nearly-a hundred lbs. of fertiliser per acre as against 40 or so in Europe and half that quantity over here and 0.6 in India. It is largely due to lack of technical knowledge, partly due to lack of resources and, of course, due to national habits. That is another part of the planning of the economic life on a world scale where I said a while ago that without scientific and technical knowledge we cannot navigate ourselves in the world; equally, without a degree of information, which enables us to cast out superstitions and prejudices, which so prevails in the food habits; in my own country, for example, large masses of people would sooner go hungry unless they get the particular type of rice to which they had been accustomed. This happened in the days of Bengal Famine. Other food habits are not to be written off merely by statistical figures. That is why, though there is production of food, there is still starvation all round. Today in the world-I am rambling about a bit-only 50 per cent of its population is above starvation level. I mean below sub-standard level. Fifty per cent of the peoples of the world, so far as food is concerned are sub-standard. When you come to shelter, sanitation, education and leisure, I would imagine, somewhere about 70 percent are substandard; because the first 50 per cent refers to the populations of certain countries. But when you come to housing, which is shelter, or sanitation, which is medical assistance, and all that sort of thing, or enjoyment of leisure, even in prosperous countries probably half the population will be sub-standard. So without in any way implying anything, I am suggesting that different forms of organisation should come in the world if it has to survive, if the 5000 millions of people have to live. in the end of the century-I believe it would be more than 5000 millions-if 5000 millions have to

live it cannot be accomplished as in the old days by finding a place. The old answer was, it was considered in terms of particular countries. If there are too many people either you take to migration or to the conquest of other territories. For living space by sending people out doesn't work today because you only shift this problem; so that with the increase of power resources revealable, the quantity of material available would go up. I am not going to bore this Committee with a large collection of facts on this, but will quote one or two things for example.

With the discovery not of fission but of fusion, because fission would lead us to the problem of radio activity, it is hoped that the discovery of thermonuclear bomb and its harnessing for industrial purposes, when our atomic energy establishments and our conceptions have gone beyond the laboratory stage and have become universal, it should be possible to use vast quantities of power that will release resources that are now unknown or unworkable. Take for example the tar oil resources in Canada. It is said that for each square mile and a foot of depth, there is one \$1,000,000 worth of oil to be obtained. Now it is not possible by any known method how we can work this tar element into oil except by the degree of heat that will come out of explosions. Now, in the next room, as you know, people are discussing atomic tests and one of the snags, which scientists from both sides are up against, is this question of underground explosions. Now it is possible, whatever may be the military significance of it, by underground explosions to produce that degree of heat which I said would convert this tar oil into fuel oil, which is required for power purposes. I believe this particular tract lies in northern Canada and is somewhere about 100 ft. deep. It is 100 ft. solid tar oil patch or rock. Now that means it is nearly a 100 million dollars worth of oil in one square mile and there are miles and miles of it. The same thing applies to various other sources of oil production. Equally our technical abilities will enable us to use what is now thrown away. For this we have not to go very far.

Before the capacity to smelt metals and purify them as quickly as we can do now, scrap ironall the tin cans and things of that sort-were of no value. Now a particularly industrious country in the world collects from India, for example, what they call third class scrap, i.e., thrown away tin cans and what not; and it goes 3000 miles by sea, it is smelted and it comes back to India as stainless steel and it is still economical. Therefore, with our new techniques, it is possible not

383

only to re-use used materials some materials we cannot use because out of the billions of tons of iron that we have produced a Grail deal has gone nowhere; somebody may want to ask us where did the iron go that we manufactured. It just disappeared, in the working by the colossal friction on the one hand and by the corosion on the other. It is said that millions and millions, of dollars worth of material is lost simply by the process of corosion of steel. But that is probably digression. What I am saving is that large quantities of lowgrade coal, low-grade iron ores and so on, which today are not considered economic, but with the requirement of humanity they will become economic. And what is more, with the availability of power and by the increase of technical knowledge, these resources become valuable resources for the larger population. Only a few days ago before the Food and Agriculture Organization-I hope there is no harm in referring to this-a very distinguished gentleman addressed them and saidthis is a newspaper report, and I believe he was misreported-that perhaps we have reached the limit of our capacity in the production of food. I would say, Mr. Chairman, we shall never reach the limits of our capacity unless our minds and our hearts capacity to work is also limited.

After all, first of all, I said we have the knowledge that matter is no longer separate from energy as it is convertible and the introduction of fourth dimension into our thinking of our knowledge of things. Secondly, with the vast amount of power that is available and the fact that there is from nowhere else where we can get energy. The matter is limited in the three dimensional sense and it is only when the fourth dimension is introduced, it can be expanded, so there is no question any time being without it. The latter part of my education having been in England, one naturally refers to English instances.

In the time of Henry VII, there were 2,000,000 people in England, it is said. I do not know how they said it. They did not know how to count in

those days! But there were 2 million people, they said. In the time of Oueen Elizabeth, there were 4 million, though she herself made no contributions so far as we know. But at both times it was said that England was over-populated. Then comes the early part of 19th century, when there were 12 million people, when they transferred from sheep farming into corn farming at the time of the Agitations. Then the population went on increasing. By 1840 the Industrial Revolution had well got under swing and the people from the villages were drawn into the towns and afterwards the population rose to 50 million. Even today they are over-populated. By the end of the century there probably would be 70 millions. They will probably still be over-populated. That is the effort that is required is not commensurate with the requirements. That is the problem, and that is our problem in other ways also. Our mind advances. Our capacity for technical improvement advances. But at the same time while we are possessed of plenty of information and the adaptability of information to known technical purposes, our knowledge is still limited. I mean knowledge in the literal sense. The wisdom of man, his imagination, his recognition in regard to limitations are imposed by himself. Though it is not possible, for example. I hope my colleagues from South Africa would not object to impose the colour bar, the Asiatic fluid or yellow fever bacteria do not recognise apartheid. If there is infectious disease in a poor part of the town, it is as much a danger to the rich part. That is one of the reasons the Public Health came into being, because the wealthy people did not like being infected by poor people. So, at any rate, the world becomes one.

So going back to these power problems, Sir, on the one hand there is the capacity to use the energy released by fusion without being dangerous to ourselves and any world plan must take into account the fact that the selfishness of nations, if nations still have the power of that kind, does not thereby create problems indeed as oil, has created problems in regard to sea water by the dumping of atomic waste into the sea; because if you dump the waste into the sea either at a depth of 100 miles where we are told the water has not been moved for many million of years-we do not know but we are told-but either that way or any other way the chances are that the generations that come afterwards will suffer from it and that is why with the advance of scientific knowledge, where we have released the bound energies within the atom, and I think, if I may say so, it appears to me, as a layman, that we are only at the beginning of this because when we realise that in every drop of water something of that size of that much is six thousand million atoms. A great deal of distance we have to cover before we are able to use the knowledge that we already have and to realise the further capacities that we insist upon.

So, on the one hand, we use this fusion power for these purposes and again, as a result of these in regard to the explosions it is possible that scientists will discover the way not merely to test these underground weapons in order to prefect these weapons of mass destruction, but they may well be converted, people say now, for the purpose of storing large quantities of heat in the same way

384

as we are now using natural gas; or we may perhaps even be able to use volcanoes which have the capacity for eruption in the future. Similarly these great bombs that are exploded underground would become reservoirs of the heat which by control can be transferred to other people and the actual primary source of it is so plentiful that the human knowledge for the release of the atomic energy would help us in that way. In the same manner, as I said a while ago, there are great deserts near the sea-water everywhere but nothing to be obtained. Why at present moment it appears that the irrigation of these areas is on the one hand conditioned by the nature of the sub-soil streams as we referred to Ghana, but perhaps even the Sahara. Well, there is plenty of water under the sand. Now, they probably do not know. The deserts of Rajasthan-Rajputana as it used to be called-has normally in the year only about two inches to two and a half inches of rain, but if every part itself does get that rain then the crop on that place-the particular kind of coarse grain crop-grows up nearly to the height of man. Thus, water is all that is lacking. All the other chemical components, everything else, is there. Except for the fact that centuries of civilised Indian people have cut down all the trees with the result from the Arawali Hills flow the winds which create erosion. That is another of the problems we have to deal with. But what I am saying is

this, that with the supply of water into the deserts the oasis becomes the normal route and not the obstruction. Now, this water may come, as I said, by breaking the clouds. But all clouds do not have water and apparently the clouds over the desert generally do not have. But if there is water in the sea, and if it is possible by the use of this considerable amount of thermonuclear energy, it may become economical to remove the slying part by the process of distillation. It very sounds fantastic at the present moment, but so many things have been done in the same manner.

Similarly, there are other sources of energy in these isotopes in regard to the increase of production and the knowledge of Genetics will introduce into the production of food fertilising elements which will soon not displace, they will soon take the place which now cannot be occupied by chemical fertilisers. The Japanese have shown to the world that the genetic processes and the genetic knowledge that they have, which they have introduced in the agriculture, has enabled them to produce grain on a scale unknown in Europe or in Asia, or in America. In my country the average grain production is somewhere about 600 lbs. per acre. I believe subject to correction it is somewhere about 1050 lbs. per acre in the United States. It can grow up very much higher but they do not want it to grow very much higher, because technical knowledge is used only to the extent it is economically and socially necessary. But in Japan and China it grows up to 2800/3000 lbs. per acre largely by the application of fertilisers and other material.

Secondly, in this world is the idea of planning for plenty of these products that are required to build up the human body. It would become known to the world that the exposure of the crop to the sun is as important as the bulk of the crop that comes to us. In other words, the Englishman's sugar which comes from beet is not as good as the sugar as I have at home because it comes from the sugarcane, and because the sugarcane is warmed up by the sun for the whole year and thereby absorbs the things that the beet plant cannot which matures in three or four months, since the investment of the sun in it is over a shorter period. No wonder the Hindus and Parsees and everybody else are all sun worshippers, because that is where all the energy comes from.

This is a subject on which one can talk at length. Therefore, why we place these matters before you was the attempt to deal with these things piecemeal. They are necessary. We have made great stories in this way, at least by drawing the attention of the world and ourselves and the countries and the nations that the elevation of the standards of life in one part of the world is not necessary if the world as a whole has to prosper.

Secondly, it is not possible for the world to be at peace so long as there is social instability. The imbalances are to be rectified. If there are instabilities then there will be other features which I hope my friends from the United States will forgive me by my mentioning. That is the tons of foreign trade and balance of payments get severely affected and you get that particular institution known of that character and people instead of living under the supposedly Iron Curtain would be living under a Tariff War, and that Tariff War in these conditions, when great powers of the world are trying to equal their energies; they also have surplus products; they are no longer markets for manufacturing countries or the producers of the raw materials; those traditions you go to the grave and we may get the plains, that would disappear. And this degree of national isolation will become a cause of befigerency. So the terms of trade and the extremely small quantum of foreign trade there as in the world, would appear to us ridiculous in conditions where there is disparity. If I refer to figures which show contract, it is not meant for

385

any other purpose but to give a picture. I believe the per capita income in this country is somewhere about \$1050 and mine is about \$50. Though there is in the last few years the bulk of the national product and national income, but it has been brought down by the increase in population. Or if you take some other country, like Russia or the United Kingdom it goes into the hundreds. So with these disparties it is not a matter of individual jealousies or individual desires to attain something. You create a situation of distinct equilibrium that will not lead to forward movement but rather to restlessness and if it has to be removed then our economic organisation has to be of such a character where the foreign trade of the country is not governed so much by mercantilist concentrations of power but rather by the desire to establish economic equilibrium which will contribute to political equilibrium. So that so long as there are territories in this way populations in any country for which the re. sources are regarded inadequate and the malnutrition and falacy is repeated in the 20th century. If he committed the falacy it was not because his basic proposition was fundamentally wrong, but because he did not take into account the fact that with the increase of population he could not be killed off by an epidemic or by war, could be said by the increase of technology. He came in the earlier part of technical development and, therefore, this idea of population pressing on the means of subsistence proved to be a falacy. Similarly, if, as I said a while ago, large populations are going to press on the means of subsistence and we sit back with folded hands, or simply say that populations may not increase, people who are not born should not be born because we are already born, that sort of thing is not going to help us.

That is for this purpose, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation thought that we should contribute something by speaking on the subject-I have left out a great many things I intended to say because time is getting on-and to request the Committee to consider the idea because this particular proposition probably would not have to go to the Fifth Committee, whether while we are going on with all the, remedies and everything else, the Secretary should not be asked by a Resolution of the Committee to prepare some study papers for the next session of the United Nations. And it is my submission, my hope, that the Second Committee in times to come-I am not saying this because I am here in this Committee-in this buildingand the Fourth Committee will prove to be far more important centres of discussions and decisions than the Political Committee is today. These economic matters will become as Mr. Black has said, the more important things when we would have forgotten all the other quarrels and I hope especially in conditions when there are no national armies. But you cannot beat souls into ploughshares unless we can use the plough shares. And what is more, you can plough a land as many times as you like, but if you plough it in the old way the result will be the old crop. Equally, this study, I hope, would go into the whole

question of education whereby the vast number of technicians which, probably at the end of this century, will grow into many millions in the world. How they would be made available? Today what we are doing is we are sending either unwanted or very much wantedmen from one country to another. That is one way of just taking one another's washing. That does not take us any further. The world wants, just as it wants more food, it wants men, it wants men and women, who have the understanding of modern technology. And modern technology does not mean merely engineering in a small sense but the development which has made the world different from what it has been. And one of the items of this study, in my humble submission, should be this idea how it is possible without distinction of race and national prestige, without even the problems that at present are created by different standards of life and by different ways of living. How we can use all the available resources in the world. How the educational and training systems of the world, including the industrial systems,. can be so changed. The vast amount of money that is now spent on research, for example, would, to a certain extent, be directed towards the reformation of technical education of our entire world so that there will be no shortages of manpower. Now the population is not the manpower in any economic sense. We would also consider this question, as I said, on the meteorological developments required in the world and its relation to all the newer inquiries in the outer space, inner space, and everything else. It would also be possible for us to put before the people the necessities of the limitations on national, I do not want to use the word sovereignty, explosive competence in the interest of the world. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will submit, even if no action was taken immediately on a submission of this kind, and this organization would have justified itself if we got out of the idea of not seeing beyond our own notions. These problems of today will appear differently tomorrow unless with wisdom we can anticipate them. It is often said for those who do not take care of the present, the future will take revenge. In this world the vast populations, which were regarded as growing menace and given various names, with the contraction of

resources as they are called do not exist. And, what is more, our inability to use the advance of technique and science in constructional ways and, therefore, the growth of suspicion would again be removed ; in these circumstances our secrecy knowledge would also disappear. So my delegation would like at some time, as I have said, to put away some of these things where I have submitted that if necessary for us, if the Committee agrees, to come to some decision which would not be too controversial, if the Secretariat, that is the Secretary-General, were so willing, as he appears to be in this, we would give him the umbrella under which great activity can take place. I would like to repeat once again, this is not a problem of coming to the relief of the underdeveloped countries. The problems of the developed countries will be even greater. The developed countries cannot prosper except under the conditions of stability. To a certain extent their stability would be maintained so long as their ideological conflicts, exist, because pressures from outside create unities within. Stabilities cannot be maintained in any country in the world when there are no universal franchises, whatever the form of it may be; that is the release of the aspirations of men where political revolutions have taken place, but industrial revolutions have not. So, in the words of a United States historian-the multiplication of new nations and the shifting power relations of old ones, the astounding advances in science and technology, the soaring productivity of farm and factory, and the population explosion in much of the world, we are passing into an era of greater and vaster change than man has ever seen. The most elementary effects-one of the most revolutionary is the unprecedented growth of population almost everywhere on the globe. I would not say 'unprecedented' because from 25 millions it has gone to 750 millions in a short time, of about 2000 years or so, but, particularly in those countries inhabited by coloured peoples. AU this has got a bias from the back-ground of the personal writing. The population of the earth is increasing by some 50 millions, if that is not accurate, probably 40 millions anyway. China is adding each year the total population of the three Scandinavian countries and by the year 2000 the population of China will be close on 1 billion, probably it will be 1200 millions. India, Pakistan and Ceylon, with the birthrate of 38 per

thousand are increasing at a comparable pace. Their population should be more than threequarters of a billion by 2000 AD. Whereas Africa will reach 400 millions. All these are guesses. Nobody can give correct figures in regard to this because so many factors enter. But there is no doubt that the populations will increase in this large way. Therefore, we would like, if there was a general degree of agreement that some kind of a solution, not necessarily emanating from the Indian Delegation, some kind of a desire could come forward. And if it is not out of order, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will take some interest in this matter and see if there is any co-ordination of ideas that is possible because this is not a thing on which either there should be too much expression of detail or too much of the depth of position from different points for producing an ideal kind of decision, but to make a start which it does not in any way affect, either the Special Fund or the SUNFED, if it ever comes into existence, Nor Technical Assistance-all things go on. But at the same time, in the First Committee, we spoke about a world without war. They try to plan for throwing away of arms and there must be the other side of this picture.

And therefore, like the poet, we would say :

" We shall be missions of a dependable future As far as human eye could see And see a vision of the world And all the wonder that will be For there is a Parliament of man, The federation of the world. They are the common sense of most And hold a fateful realm in awe And kindly the earth shall slumber Left in universal law.

INDIA USA AUSTRALIA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA JAPAN CANADA THAILAND LATVIA RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA GHANA PAKISTAN

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Political Committee on Suspension of Nuclear Tests

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee, on November 18, 1959 on the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests :

Mr. Chairman,

Once again my delegation has submitted the item 'SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMO-NUCLEAR TESTS' for consideration by the General Assembly. We have done so in the firm conviction and faith which have, during the past five years, prompted us to bring up this question more than once before the General Assembly. The Government and people of India

387

have steadfastly urged that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction be outlawed, that nuclear energy be used only for peaceful purposes and that the fissile material contained in existing nuclear and thermonuclear weapons be converted to peaceful uses. We believe that suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions is an essential first step in disarmament and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and the outlawry of war. Equally important is the need to meet the moral challenge posed by the unleashing of the tremendous forces of nature locked up in the nucleus of the atom and hitherto not unmercifully hidden from man.

As members of the Committee are aware, we have brought this issue before this world forum every year since 1954 in the hope that the Assembly would take cognizance of the anxieties and apprehensions of the peoples of the world regarding the dangers. of continued testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and make appropriate recommendations regarding cessation of such tests. As far back as April 2, 1954, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, said in the Indian Parliament-"I have stated publicly our view that these experiments which may have served one and only useful purpose, namely, expose the nature of the horror and the tragedy, even though only partly, should cease. I repeat that to be our considered position and it is our hope that this view and the great concern which is reflected in worldwide opinion will evoke adequate and timely responses. Pending progress towards some solution, full or partial, in respect of prohibition and elimination of these weapons of mass destruction which the General Assembly has affirmed as its earnest desire, the Government would consider among the steps to be taken now and forthwith some sort of what may be called standstill agreement in respect, at least, of these actual explosions even if arrangements about the discontinuance of production and stockpiling must await more substantial agreements among those principally concerned." This proposal for a 'standstill agreement' by our Prime Minister was forwarded for the consideration of the Disarmament Commission. Subsequently, several proposals covering many fields of disarmament were made by our delegation to the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee. Among all these, the one to which we attached special importance, was the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. Unfortunately, all our efforts were of no avail and the sterile discussions in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee inevitably led to virtual dissolution of the Commission. Apart from the proposals that we had made from time to time for the consideration of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, which in those days were the only forums where the questions in the field of disarmament were discussed in any seriousness and to which all proposals made in the Assembly until 1957 were transmitted, my delegation did not lose any opportunity during the sessions of the General Assembly to make some headway towards the goal of cessation of these experimental nuclear explosions.

I need not recall in any detail the main resolutions moved by my delegation at successive sessions of the General Assembly, to further the objective of cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. It is well-known that for some time there was acute controversy on the possibility of detection of nuclear and thermonuclear explosions, despite the consensus of opinion among reputed scientists that most of these were capable of being detected. At the 12th session of the General Assembly, the delegation of India submitted a draft resolution on the question of stopping nuclear tests: In this resolution (document A/C.1/L.176) we suggested among other things the setting up of a scientific and technical commission, which should look into the question of detectability of explosions. Our draft resolution failed to secure approval because of the opposition of certain nuclear powers to our proposal in that resolution for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests without delay. However, the suggestions regarding the technical talks and the detectability of tests found favour and were incorporated in General Assembly resolution 1148 (XII) adopted at the 12th session.

I have said all this, Mr. Chairman, to convey the sense of urgency and purpose, with which my delegation has pursued its efforts to secure the discontinuance of the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. We have not been deterred by setback and failures as we believed that we were persevering in a world cause sustained and supported by world public opinion. And, if I may say so, Mr. Chairman, neither we nor the General Assembly as a whole have any reason to be despondent at the lack of results so far. Indeed, discussions here have not only mirrored the concern and the anxiety of the people of the world in regard to nuclear explosions and the continued possession and manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of mass destructive power even difficult to contemplate, they have in turn educated and stimulated world public opinion and interest. Indeed, these discussions have had their inevitable impact on the

388

powers that have been conducting nuclear and thermonuclear test explosions.

It is not without significance, Mr. Chairman, that the last two years have witnessed a significant advance in this regard. Two conferences have been held on the subject of cessation of nuclear weapons tests. The first, a scientific and technical conference; and the second, a political conference, which is being held in Geneva and is still pursuing its labours, with a view to implementing the findings of the first. Between the 1st July and 21st August 1958, 23 experts from the East and the West met in closed session in Geneva and came to the conclusion that it was technically feasible to establish "a workable and effective control system to detect violations of an agreement on the world-wide suspension of nuclear weapons tests". According to them, even low yield explosions of 5 kilotons or under could be identified by collecting samples of radioactive fall-out by recording seismic, acoustic and hydroacoustic waves, by radio signals and by 'on site' inspection of suspected and unidentified explosions. The Conference recommended the establishment of an international control organ with 160 to 170 land-based control posts and 10 more of water. The political conference in Geneva has, as a result of patient and protracted, and, if I may say so, sincere and skilful negotiations reached a large measure of agreement although some outstanding issue, namely, the staffing of the control posts, the question of 'on site' inspections, and the method of taking decisions in the control commission, still await solution. It is our sincere hope that these negotiations succeed in the evolution of an international agreement which could later be adhered to by all members of the United Nations. At the same time, it seems to us, Mr. Chairman, that in the attainment of these milestones of progress, the United Nations is entitled to take some credit, and that the discussions over the years in the General Assembly have not gone in vain.

The question may be asked, what is the reason for the persistence shown by my delegation ? Mr. Chairman, much can be said on this subject -and has been said-not only during debate, in past years but in the discussions in the Committee on other items concerning Disarmament; in particular there was a fairly full discussion of the dangers arising from nuclear explosions during the debate on the item submitted by Morocco regarding French nuclear tests in the Sahara. It seems to me necessary, however, in a discussion on the subject of nuclear explosions to summarise as briefly as possible, what appear to us conclusive reasons for continued United Nations interest in this subject.

Firstly, nuclear test explosions are intimately connected with disarmament. Until recently some nuclear powers held the view that there could be no cessation of nuclear tests unless and until there was a comprehensive agreement on disarmament. This view has fortunately been modified and now it is generally held that the cessation of nuclear tests though connected with disarmament need not necessarily wait till after a comprehensive agreement in all fields of disarmament. This had indeed been the view of my delegation all along. Test explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, however, are motivated by a desire for increasing re-armament and for perfecting and augmenting the destructive power of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. In this sense, nuclear and thermonuclear. explosions are an ugly and ominous symbol; and without the cessation of test explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons there can be no advance towards the universally desired goal of total and general disarmament, which, only the other day, has been endorsed by the General Assembly with a unanimity and in an atmosphere of hope and goodwill, unparalleled in the history of the United Nations. If the nations of the world, which possess nuclear weapons, and others, which do not possess such weapons, but are in a position to manufacture them now or in the near future, can agree to the cessation or suspension of test explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the first major breakthrough in disarmament will have been made. The establishment of the necessary machinery for inspection and control, and experience of its working, will show the way to the comprehensive controls which must form part of any general and complete disarmament.

Here, may I quote, Mr. Chairman, a statement made by Mr. Wadsworth, the United States representative at the Geneva talks, who is playing such a valuable role in these talks, which expresses the same ideas. Speaking on September 3, 1959 at a news conference, Mr. Wadsworth said : "We should not lose sight of the fact that these conferences are the only hope of establishing a precedent which can be used in negotiations throughout the whole field of disarmament."

Not only is the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear explosions necessary for halting the race for nuclear and thermonuclear armament among the powers that now possess them, but it is equally necessary to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons among other nations. The ate Prof. Einstein used to say that in the not too distant future anyone could manufacture a

389

nuclear bomb in his backyard ! Scientists agree today that at least 10 or 12 nations, besides the present-day nuclear powers, are capable of manufacturing either now or in the near future nuclear weapons; and if no agreement is reached on the cessation of such tests sooner or later there may be test explosions by other powers as a step toward the manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Once such weapons are spread around the world, not only will disarmament become much more difficult but the chances of a nuclear war with total destruction will become immeasurably greater. The measure of support for the resolution on this item brought up by Ireland which was adopted without dissent is a clear indication of the views of the United Nations in this regard.

Secondly, there is the fear arising from nuclear and thermonuclear explosions. This fear, as everyone knows, is real. It is the fear of total destruction likely to be caused by a nuclear and thermonuclear war-destruction not merely of human lives but of all the accumulated culture and achievements of humanity. It is also the fear of the unknown which is sometimes more potent, more insiduous than fear of something which one can lay one's hands on. There is today, no one can doubt, a widespread fear of the effects of the radio-activity released in the nuclear test explosions and of the effects of the nuclear fall-out. We have heard in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, in the discussions on a previous item, views calculated to allay these fears.

Mr. Chairman, detailed figures were given during discussions on another item to show that the increase in radiation caused by nuclear explosions is infinitesimally small compared to the natural radiation to which man is subject. Statistically these figures are not open to question, but can anyone of us, Mr. Chairman, argue from these figures that there is no danger to human health from the increased man-made radiation as a result of the 207 nuclear explosions that have already taken place ? There is difference of opinion among scientists as to the exact extent of the danger and the effects themselves are not fully known, but there is not one responsible body of opinion which asserts that increased radiation from man-made explosions poses no danger to humanity. If ways and means could be found to prevent deaths and damages due to natural radiation, man would do it. In the case of natural radiation, we are faced with a situation where, for the time being at least, we are unable to do very much to ward off the danger. Man made radiation is in an entirely different category and there can be no doubt that neither the occurrence nor the consequences of such radiation can be accepted as inevitable.

What are the known facts about atomic radiation ? Eighteen scientists, Nobel Prize winners of many countries, on 15 July 1955 gave a warning that the use of nuclear weapons might contaminate the world with radio-activity and wipe out entire nations. At the international conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy in 1955 much attention was devoted to the possible genetic effects of radiation on the human race and suggestions were put forward that international organisations should be set up to study the matter and establish standards of radio-biological protection. The consensus of opinion was that although the dangers might not be immediate, quick action should be taken to safeguard the human race against adverse effects of radiation, particularly as regards the possibility of unfavourable genetic mutations.

On 15 February 1955, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in a report on Bikini Hydrogen Bomb test of March 1, 1954, said that there was sufficient radio-activity in the down-wind belt for about 140 miles in length and of varying width upto 20 miles to have seriously threatened the lives of all persons in the area who did not take protective measures.

Addressing the Royal Society for Health in England, Prof. Gordon Fair of Harvard said : "Present figures indicate that fall out from weapons tests before 1957 accounted for the birth of between 2500 and 13000 genetically defective children and between 25,000 and 100,000 cases of Leukemia and bone-tumor considered altogether."

The report of the U.N. Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation, to which reference has been made in this Committee very frequently, also states that an estimated total of 2500 to 100,000 genetic defects will occur over subsequent years from tests already held.

The U.S. official publication "The Summary Analysis of the Public Hearings" held from May 5 to May 8, 1959, by the Special Sub-Committee on Radiation of the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy, on fall out from nuclear weapons tests, says : "It was generally agreed that in considering acceptable exposure limits in the context of worldwide environmental contamination from fall out, the best assumption that can be made at present concerning the relationship of biological effect to radiation dose is to assume that any dose, however small, produces some biological effect and that this effect is harmful."

390

Many more quotations of scientific views might be made but I do not wish to burden the Committee with such quotations. Suffice it to say that responsible bodies like the Federation of American Scientists, the British Medical Research Council, the U. S. Academy of Sciences and others have voiced concern at the genetic and other effects of radiation and nuclear fall out.

I have mentioned these facts to show that even though the extent of the danger or damage caused radiation or nuclear fall out may be a matter of controversy, the danger is still there and cannot be ignored, and irrespective of how many people might be affected, world opinion and indeed the General Assembly cannot for a moment approve the continuance of the nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. No nation has the right to cause genetic or other damage to the human species, irrespective of whether they are its own nationals or not.

I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the moral challenge offered by the whole question of nuclear explosions. What is the nature of this challenge ? The challenge, Mr. Chairman, is nothing less than that of survival of human race. This cannot be put in more precise or moving words than those used by the scientists' appeal for renunciation of war, made by the late Prof. Albert Einstein and 8 other world famous scientists. The appeal said, inter alia : "In the tragic situation which confronts humanity we feel that the scientists should assemble in a conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction and to discuss a resolution

"We are speaking not as members of this or that nation, continent, or creed, but as human beings, members of the species Man, whose continued existence is in doubt

"It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death-sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

"Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realised......

"Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful and inescapable : Shall we put an end to the human race ; or shall mankind renounce war ?"

The scientists' appeal, to which I have referred, concludes : "There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge, and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death because we cannot forget our quarrels ? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings : Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise ; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.

Mr. Chairman, this is the great challenge of our time - the supreme challenge of the spirit. Shall man have the wisdom to use the tremendous power placed in his hands by the discovery of atomic power to make this planet a world of happiness and plenty, or will he, in wanton folly use nuclear power for committing mass suicide and the destruction of the human race ?

This, Mr. Chairman, is the challenge that we are facing today. Nuclear and thermonuclear tests are but a facet of this great challenge, since these are a symbol of nuclear war. We of the United Nations are placed in a position of privilege and responsibility. The way we attempt to answer it will be inscribed in the pages of history. I hope, for the sake of us all, that we shall face the challenge in the right way.

Having said all this, Mr. Chairman, to emphasise the great importance of the subject before us, and the approach of my delegation in bringing it up before the United Nations, we would like to make it clear that my delegation has a sense of satisfaction at the earnest efforts being made in Geneva to reach a final and definitive agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests with effective international control. We wish to pay a tribute to the patience and the earnestness of purpose and perseverance of the three great powers, the U.K., the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., which are participating in the Geneva discussions. It is our earnest hope that these discussions reach a satisfactory conclusion and that the remaining points of difference are resolved very soon. The omens are good. Agreement for the cessation of nuclear tests should be facilitated in the new atmosphere of understanding among the great powers. If agreement is reached the world will have a sigh of relief and we shall enter a new era of hope and confidence for the future of nations.

It may be asked why we have thought fit to bring this subject before the United Nations again when the Geneva discussions are already in progress and promise results. I can assure the members of the Committee that we have done

391

so to help and not to hinder the negotiations in Geneva. Our task is to reinforce and not to undermine the efforts that are being made. We sincerely feel that the question of suspension of nuclear tests is an issue of such great importance that the United Nations must remain continuously seized of it. It is our intention that the United Nations General Assembly by its resolution and through an appropriate expression of opinion record appreciation for the efforts being made by the nuclear powers in Geneva to reach agreement on the suspension of tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons under a system of effective international control, and we wish the Powers goodspeed in their efforts to reach agreement in this regard.

It is also our intention that we should appeal

to the powers to continue their present voluntary suspension of tests; and that not only the three nuclear powers who at present are in a position to conduct such tests but all other States should desist from undertaking such tests, even if they should have the capability of doing so. Such appeal might have looked unpractical a couple of years ago, but 1959 is different. The success already achieved in the negotiations and the proximity of eventual complete agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests makes such an appeal not only entirely practical but timely, natural and desirable, as well as urgent and imperative. We believe that the discussions in the United Nations General Assembly will contribute to the realisation of the great objective of prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. It is in this spirit that we have co-sponsored, along with others, the resolution before the Committee which embodies these ideas.

INDIA USA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND MOROCCO IRELAND UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in Special Political Committee on Report of U. N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.

Shri C.S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made a statement in the Special Political Committee on November 19, 1959, on the Report of the U.N. Relief & Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.

The following is the full text of the statement :

Mr. Chairman:

Once again the problem of Palestine refugees is before us. A problem of long standing, its origin

lies in the upheavals that took place in Palestine in the years 1947-48 following the decision of the United Nations to partition Palestine and to create the State of Israel-upheavals which. need not have taken place if wiser counsels had prevailed. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the proposals which my delegation had then sponsored providing for the establishment of a federated Arab State with autonomous Arab and Jewish regions in Palestine. This proposal we shall never cease to regret, did not find favour. We believe that it would have been the wisest solution, would have preserved the peace and stability in the Middle East and saved us from facing the problem of Palestine Refugees and many other headaches. It would have enabled the Arabs and Jews of Palestine to play a worthy role in the national life of their own country and in the life of the Middle East and contribute to its stability and prosperity.

In 1947-48, Mr. Chairman, a million Arabs were forced to leave their homelands and seek shelter in neighbouring countries across the borders of Palestine. They were indeed the majority of the then population of Palestine and the very fact that they were forced by circumstances to leave their hearths and homes is indication of the intensity of the upheavals and the resultant passions and emotions and tragedies. The refugees have remained during all these years a seething mass of discontented population, unreconciled to their plight and longing to return to their native land.

From the very beginning, the United Nations recognised their responsibility for the refugees. It was in consequence of such recognition that Resolutions No. 194 and No. 212 of the Third Session were adopted. Under the latter, a Director of United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees was appointed, and in paragraph I I of the oft-quoted Resolution 194 (III) the United Nations resolved that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest possible date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible, and it instructed the Conciliation Committee on Palestine to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and

economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the Director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine refugees.

392

By Resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949, the General Assembly declared that, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of the General Assembly Resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, continued assistance for the relief of Palestine refugees was necessary to prevent conditions of starvation and distress among them and to further conditions of peace and stability, and that constructive measures should be undertaken at an early date with a view to the termination of international assistance for relief, The organisation for relief for Palestine refugees was set up in terms of this Resolution under the control of a Director, and he has been making annual reports to the United Nations on the nature and progress of his work within the terms of his mandate as laid down in Resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949.

Since that time, the report of the Director of United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East has figured on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly every year and appropriate resolutions have been adopted. The control theme of all these resolutions, apart from details, has been to recall Resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 and Resolution 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949, and subsequent resolutions connected therewith, and to emphasise that the resolutions and recommendations adopted were without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of Resolution 194 (III) or to the provisions of Resolution 393 (V). These resolutions have also made it clear that the continuation of the United Nations agency for relief of Palestine refugees was necessary because "repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph II of Resolution 194 had not been effected, and that the situation of the refugees continued to be a matter of great concern". This is a quotation from Resolution 818 (IX) which is the one which decided to extend the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East for five years ending 30 June 1960.

The essence of these resolutions, Mr. Chairman, is that the United Nations have steadfastly stood by the principles laid down in paragraph 11 of their Resolution 194 (III) and. that they have recognised the continued United Nations responsibility for the relief of the refugees until repatriation or compensation is provided for in terms of that paragraph.

The distinguished representative of Israel has argued that paragraph 11 of Resolution 194 (III) does not confer unconditional right of return. Varying interpretations are possible on any formal document and we have no desire to enter into a legal argument about the meaning of paragraph 11 of Resolution 194 (III). The plain meaning of the text of that resolution and subsequent resolutions adopted by the United Nations to which I have made reference, seems to us that it was clearly the intention of the United Nations that the refugees should be given the choice of either returning or not returning to their homes with compensation for the loss or damage to property, and that whatever choice they made should be respected. There was no qualification placed on either the exercise of the choice or the acceptance of it, except of course that it shall be freely and voluntarily made, which is an inherent aspect of any free choice, and that those wishing to return to their homes should be willing to live at peace with their neighbours. This last qualification seems to our delegation to be wholly reasonable because we believe that refugees who wish to return to their homelands in Israel must be prepared to live peacefully as good citizens. This point has been made clear in statements on behalf of my delegation in previous years. Subject to these qualifications, we believe, Mr. Chairman, that the intention of the United Nations which has been repeatedly expressed in its resolutions is quite clear.

To our delegation, the problem of the Palestine refugees is one of the greatest importance Anyone who has lived in the Middle East or visited the areas where the refugees are housed in camps and has observed and studied the Middle Eastern situation knows that the problem of Palestine refugees is not merely an intensely human problem; it is also one of great political importance and indeed affects the entire complex of political relations in the Middle East. It cannot be treated in isolation and purely in terms of economic rehabilitation. It is an inseparable element of the whole Middle Eastern situation. It is not for us, in the consideration of the item before us, to go into political aspects in any detail or to try to find solutions thereof solutions which have baffled efforts for over a decade. We have to confine ourselves to the problem of what to do after 30 June 1960 when the present mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East expires.

It seems to us inevitable that the Agency should be continued. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that after assuming responsibility for the Palestine refugees in a certain context, the United Nations cannot, after 30 June 1960, cease all interest in the welfare and relief of the refugees, when there has been no fulfilment of the conditions laid down in paragraph 11 of Resolution 194

393

(III). There can be no departure from the basic stand of the United Nations regarding the future of the refugees as contained in that resolution and reaffirmed over the years. It is abundantly clear from the latest report of the Director of the Agency that the plight of the refugees continues to be us miserable as before. Not only on the basis of human considerations is the continuation of the Agency justified and desirable, but as the Director has pointed out, quite rightly, the Agency has helped to maintain a climate in which the forces that can and will solve the problem in its various aspects and work effectively. If nothing else, it has kept the-refugee problem from boiling over and seriously endangering the peace and tranquillity in the Middle East. At the same time, the intensely human problem of the refugees continues. As the Director points out, and I quote : "The relief given to refugees, indispensable though it has been, supplies only their basic needs. It does little to satisfy the aspirations of the adult mind or to challenge the creative talents that exist. The life of the refugees continues to be one of hardship and disappointment. Their standard of living is meagre; their opportunities for selfadvancement almost non-existent; and their hope of repatriation and for compensation appears no closer to realisation today than when first held out to them by the General Assembly eleven years ago". He further says: "It is a means for alleviating human suffering and augmenting stability in the

Middle East while forces that will shape the future of the area are at work-forces that in time will, among other things, resolve the Palestine refugee problem".

These are the considerations which provide a justification for the continuance of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency even though it entails considerable expenditure and is a burden on many members of the United Nations.

As I have indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, if it were merely a question of resettling a million refugees in certain areas, the problem though onerous would not have been of such difficulty and severity. We in our country have succeeded in settling and reintegrating nearly nine million refugees who came into India-and some are still coming in-as a consequence of the partition of India. In ordinary circumstances it might have been possible in time to settle the problem by purely economic methods, but that in the case of the Palestine refugees seems impossible. In fact, any attempt to do so could bring great danger to the peace and stability of the Middle East. It we are to believe the numerous and successive reports of Directors of the Agency and of all observers, the refugees are unreconciled to their plight and continue to display, by and large, an intense longing and determination to return to their homelands.

All this is not to say that we minimise the importance of the human consideration in this problem. The Relief and Works Agency has over the years done admirable work in many fields and the host Governments themselves have home a great deal of responsibility, particularly in the matter of education. In particular, it is gratifying to note that by December 30 of this year the last tents housing the refugees will disappear; the facilities for vocational training which had to be curtailed in 1957 have been resumed and extended in 1959; and that it has been possible to arrange for school education of practically all refugee children of school-going age. Many Governments have made munificent contributions: my own Government fully recognising the nature of the problem and moved by humanitarian considerations has made contributions, both in cash and in kind. It has not been possible for us to make more than token contributions because of India's own colossal expenditure towards the rehabilitation and resettlement of its own over nine million refugees. Our sympathy for the Palestine refugees continues and we hope that in the not-toodistant future conditions of peace and harmony in the Middle East will prevail which, among other things, will provide the solvent for the Palestine refugee problem. The first step in the creation of these conditions might well be a sincere and objective attempt to implement faithfully the oft-repeated paragraph 11 of General Assembly Resolution 194 (III), to which all Members of the United Nations have subscribed over the years. Given the goodwill and good faith, this, like any other task, is not impossible of fulfilment.

Meanwhile the United Nations Relief and Works Agency has to continue. In the words of the Secretary-General, this has to be for all time and to all the extent necessary.

INDIA USA ISRAEL PERU

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Letter to President of Security Council

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on November 12, 1959 :

I have been instructed by the Government

394

of India to invite Your Excellency's attention to the following report which has appeared in the Pakistan press and has not been contradicted by the Government of Pakistan :

"AZAD KASHMIR GOVERNMENT TO SELL

STATE PROPERTY IN WEST PAKISTAN

(From Our Lahore Correspondent)

Oct. 10: The Azad Kashmir Government has decided to sell by open auction all property belonging to Jammu and Kashmir State in different parts of West Pakistan. The property includes both residential buildings and agricultural land. its value is estimated at more than rupees two crores (Rupees twenty million)". (Words in brackets added).

(Morning News, Dacca, 12 October 1959)

As Your Excellency and the members of the Council are aware, the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, which is a constituent State of the Indian Union, is the only lawful Government of the State. This was clearly stated by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan both. in its resolutions of 13 August 1948, and 5 January 1949, which India and Pakistan accepted, and in the assurances which it gave to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the Security Council. The following quotation from paragraph 69 of the First Interim Report of the Commission will make it clear that the United Nations Commission categorically refused to recognize the so-called Government of Azad Kashmir:

"During the 29th meeting, held on 5 August, the Commission discussed the (Pakistan) Foreign Minister's statement and agreed that it should avoid any action which might be interpreted as signifying de facto or de jure recognition of the 'Azad Kashmir Government'." (Words in brackets added).

As a matter of fact, the then Pakistan Foreign Minister, Sir Mohd. Zafrullah Khan, solemnly assured the Commission that even the Government of Pakistan had "not granted legal recognition to the Azad "Government" in view of the implications which might ensue" (S/1100, paragraph 132).

Neither the Government of Pakistan nor the so-called Azad Kashmir Government, have any legal right to sell these properties of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir which are valued at rupees five crores (Rupees fifty million). The proposed sale, if persisted in, will be an unlawful and fraudulent transaction in violation of the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948, and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949.

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

INDIA PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri H. Dayal's Statement on Report of U. N. Commission for Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea

Shri Harishwar Dayal, member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Political Committee on November 26, 1959 on the Report of the U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

The following is the full text of his statement

The fact that this item has been appearing upon our agenda year after year is a tragic reminder that Korea and the Korean people have not yet recovered from the devastation of the Second World War.

It is customary for my delegation to begin by informing the Committee of the status of the former prisoners of war who wished to settle in neutral countries and who were brought to India from Korea with the Custodian Force in February 1954. This was a residual responsibility assumed by India by reason of the fact that we had presided over the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. There were 88 such ex-prisoners, comprising 74 whose homes were in North Korea, 2 South Koreans and 12 Chinese. They were placed in a camp established by the Government of India and maintained there pending their departure for other countries or resettlement in India.

In accordance with their wishes, 55 of these ex-prisoners have been sent to Brazil, 2 to China, 6 to North Korea and 14 to Argentina, leaving 11 still in India. Five of these have opted to remain in India and have been given employment. The remaining 6 are men who were not accepted by the country to which they wished to go. Five of them have been or are being resettled with financial and other assistance from the Government of India. The remaining one, the last of the original 88, is reported to be mentally deranged and continues to

395

be looked after by the Indian authorities. With this, the disposal of these ex-prisoners has for all practical purposes been completed, and the camp set up for them was closed in September of this year.

I come now to the substance of the matter before the Committee. My delegation has studied the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and has given due attention to the debate in this Committee. We are bound to say, with regret, that we have found nothing in the report or in the course of the debate so far to cause us to hope that the lines on which we are proceeding will lead to an early realization of the common objective of us all. And it is useful to remember that there is a common objective, namely, the reunification of Korea under a government based upon the freely expressed will of all the people of Korea.

It is the will of all the people that has to be expressed, and my delegation consider it unfortunate that the Committee has once again denied itself the opportunity of hearing a representative of the regime operating in North Korea, namely the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, along with the representative of the other part of the country, the Republic of Korea. It is not as if the United Nations has at all times refused to have anything to do with the North Korean authorities. It has negotiated with them for an armistice and for the disposal of prisoners of war. Both before and since the war in Korea, the United Nations and Commissions and other bodies set up under its authority have made contact, or attempted to make contact, with the Government of North Korea. We are convinced that the future of Korea cannot be effectively discussed, still less can any solutions for the present divisions and difficulties be found, in the absence of the Government responsible for more than half the area and nearly a third of the population of Korea.

We are equally convinced that no solution is likely to come out of a simple reiteration of previous resolutions of the General Assembly. We hold to this view although we have no doubt that the United Nations has the responsibility for working towards the reunification and rehabilitation of Korea. Nevertheless, as a practical matter we cannot ignore the difficulties of approach that have arisen from the fact that the North Korean Government has been at war with a United Nations force and has refused to cooperate with a Commission composed of representatives of countries whose troops have been fighting under the banner of the United Nations. My delegation has pointed out on previous occasions that the United Nations has at no time exercised authority or supervision over the whole territory of Korea. If we are to escape from the present deadlock, there has to be a step forward from the present fixed positions. Some form of international supervision of elections, for instance, other than that now proposed to us, can, we think, be devised.

There is also the matter of foreign troops in Korea. My delegation has learnt with satisfaction of the withdrawal of the Chinese People's volunteers. We are of the view that the withdrawal from the other part of the country of the forces under the United Nations flag, whose number is already much reduced, might be helpful to progress towards political solutions. There are other ways of maintaining an armistice. The Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission played a useful role in the early stages in Korea. Elsewhere, we have other instances of international supervision of cease-fire and armistice arrangements.

There remains the economic aspect of the Korean problem. It continues to be a matter of regret to my delegation that the operations of the United Nations even in this field have to be restricted to only one part of the country. Statements made here have claimed superior economic as well as social and political progress for each part as compared with the other, and it is said that progress on one side is matched by misery on the other. In our opinion, progress in all fields can best be made if the problems of the country are treated as a whole and the present unnatural division eliminated. We look forward also to the day when altered circumstances may make it possible to apply all assistance from abroad to purely productive purposes.

It follows from what I have said that my delegation does not feel able to support the fourteen-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.245. It will also be unable to support any other proposal which might be put forward that might have the effect of freezing the present division of Korea. It should not be thought that our abstention is based upon indifference to the future of the Korean people or to the practical realities of the situation. I might remind the Committee that my country has from time to time been called upon to play a part in Korean affairs. India provided the Chairman of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea which was set up at the second session of he General Assembly to facilitate the establishment, through elections, of a national government Korea and to arrange the withdrawal of the then occupying the forces, and which unfortunately was

396

able to function in only a part of the country.

In the years immediately following, India was elected to two new Commissions charged with the peaceful unification of Korea. In 1950, India participated as a member of the Security Council in the Council's decisions after the outbreak of hostilities. We provided a military medical unit for service with the United Nations in Korea. India was a member of General Assembly's Cease-Fire Group in 1950-51, and at the seventh session of the General Assembly introduced the resolution that led to the Armistice. At a later stage, India became Chairman of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission; and I have already spoken of measures taken for the resettlement of some of the prisoners of war.

So it is from no position of indifference or

detachment that my delegation comes to the conclusion that a solution of the problems of Korea will emerge only, when korea ceases to be an item in the general complex of great-Power disagreements in Fast Asia and throughout the world. But, as I have said, on one thing at least there is no disagreement, and that is the objective of a unified, democratic and prosperous Korea. That objective, we feel, can be achieved with goodwill, if the Korean people can be assisted to work out their own solutions.

INDIA KOREA USA NORTH KOREA BRAZIL CHINA ARGENTINA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Venkataraman's Statement in Trusteeship Committee

Shri R. Venkataraman, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Committee on November 25, 1959, on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The following is the full text of the statement

Mr. Chairman,

I join in the tributes paid to the Chairman of the Committee, the distinguished representative of Australia and the Chairman of the Sub-Committee, the distinguished representative of Ceylon and naturally thank the delegations for their kind references to the Rapporteur from India.

The item which we are now discussing arises from the information that is transmitted by members of the Organisation who administer dependent Territories. The scope of this information is restricted to the fields of social, economic and educational conditions prevailing in these Territories. In the examination of this information, it is often overlooked that article 73 (e) is only one part of Chapter XI of the Charter which must necessarily be read as a whole. While information is submitted under the provisions of Section (e) of article 73, any fruitful examination of that information can take place only in the light of the objectives of chapter XI as a whole.

In terms of Article 73, Administering Members have responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government. These members recognise the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these Territories are paramount and they accept as a "SACRED TRUST" the obligation to promote the well being of these inhabitants "within the system of international peace and security". Part (b) of article 73 goes on to define the principal objective of Chapter XI viz. "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions".

If, therefore, article 73 (e) asks for the submission of information in respect of these Territories only in the functional fields, that does not mean-it cannot be interpreted to mean that in the examination of that information we are to ignore or set aside questions relating to the advancement of dependent peoples in the political field. Rather, we have to assess the significance of the information submitted by Administering Members in relation to the progress made in the direction of the achievement of the principal objective, namely, self-government or independence.

It is hardly necessary to stress the interrelationship of social, educational, economic and political conditions. It is unrealistic today for any one to assert that politically submerged inhabitants of dependent Territories need nothing more than a little economic advancement, a little social encouragement or a few universities and schools. The views of non-administering countries on this subject are likely to be brushed aside by some Administering Members as unpractical talk. We, therefore, prefer to draw the attention of Administering Powers to what their own representatives or citizens feel or say about this matter. If we refer them to the views of their own people, we do so not with a view to scoring a debating point but because we genuinely feel that the expansion of freedom in dependent Territories is due as much to the liberal ideas cherished by the progressive sections of the populations of colonial

397

countries as to the struggles of the colonised peoples. Our attention, Mr. Chairman has been drawn to the annual report of the Chairman of the Rhodesian Selection Trust, Sir Ronald L. Prain, who is the Chairman of, perhaps, the most powerful copper combine in Africa. In this report, Mr. Prain says, and I quote: "that economic development alone will prevent the emergence of political problems has been amply demonstrated in other African Territories to be a fallacy It is clear that to Africans political and social advances are just as important as economic advances if not more so.

In recent months we have witnessed serious disturbances in the Congo under Belgian Administration, in Nyasaland and in other Territories. The Parliamentary Enquiry Commission established by the Belgian Government following the disturbances last year and earlier this year in the Congo stated that among the causes which led to the disturbances in that Territory were the low-level of human relations, the differences in wages and salaries of the White Europeans on the one hand and the indigenous people on the other, the arbitrary and discriminatory labour legislation, and the slow application of political reforms. It is obvious, therefore, that even the much proclaimed social, economic and educational development in that Territory had not kept pace with the aspirations of the people and that its inadequacy has given rise to political troubles of a serious nature. Political conditions apart, here we have examples of vast Territories on the continent of Africa, in which provisions of Articles I and 55 of the Charter, in the light of which the Committee on Information is authorised to examine the information submitted by Administering Members, continue to be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that some Administering Authorities persist in their refusal to submit political information to the General Assembly to enable its Committee on Information to examine the other information submitted under Article 73 in a proper perspective. While we commend the voluntary submission of information of a political and constitutional character by some of the Administering Authorities, we would urge upon other Administering Authorities also to submit such information. At the appropriate time in the proceedings of the Committee my delegation proposes to submit a resolution for the Assembly's consideration with regard to this matter.

I should like to say here how much my delegation regrets the fact that the Government of Belgium has thus far withheld its cooperation in the work of the Committee on Information established by the General Assembly, and we hope very much that Belgium will find itself in a position to send representatives to the 11th session of that Committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is the intention of my delegation to intervene in the various sub-items that we have before us. In this general statement, however, I would like to comment briefly on the various aspects of the Report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories.

In its report to the Tenth Session of the General Assembly, the Committee had summed up one of the directive principles of policy to be adopted in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the following words :

"To bring to every community a vision of a better way of life which, by their own efforts, they could build for themselves."

The Committee on Information had defined this principle in relation to the policies and programmes of Administering Powers in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the field of their social advancement. Education being the most important and effective means of the advancement of a society, this aim is equally applicable to educational policies.

If the orderly development of these Territories towards independence and self-government is to continue unhindered, educational activities in these Territories will need to be considerably expanded and intensified almost immediately. We are not unaware of the difficulties, both financial and administrative faced by those who are responsible for the formulation and implementation of educational policies in Non-Self-Governing Territories. We have been, and are now, face to face with these difficulties in our own country. We appreciate the efforts that the Administering Powers are making to achieve the objectives of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories enunciated by the General Assembly in its Resolution 743 (VIII). Nevertheless, despite notable progress in some individual territories, the progress on the whole in the sphere of education has fallen far short of the needs of the people of their passionate desire for education and of the pace at which Non-Self-Governing Territories are moving towards the realisation of the goal of self-government or independence under the impact of modem world conditions.

We are glad to see that in some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly those

398

under the administration of the United States of America, educational progress has been spectacular. A few decades ago there was nothing in these territories to distinguish them from the rest of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the matter of educational advancement. Today in these territories primary education is free and compulsory; secondary education, technical and vocational education are available to the inhabitants free of cost and in adequate measure; and higher education, not only in the academic field but also in the professional fields, such as medicine, technology and engineering, has made rapid strides.

Impressive progress has been achieved, especially in the field of primary education, in the Australian Territory of Papua. Papua is, perhaps the only territory where not only education imparted by the State but also by Missionary organisations is completely free. This is an example which deserves special mention and emulation by other Administering Authorities.

In terms of numbers, comparatively speaking, the task was easier in the territories under New Zealand administration, but we are impressed by the zeal and success with which the Administering Authority has tackled this task, and we are happy to note that educational policies and programmes of the Administering Authority in. the Cook Islands, in the Niue Islands and the Tokelau Islands have evoked the enthusiasm and the support of the people for whose benefit they were intended.

My delegation is not unconscious of the genuine, sustained and well-intentioned efforts which the United Kingdom is making for the expansion and development of educational facilities, especially in the primary field, in Territories under its administration and control. These efforts are bearing fruit in Nigeria, where the formulation and implementation of educational policies are now largely in the hands of indigenous authorities. But on the whole, government programmes and plans for the dissemination of education are only now beginning to assume tangible proportions. My delegation was glad to bear the statement made by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom yesterday. He has given an account of the programmes and policies for which credit is due to the Administering Authority. On the other hand, we cannot help feeling that the picture, as a whole, of the educational advancement in Territories under the United Kingdom Administration, is not particularly bright, There is hardly a Territory in which primary education is either free or compulsory or both.

In Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights it is stated that "everyone has the right to education; that education should be free at least in the elementary and fundamental stages and that elementary education shall be compulsory " In some Territories under United Kingdom administration primary education is, in fact, exorbitantly expensive as in the Territory of Fiji. That is, in varying degree, true of numerous other dependent Territories.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom gave some facts and figures about the education of girls and women. There has been some considerable progress in this direction-especially in the primary field where the percentage of girls students sometimes exceeds 50. High as these percentages are, in total numbers they are less significant as total enrolment of pupils in relation to the total number of boys and girls of school-going age is rather low. It is gratifying to note that at long last the first African woman from Kenya had qualified as a registered nurse in the United Kingdom. I suppose there is a 100 per cent increase in the number of nurses. Mr. Chairman. India is one of those countries which has from time immemorial believed in the essential equality of women with men, and has regarded the basic education of women in religious and domestic matters as of the highest importance. It is our considered view that no country can continue its forward march if its women are not educated. We can hardly overemphasise the need for paying greater attention in Non-Self-Governing Territories especially those of Africa to the promotion of education of women. Without going into great detail at this stage, I would merely draw this Committee's attention to the measures recommended in the 1953 report of the Committee on Information for the rapid development of educational facilities for women, which have been reiterated in the Report before us.

About secondary, higher secondary and university education, my delegation expressed some detailed views during the 10th session of the Committee on Information. We shall cover some of the ground over again in our statement on the Report of the Committee on Information. Here I would merely like to say that in our view the facilities for secondary education need to be multiplied many times almost in every dependent Territory.

The facilities for the education of workersboth in the fields of agriculture and industry-are more or less completely non-existent, and need to be developed. Of special importance is the

399

education of union representatives in the techniques of trade-union organisation, management and financing and education of union members for their intelligent participation in union affairs, should be undertaken. Schemes of training teachers for workers' education should be prepared and implemented. Such programmes can be financed through Government grants, trade union contributions, employers' contributions, contributions in kind in the shape of classrooms, libraries and teachers etc. from educational institutions and grants from funds consisting of unpaid wages, fines and canteen profits etc. The International Labour Orrganisation has commendable schemes and the Administering Authorities should seek their guidance in promoting workers' education.

With regard to higher education, we would stress the need of what the Secretariat in paragraph 64 of its paper A/AC. 35/L. 299 described as the "systematic policies of Africanisation" of education. While bursaries and scholarships for study abroad are useful and fill a gap, it is to be regretted that with the exception of the University of Dakar there is not a single university in any of the African Territories. The representative of United Kingdom had mentioned that some 3000 students from Non-Self-Governing Territories were studying in the United Kingdom. We do not deny the significance of that number. But apart from the fact that of this number some 2000 students had gone to the United Kingdom at their own expenses, experience in Nigeria and elsewhere shows that only a very small number of these foreign educated students may be expected to return to the service of their respective countries ; for the education they receive abroad is ill-adopted to their needs owing to the fundamental differences between highly-developed countries. We would, therefore, urge that every effort should be made to establish two or three small universities, each having 4 or 5 faculties, in some of the larger African territories.

I do not say this to minimize the importance of education abroad. Facilities for advanced studies-especially in scientific and technical education-that are available in the more advanced countries of the West will be needed by the inhabitants in dependent Territories and other under-developed countries for some time. Moreover, the programmes of bursaries and scholarship for study abroad are, in themselves, useful as an interim measure. We would, therefore, like to see all member states pool their resources and offer as many scholarships to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories as possible. I might, perhaps, mention that under its Cultural Scholarship Scheme for the year 1959/60 my government has been able to offer 56 scholarships to the inhabitants of Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar, Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, British West Indies, British Guinea, Trinidad, Aden, Fiji, Mauritius, Nigeria and Madagascar, of which 49 scholarships have been utilized. We hope that the scholarships offered by other governments will be equally well availed of.

Mr. Chairman, on the chapters dealing with

social and economic conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Committee's report also my delegation will make a separate statement at the appropriate time in our proceedings. I would, therefore, confine myself to a few general observations at this stage.

First of all the methods of cyclic examination adopted by the Committee disables it, much to our regret, from giving adequate consideration to the developments in the remaining two fields every year. While we recognize the difficulties which led to the adoption of this method of examination of information, we cannot help feeling that it is an unsatisfactory method. I would, therefore, reiterate the suggestion my delegation made in the Committee on information that the Specialized Agencies should jointly prepare every year two or three brief studies for the Committee on the two fields other than the one which comes up for full discussion. In this connection my delegation desires to reiterate the suggestion it made on a prior occasion, namely that the Economic Commission for Africa may lend its cooperation to the work of the Committee by sending their representative to the Committee and submitting their observation on economic development in these territories. Simultaneously with that we would also request the Administering Authorities to inform the Committee at its successive sessions of the concrete measures that their administrations have adopted to implement the suggestions and recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee on Information of the preceding years. It is, perhaps, not enough to know that these reports were forwarded to the Administrations of Non-Self-Governing Territories : What this Committee would be interested to learn is the degree to which the recommendations of these reports have been put into effect in each succeeding year.

Though there is some evidence of a limited progress in the elimination of racial discrimination and racial policies in the fields of economic, social and educational development of these territories, the present position is far from satisfactory and much yet remains to be done in that direction. In the Committee on Information

400

my delegation bad drawn attention to the

glaring disparities in the allocation of funds for the education of different racial groups. In Kenya, for example, in 1956-1957 about œ 880,000 sterling had been allocated for the education of the children of 63,000 Europeans, whereas the 6 million Africans had been allowed only œ 12,130,000. Thus the United Kingdom had failed to respect the. Committee's recommendation, made as early as 195C, that where separate systems existed, each sector of the population should receive a fair share of the available funds. In fact, the small European community was at the present time receiving the lion's share of such funds. The organization of education on racial lines has tended to develop prejudices against technical and vocational education. When a European community is given education of the academic type aiming at turning out qualified personnel for high administrative jobs the impression is created that the technical and vocational education offered to an indigenous community for different purposes is intended to exclude that community from professions of greater importance, and is therefore an education of an inferior type. The situation is aggravated when an agricultural institution like the Egerton Agricultural College of Kenya, where a superior type of agricultural education is imparted is reserved exclusively for Europeans. Prejudices are further perpetrated when an indigenous person with qualifications equal to a European counterpart is called by a different name and designation in the same professional field. The FAO has, pointed out in one of its studies, that while a European officer with certain training is designated an Assistant Agricultural Officer, an African with equal training is referred to as a Field Officer. It is FAO's view that this is a minor point, but it is our conviction that this is a point of major psychological importance since discrimination between two persons of equal qualifications but different races cannot but aggravate prejudice.

Mr. Chairman, it is our considered view that on no ground whatsoever, can the principle of racial education be justified. Racial discrimination results from, and, in turn, creates political discrimination. It serves to keep the communities and races apart by solidifying the barriers to the understanding which should result from membership of common educational institutions and providing equal opportunities to all. History has proved that no one race is nearer to God than any other and that no race as a whole is superior or inferior to the other. Discrimination on the grounds of race in any matter can only precipitate strife. Racial discrimination in the field of education can only perpetuate racial division, and thereby aggravate such strife. And yet in the Congo, as in the Central African Federation, in Kenya and in Uganda and in numerous other territories, education continues to be organized on racial lines.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has time and again in this Committee suggested that the Administering Authorities concerned should endeavour to establish comprehensive plans in all fields of development of these Territories with stages and tentative time-tables for the accomplishment of there stages duly specified. While in some territories there are five-year and tenyear education plan or plans of general development in which the implementation of educational measures is taken care of, in most territories measures for the expansion of primary, secondary, technical, vocational and higher education are adopted on an ad hoc basis. Our own experience in India has confirmed the view that we have so often expressed that progress is much more satisfactory and much more easily achieved in any field when it is systematically planned ahead. The aim of educational policies in most territories is the introduction of free and compulsory primary education. While the progress in the various fields of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories is characterized by a remarkable variety, there seems to be general agreement on this point, namely, the introduction of free and compulsory education. We would, therefore, strongly urge that all Administering Authorities adopt as the Committee on Information has recommended, time-tables for the attainment of each particular stage on the path towards free and compulsory primary education both for men and women in all Non-Self-Governing Territories.

I feel that I should once again, stress on behalf of my delegation the important mutual link between educational, social and economic advancement and political responsibility. More education and better education mean better base for political advance and greater acceleration towards self-government. At the same time, the larger the responsibility of the people, the greater will be the stimulus for education and the more accelerated will the spread of education become. The processes of devolution of political responsibility on the people and the development of education or of economy, must, therefore, go hand in hand. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that the increased participation of people leading to an early entrustment of responsibility for education for social and economic development on elected

401

Ministers is a necessary and urgent further steps in all Non-Self-Governing Territories. We therefore, attach very special importance to section III of the Sub-Committee report on educational conditions and would commend that part of the report in particular to the urgent attention of all Administering Authorities.

Mr. Chairman, it is one of the greatest tragedies of our time that two of the largest African territories, namely, Angola and Mozambique, and a few smaller territories, which are Non-Self-Governing Territories in every sense of the phrase, are not so regarded by the colonial power that administers them by a few friends of that power. They are regarded as part of Portugal itself. In spite of all the legalism and tenacity with which this view is maintained, our delegation considers that the myth of such territories forming part of the metropolitan country cannot obscure the real fact of their being no different from a colony. In the absence of the information which ought to be submitted to the United Nations under Article 73 of the Charter by a colonial power which is a member of the United Nations, we can only extend our sympathies to the peoples of these territories who in this latter half of the Twentieth Century continue to bear the yoke of colonialism and tosuffer exploitation in speechless sorrow.

At an appropriate stage in our deliberations we intend, along with several other like minded delegations, to submit proposals to the Committee which will enable the Assembly to remove the existing anomalous position with regard to these Territories. We regret that so far the Assembly has not been able to take effective action to bring these Territories, like other colonial territories, into the purview of Chapter XI of the Charter. Viewed either in the light of the Factors Resolution adopted by the Assembly at its 8th session or in the prevailing context of Africa and Asia today, these Territories cannot be regarded as different from colonies. You may call them what you will, but colonies, by any other name, remain colonies. The sacred trust and the principles mentioned in Chapter XI of the Charter apply as much to these Territories as to any other. We cannot, therefore, sit here year after year and ignore the voices of these people which try to reach us but are prevented from reaching us by juridical and constitutional adumbrations which are prepounded to us. On the eve of the 6th decade of the 20th century, it is not good enough for us, who are members of the United Nations and are signatories to its Charter who hold aloft the torch of liberty, and who proclaim the indivisibility of human freedom to ignore the claims to freedom and equality of these suffering peoples, claims which we ourselves dearly cherish.

Mr. Chairman, twice in the last four decades our world has gone to war to fight and eliminate the suppression of human values ; and yet if we allow the same to presist, all those noble ideals for which the great Powers along with others struggled so hard may again be endangered. And once again strife may ensue which might endanger the very peace for the maintenance of which we are assembled in this organization. We sincerely hope, therefore, that those who have failed in the past to see eye to eye with us in this matter of treating the dependent territories on a par with other Non-Self-Governing Territories, will now join their efforts with ours to extend to them the solicitude and the care of the United Nations which they so well deserve.

INDIA USA AUSTRALIA CONGO BELGIUM NIGER NIGERIA FIJI OMAN KENYA SENEGAL UGANDA GUINEA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MADAGASCAR MAURITIUS ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE PORTUGAL

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Jagannath Rao's Statements in Trusteeship Committee

Shri Jagannath Rao, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made three statements in the Trusteeship Committee on November 10, 13 and 30, 1959 on a variety of subjects.

The following is the text of the statement Shri Rao made on November 10, 1959 on the Report of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. Chairman,

The principal objective of the United Nations Trusteeship System, as laid down in the Charter, is "to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence" it goes without saying that the responsibility of fulfilling this task of promoting the economic, social and educational welfare of the peoples of Trust Territories and of preparing them for independence rests largely on the Administering Powers. We come into the picture, whether as members of the Trusteeship Council, or this Trusteeship Committee, or of the General Assembly, as components of the organs of supervision to which these Administering Powers are accountable for the administration of the Trust reposed in them by the United Nations. While therefore, this noble task is primarily the responsibility of the Administering Authorities, it is also, at the same time, a cooperative endeavour

402

of the Administering Authority and the peoples of the Trust Territories acting in mutual confidence and partnership on the one hand, and between them and ourselves who are represented here in this Committee or in the Trusteeship Council on the other. We can only help by our comments and commendations, by our criticisms and suggestions made in a helpful and constructive spirit and with the sole purpose of carrying forward the purposes and objectives of the Trusteeship System. It is in that spirit of helpfulness and of constructive cooperation that we view the report on the work of the two preceding sessions of the Trusteeship Council. If- therefore, at times the remarks and observations made by my delegation, either here or in the Trusteeship Council should appear critical, we do not have to offer an apology for the views or suggestions that we put forward ; and it is our hope that our remarks will be accepted by the representatives of the Administering Authority in the spirit in which they are offered.

As has been pointed out by several speakers, who preceded me in this general debate, the Trusteeship System is now beginning to mature and yield results which were contemplated by the founders of this organisation. In a few weeks from now the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration will become independent. Togoland under French Administration will soon follow suit. Later, in 1960, Somalia will join the comity of independent nations. The process leading to the termination of Trusteeship in the Cameroons under the United Kingdom Administration have already begun. All these Trust Territories are situated in the great continent of Africa, which, after a slumber of centuries, is now coming into its own. Those of us who heard, the other day, the elotuent and moving address of His Excellency, Mr. Sekou Toure, President of the Republic of Guinea, will recall his words ; and I quote : "Too long excluded from free human enterprises, too long held on the sidelines of history, Africa-fully aware of the needs of its future-refuses from now on to remain on the back lines of history, it refuses to allow the unlimited sacrifice of generations of its people.". And again, "African history in our days is undergoing such an acceleration that decisive and important events punctuate the process at an unexpected rhythm." "The noblest task which the United Nations will have to accomplish in the immediate future," added His Excellency Mr. Sekou Toure, "is the task of liberating colonised peoples."

The independence of the two Cameroons, of Somalia, and of Togoland are, undoubtedly, important events in the acceleration of African history of which the President of Guinea spoke in his address to the General Assembly. We have also no doubt that these events, important as they are in themselves, will further accentuate that process. And these are events in which the Administering Authorities concerned, the Trusteeship Council, and this Committee itself can take justifiable pride. As I said, this Trusteeship System of the United Nations is beginning to mature and to yield results. By and large the experiment has proved successful. We would, therefore, like to renew the appeal that our delegation made in the general debate in the Assembly plenary, that Administering Powers may find it possible to place other territories that are non-self-governing under Trusteeship. We make this appeal not so much with a view to finding work for the Trusteeship Council to do as with a view to rapidly promoting the expansion of freedom in dependent areas of the world through peaceful and constitutional processes. The Charter provides for the placing of territories under Trusteeship in that way, and that would, in our submission, be the best way of proclaiming what the representatives of the Administering Powers so often proclaim on the floor of this Committee, namely, their attachment to the principle of the "Sacred Trust".

SOMALIA

After these prefatory remarks, I would seek your permission, Mr. Chairman, to submit a few observations on individual Trust Territories. Somaliland, under Italian Administration, is the closest land area of Africa to India, and if I may say so, Somaliland is our closest African neighbour, with which we have had close commercial and cultural ties from time immemorial. The last two or three year have witnessed encouraging developments in the educational, economic, social as well as the political and constitutional fields of the Territory's life. Recently general elections were held in the Territory, resulting in the constitution of a new legislature. Though there was some dissatisfaction among some of the political parties concerning the conduct of these elections, it is gratifying to note that aspirit of harmony and reconciliation prevails in the Territory. In the Trusteeship Council my delegation had suggested that it would be in the interest of stability and progress of the future independent State of Somalia that the Political Committee, which is charged with the task of drafting the Constituent Assembly, which is shortly to be established, should be constituted on a broad base so as to include the representatives of such political, cultural, regional. trade unions, and economic interests as are not

represented in the present government Pr the Legislative Assembly. We heard with interest the statement made by the representative of Italy yesterday concerning Somalia. We await the intervention in this debate of the distinguished Chairman of the U.N. Advisory Council, and we shall, if necessary, intervene in the debate, once again, with regard to Somalia.

CAMEROONS

Mr. Chairman, we have listened with great interest to the petitioners from the Cameroons under French Administration. In its Resolution 1349, adopted at the resumed Thirteenth Session, the General Assembly has already decided that the Trusteeship over this Territory should be terminated on January 1, 1960, upon the Territory's accession to independence. The forthcoming independence of the Cameroons under French Administration will be a happy event, which should give all of us great satisfaction. However, we are not unware of the apprehensions entertained in some quarters in regard to the conditions in the Territory.

The independence of an under-developed Territory brings in its wake numerous problems of great economic, social and political consequence, which only the united will of the people can surmount and solve. We had, therefore, hoped that independence would be preceded by a period of transition marked by peace, tranquility and co-operation among all political groups and parties in the Territory. Independence born in strife often loses some of its meaning. It is natural, therefore, that the disturbed conditions, the 'state of alert', which have been frequently reported upon in the world press in recent months should cause us concern. We hope that the political parties of the Territory and their leaders, and the government of Prime Minister Ahidjo will do their utmost to promote reconciliation and harmony in the Cameroons.

It was with a view to assisting in this endeavour of national reconciliation that at the resumed session and earlier at the 23rd session of the Trusteeship Council my delegation had insisted on the implementation of the broadest

403

possible measures of political amnesty and the holding of general elections in the Territory immediately after its independence.

Therefore, in renewing our appeal to the political leaders and parties of the Territory to eschew violence, and to subordinate all factional interests to the larger and more vital interests of the nation as a whole at this crucial time in its history, we would also say that liberalisation of amnesty measures and the full restoration of an atmosphere of complete freedom of expression of opinion, whether through the press or from the political platform would be an act of wisdom on the part of the government of the day. Such an act would help remove whatever political differences persist, and will enable the government and the people of the Cameroons to consolidate their country's independence, and to secure its future as a strong sovereign State.

We heard with interest the information the delegation of France gave us in their statement of November 3 about several new developments in the Trust State of the Cameroons since the resumed session. We were glad to note that the Government has decided to hold fresh general elections in the month of February, 1960, that is to say, about two months after independence. We wonder if the petitioners were aware of this decision of the Cameroonian Government when they spoke here. A clear and categorical announcement concerning the date on which elections are to be held, may therefore help remove some of the existing doubts and uncertainties in this regard.

A fresh declaration of intentions on the part of the government to that effect will, in our view, further alleviate the concern and anxiety felt among certain sections of the Territory's populations. We would suggest that there should be declaration by the present Government of the Cameroons reaffirming that the forthcoming elections will be held in complete freedom and fairness, and that the Government would invite, of their own volition, the world press and other impartial observers to watch the elections. This we believe, will be an act of far-sighted statesmanship.

WESTERN SAMOA

Mr. Chairman, it was our privilege, a few

days ago, to hear the distinguished Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Walter Nash, in this general debate. The visit of the Prime Minister of New Zealand among us is, to my mind, evidence of the deep sense of obligation and responsibility that the Government of New Zealand feel as the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. In that part of the Council's Report which deals with this Territory, there are many things from which this Committee will derive satisfaction. First, the leaders of the Samoan people have agreed to hold a plebiscite on the basis of universal adult suffrage to ascertain the wishes of the Samoan people concerning the termination of Trusteeship and to obtain popular

404

ratification of the constitution of the new State. Viewed in the context of the Samoan Tradition, which has preference for the restricted matai suffrage, this is a significant step forward which might mark the beginning of the introduction of universal adult suffrage in territorial elections. Western Samoa is expected to accede to independence towards the end of 1961. The emergence of this Territory from International Trust will mark the birth of the first sovereign and independent Polynesian State in the Pacific. Despite the smallness of its territory and population, Western Samoa is in many ways well placed to live an independent life, and we shall look forward to welcoming its representatives in our midst at the 16th or 17th Assembly. Of special significance to this Committee is the fact that the Administering Authority in this case has not only fulfilled the recommendations of the General Assembly concerning the formulation of immediate targets and stages, but has gone ahead and fixed, in consultation with the Territory's leaders, a tentative final target date for the Territory's independence. For this and for many other actions which are dealt with in the Trusteeship Council's Report the Government of New Zealand deserves our warm appreciation and commendation. While this Committee will be expected to approve of the modalities leading to the termination of Trust over Western Samoa, only next year, we would like, at this stage, to express our general endorsement of the timetable drawn up by the Administering Authority for Samoa's progress, stage by stage, towards independence in 1961. We would also express the hope that the Administering Authority will

agree to such modifications in this programme as the Samoan authorities may consider necessary or desirable.

TANGANYIKA

Sir, in our statement to this Committee in the debate on the Trusteeship Council's Report, last year, my delegation had noted that progress in Tanganyika--the largest, both in size and population, among Trust Territories-was in the right direction and that it seemed that there was every intention on the part of the Administering Authority that Tanganyika should become independent as soon as possible, in accordance with the wishes of its people. We were, therefore glad to hear the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom tell us, Friday last, that the Territory of Tanganvika is on the move and that the Administering Authority and the leaders in the Territory are already deeply involved in the complex processes of building up the machinery for self-government, Sir Andrew Cohen also gave us an account of the developments that have taken place in the Territory since the Council last discussed its affairs in January of this year. These developments are encouraging as they are important; and we welcome them. The recent elections though held on the basis of an extremely restricted franchise and parity of representation, have happily resulted in a sweeping victory for the Tanganvika African National Union which is led by a man of great vision, wisdom and moderation, Mr. Julius Nyrere, an erstwhile petitioner of this Committee. The results of these elections, limited as their scope was, have proved that so far as Tanganyikans are concerned, the system of parity representation is out-of-date, and we are glad to have the assurance of the Administering Authority that it will be discarded before long. We awai with interest the report of the Post Elections Committee, and the constitutional and political reforms that may ensue therefrom.

We cannot, however, fail to note that, to begin with, the terms of reference of this Com. mittee were not sufficiently broad as was recommended by our delegation and by several others at the winter session of the Trusteeship Council. For example, the Committee was asked "to recommend whether, within the general principles of a qualitative franchise-I wish to emphasise the words "within the general principles of a qualitative franchise"---"any changes in the present qualification for candidates and voters would be desirable." In our view, Mr. Chairman, qualitative franchise is not in conformity with democratic principles and practice ; and Tanganyika in its advance towards the objectives of the Charter has moved beyond the stage of qualitative franchise.--Our preference as a general rule is for an electoral system based on universal adult franchise. We do not believe that illiteracy or similar other considerations, which are brought forward in support of qualitative franchise, in effect act as a bar to intelligent voting. The Council has been recommending for some years now, in respect of Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi, and several other territories, the introduction of universal suffrage in elections at all levels. Action to implement these recommendations has long been in coming, and we hope that it will not be further delayed. Fresh general elections have now been fixed for September 1960, and we would recommend that these be held on the basis of universal adult franchise

In his reply to the Governor's address of October 29, 1959, to which Sir Andrew Cohen referred in his statement, Mr. Nyrere stated in the legislative council, and I quote : "I would like to express the hope that the necessary preparations for a general election will be com-

405

pleted long before September (1960) so that the elections may be held earlier." There is in Tanganyikan political circles an urge for the immediate introduction of responsible selfgovernment. At present, only 5 of the 12 Ministers in the Council of Ministers are drawn from the elected wing of the legislative council. They are not, in any way, responsible to the legislature. Besides the Council of Ministers, the Executive Council has continued in existence. The elected members themselves are in a minority in the legislative council. It cannot, therefore be said that the present government is, to any tangible degree, either responsible or representative in the strict political sense of the word. While Mr. Nyrere accepted these arrangements, he did not do so without reservation,' and this in our view is a fact of some importance of which this Committee, should be seized. Speaking in the legislative council, Mr. Nyrere stated his partys

demand for "an elected government in which few civil servants might still participate." He added and I quote : "I have said in this Council before that this demand of ours must be put in its proper perspective. It must be put in the perspective of an Africa which is impatient, an Africa which is seeking, not responsible government, but complete independence from colonial rule. It must be put in the perspective of an Africa which regards colonialism as such, as a wrong. We are part of that Africa, and we have even stronger reasons, stronger grounds for being more impatient."

We hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Administering Authority in full knowledge of this African perspective and in the light of its own experience and wisdom will keep ahead of the aspirations of the Tanganyikan people rather than fall behind them, and be subjected, in any way, to the pressures of events. In our submission, the time has come in this Territory for those who are responsible, in one way or another, for the management of its affairs, not only to move forward but to move forward with determination and speed. We feel that it will be an act of wisdom on the part of the Administering Authority to formulate, in consultation with the elected representatives of the people, only not intermediate stages of the Territory's progress towards the objective of Trusteeship but also to define a final target, however tentative for the attainment of independence by the Territory. The Governor of Tanganyika said in his address to the legislative Council on the 17th March of this year : "The position we have now reached is a stage in a succession of stages, each one of which will get us nearer to our final goal." We hope, therefore, that when new constitutional reforms are formulated in the light of the Post Elections Committee's recommendations, these will be formulated and implemented in the light of a carefully drawn up programme in consultation with Tanganyikan representatives.

RUANDA-URUNDI

I come now to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. This Territory, Mr. Chairman, is situated in the very heart of Africa, and, therefore, it cannot remain isolated from the mighty forces that are surging around it, in Tanganyika, in Western Africa and particularly in the neighbouring Congo. We have no indication as yet of the political reforms which are contemplated by the Administering Authority for Ruanda-Urundi. When they do come, however, we hope it will be their purpose to ensure that Ruanda-Urundi is not left a straggler on the African scene, out of tune with its surroundings and out of tune with the aspirations and thinking of fellow Africans. While this Territory has made some tangible progress in the development of its economy and in the provision of health and education facilities, the Administering Authority has paid little heed, in the past, to the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council with regard to political reforms such as the introduction of elections on the basis of universal franchise, the conferment of legislative powers on the high councils of Ruanda and Urundi and the general council of the Territory. Despite Trusteeship Council's recommendations there is little evidence of measures on the part of the Administering Authority to promote national consciousness and to develop a sense of nationhood among the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi. Even the Council's recommendation that the Administering Authority devise a national flag and an anthem for Ruanda-Urundi has been ignored. Without attempting to pass premature judgment on the contemplated reforms, we hope that the Administering Authority will lose no further time in introducing the principle of elections into the sub-Chiefdom Councils, Chiefdom Councils, the Regional Councils of Ruanda and Urundi and the General Council. It is also necessary that women should be given their due place and their due rights in the political life of the country. The two parallel administrations the indigenous administration and the Belgian Administration-must be immediately integrated. The development and growth of democratic institutions and democratic practices has been too long discouraged, and an accelerated effort to bring them about is now called for. The people of the Territory have not, at any stage, been associated with the formulation of plans of economic, social or educational development or in the implementation of those plans. From that

406

in good part, results the falling short of target defined in the ten-year plan which is now coming to a close. It is, therefore, imperative that an indigenous development council should be established to assist in the formulation and implementation of plans.

Mr. Chairman, in the Trusteeship Council and in this Committee we have expressed our deep concern regarding the fact that a military or paramilitary force-the public force of Belgian Congo-drawn from outside the Territory should be stationed in Ruanda-Urundi for the purpose of maintaining law and order. And, what is more, the Territory has to pay for the maintenance and upkeep of this Force from its slender resources and from a budget which suffers from chronic deficits. If it is regarded necessary to develop a force to constitute the nucleus of a territorial army, that force should be created over the years, from among the Territory's own inhabitants. The maintenance of the Territory's security is, ultimately, the responsibility of its own people, and we cannot view with satisfaction an arrangement which denies them the full burden of that responsibility.

As distinguished delegates will have observed from the Council's Report large sections of the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi do not yet enjoy many of the fundamental freedoms envisaged in the Declaration of Human Rights. While there has been, in the last year or two, a partial removal of regulations and laws relating to compulsory labour, curfew and the movement of indigenous inhabitants from one area to another, the surviving restrictions are contrary to the Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the Charter : these restrictions are in themselves undesirable, and must go. It is also clear from the Administering Authority's Report and other information submitted by it, and it is borne out by the evidence of the petitioner, Mr. John Kale, that because of various restrictions in the extra-customary areas, there is little encouragement for the formation of political organizations and healthy public opinion. Such restrictions in these times, and on the population of a Trust Territory, can only be regarded as unprogressive and archaic ; and it is hoped that the Administering Authority will give serious consideration to their immediate removal

Mr. Chairman, our position concerning the establishment of intermediate and final timetables envisaging the progressive movement of Trust Territories towards independence is too well-known for me to reiterate here. At the appropriate stage of our proceedings we propose to submit in CO-sponsorship with other delegations who think like us in this matter a suitable resolution for the Committee's consideration. I would, however, like to state our view that Ruanda-Urundi, like Tanganyika, is now at a point of development, where its final destiny can be visualised and, therefore, it would be appropriate for the Administering Authority, acting in concert with local authorities, to set a date for the attainment of the final objective of independence.

NAURU

Sir, I shall not say much about the Trust Territory of Nauru here. The most vital question in this Territory is that of the future of the Nauruan community after the phosphate deposits have been exhausted. We trust that the views that my delegation and several others have expressed in that regard in the Trusteeship Council will receive the Administering Authority's serious attention.

NEW GUINEA

In New Guinea the Administering Authority, that is Australia, is faced with a unique task, with a unique responsibility and with a unique opportunity. We have expressed ourselves in great detail on all aspects of the conditions prevailing in that Territory at the 24th session of the Trusteeship Council. We have expressed our concern, particularly with regard to the inadequacy of the civil service, somewhat serious short-comings in the scope and nature of the Territory's educational programme, the comparative lack of industry, failings in the programme of agriculture extension and the disconcerting paucity of economic planning. It has seemed to us that in comparison with neighbouring Papua, with which the Territory is bound in an administrative union, the development of the Territory has been somewhat neglected. As a result dissatisfaction and discontentment in New Guinea have lately been in evidence. We have no doubt that the Administering Authority will, before long, take adequate measures to increase the tempo of political, social, economic and educational progress of New Guinea.

In the political field the increase in the number of local government councils and the development of Kivunges--unofficial village councils covering groups of three or four villages-are encouraging developments and we hope that the growth of these Councils will be further stimulated. The composition and character of the Legislative Councils, however, continue to cause dissatisfaction in the Territory and concern to us here. First of all, the Territory has not been given a

407

legislative council of its own. Secondly, the indigenous members representing New Guinea in the legislative council, which has a predominantly Papuan bias, are appointed by the Administration. The missionary organisations-and this is a unique feature--have representation on the Council, in their own right, equal to the representation granted to the vast mass of indigenous inhabitants. In addition, missionaries have the right to vote in the election of three other non-indigenous members. These arrangements result in the grant of undue weightage to an alien community numbering about 1200, and the continuation of this practice can hardly be expected to have a salutary effect on the growth of democratic organs and democratic practices in the Trust Territory. The Visiting Mission, which visited the Territory recently, has stated that the New Guineans would prefer to elect the persons who represent them in the legislative council. The Mission also expressed the view that there are men in the Territory who would make effective indigenous representatives on the council. In these circumstances, we hope, that the Administering Authority will not hesitate to take such steps as may be necessary to remove the grievances of the people in this regard before long.

ASSOCIATION OF TRUST TERRITORY WITH THE E.E.C.

Mr. Chairman, having commented, as briefly as I could, on the various sections of the Council's Report dealing with individual territories, I would like, if I may, to submit some general observations for your consideration and for the consideration of my colleagues. round this table. It will be recalled that last year we had expressed reservations-and we hold to those reservations today concerning the association of some of the Trust Territories with the European Economic Community and the European Common Market. Considering that the association of Trust Territories with the community may have a significant impact upon their development towards independence, the Assembly had adopted resolution 1275 (XIII) in which it reiterated its request to the Administering Authorities to include in their annual reports information concerning the effect of such association. This resolution further asked the Trusteeship Council to examine this question, and the Council's action in this matter is now before you in Chapter XI of Part I of its Report. My delegation had expressed itself on this question in its general statement on Ruanda-Urundi, and I can only regret that our observations have not found a place in the relevant chapter of the Report. The delegations of Belgium, France, and Italy, in the additional information submitted by them, gave their views on the possible effects of association of Ruanda-Urundi, the Cameroons and Togoland, and Somalia with the European Common Market. It was stated by them that these Territories stand to benefit from this association, that they have already received monetary and technical benefits, and that no other effects were likely to ensue from this position. We respectfully beg to disagree with them. We submit that this action of the Administering Authorities, which does not have the support of indigenous populations, on which the indigenous populations or their representative bodies have not even been consulted by the Administering Authorities, is contrary to the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements. While these Agreements give the Administering Authorities powers to constitute the Territories into administrative and fiscal unions with adjacent territories, they have no competence under the Trusteeship Agreements to link the economies of these Territories for the present, or for the future, or for both, to a community or group of countries far away. The one and the only consequence of this association is not, as the Administering Authority would have us believe, the allocation from the Community's resources of financial grants or credits to the Trust Territories concerned ; that would be an over-simplification of the matter. There are larger questions involved such as the direction of the trade of these Territories and the exploitation of their mineral and other wealth. These ought to be investigated in detail. What we are interested in is to see that the economic interests in general and the resources in particular-of these Territories are not mortgaged to outside interests, to the detriment of their own future independence

in economic or political action.

CIVIL SERVICES AND ECONOMIC PLANNING

Experience in regard to the Territories which are now heading for independence, has shown, Mr. Chairman, that problems of great economic and administrative consequence are brought to light, almost as a rule, on the eve of independence. Whether you take Tanganyika, or the Cameroons, or French Togoland, or Somalia, it is the same story : acute shortage of trained administrative, medical and other technical personnel, budgetary deficits, and inadequacy of financial and technical resources for expansion and implementation of development plans. Independence or the arrival of independence releases new expectations and gives rise to new aspirations. Therefore, while it is natural that the requirements of civil cadres and technical and financial assistance for development purposes should expand with approaching

408

independence, we feet that careful and bold planning ahead of independence should assist these Territories in meeting new demands when they come. It will be observed from the Report of the Trusteeship Council and from related documents that such planning, except in a few cases, is completely lacking ; or where plans exist, they are compartmental plans, conceived in isolation on departmental basis, and, in effect, suffer from a lack of the essence of planning which is coordinated assessment of needs and assets and the allocation of priorities.

We are glad to note from the Trusteeship Council's Report that Somalia's needs with regard to civil or technical personnel and financial and technical assistance are, for the time being, met. We hope that the Assembly will give sympathetic consideration to Togoland's renewed plea for United Nations financial and technical assistance so eloquently put to us the other day by the distinguished Minister of State, Mr. Freitas, whom we were happy to see here. While renewing our appeal to the Administering Authorities to formulate carefully and boldly conceived plans for the training of civil, medical and other technical personnel, and to develop internal economic resources in a manner commensurate with the requirements of Trust Territories both before and after independence, we trust that this Committee, within the purview of its powers and functions, will continue to support, as it has done in the past, the requests of Trust Territories for assistance from the United Nations' sources.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

You will recall, Sir, that last year on the recommendations of this Committee, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 1276(XIII) requesting the Secretary-General to prepare for the 24th session of the Trusteeship Council a report on the early establishment of information centres in or near Trust Territories to promote the dissemination of U.N. information. We are confident that those who have seen this report (document T/1467) will join us in expressing admiration for its remarkable brevity, which, perhaps is its sole virtue. Members of this Committee would also have perused another report of the Secretary-General in document T/1463 submitted by him to the Trusteeship Council pursuant to the Council's resolution 36(III). It emerges from this report that not only there has been no noteworthy progress in the dissemination of information but, on the other hand, there has been some decline in the circulation of printed information about the United Nations and the Trusteeship System in practically all Territories except Western Samoa and the Pacific Islands. This view is further confirmed by the Visiting Mission that visited Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi in 1957 and the Visiting Mission that went to the Trust Territories in the Pacific earlier this year. In view of the special status of Trust Territories and also the special obligations of the United Nations with respect to these Territories, we feel that active steps should be taken to establish U.N. information centres in some of the larger Territories, such as Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi and New Guinea. In view of the fact that the paucity of information about the United Nations in these Territories is admitted by the Administering Authorities themselves, we are confident that if the Secretary-General or the Office of Public Information were to approach the Administering Authorities concerned with a view to opening information centres, their agreement would be readily forthcoming. Mr. Chairman, if necessary, we shall submit more detailed observations on this

question for the Committee's consideration when we come to the stage of submitting resolutions.

I wish to thank you, Sir, and the Members of the Committee for allowing me to speak at such length.

On November 13, 1959, Shri Rao made the following statement on the question of offers of scholarships to students from Trust Territories :

When at its sixth session, the General Assembly invited Member States to make available to qualified students from Trust Territories, fellowships, scholarships and internships in public as well as private institutions, it did so in the belief that the speedy educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories will accelerate their advancement towards the basic objective of the International Trusteeship System, namely independence. It is common knowledge that the facilities, even for primary, secondary and higher secondary education in Trust Territories, are, viewed in relation to their needs, highly inadequate. Facilities for higher education are very much less adequate; and, in fact, in several Territories are completely non-existent. We do not wish to minimise the work the Administering Authorities have accomplished to develop educational facilities in these Territories, but that is the overall picture that emerges from a study of the annual reports of the Administering Authorities on these Trust Territories, and of the reports of the Trusteeship Council. It would be neither realistic nor beneficial to ourselves or to the Trust Territories or to the Administering Authorities for us to try to forget or to get away from that picture.

409

Since the Trusteeship System is a cooperative endeavour of the world community, this invitation was entirely appropriate, and it is gratifying to note that there have been encouraging responses from Member States to this invitation contained in Resolution 557(VI). However, it is equally to be regretted that while the number of scholarships and internships by member States has been increasing during the past six years, large numbers of these offers have remained unutilised. The General Assembly has, very rightly, taken a very serious note of this situation. It was largely to examine this anomaly in greater detail than hitherto that by its Resolution 1277(XIII) the Assembly decided to place this question as a separate item on the agenda of this session.

A study of the report submitted by the Secretary-General to the 24th session of the Trusteeship Council presents, Mr. Chairman, a rather disturbing picture. While the number of scholarships offered for the year 1958-59 increased by 19 over the previous year, the number of scholarships actually utilised decreased considerably. In view of the concern felt by the Assembly over this situation, one would have thought that the Secretary-General's report would give an analysis of the causes resulting in this state of affairs to enable the Assembly to suggest or recommend corrective measures. We hope that an attempt in that direction will be made in the Secretary-General's next report on the subject.

My delegation, Sir, finds a number of reasons for this non-utilisation of offers of scholarships and fellowships. One of them is the difficulty of the medium of instruction. A number of students in Trust Territories are unable to avail themselves of these offers because the medium of instruction is alienated to them, and in many cases there are not enough opportunities for them to learn that language. Of course there are a number of countries which offer facilities for such instruction as part of their scholarship schemes. In this connection my delegation wishes to take note, with satisfaction, of the statement of the distinguished representative of Burma at the 24th session of the Trusteeship Council that his government has been able to devise a procedure to remove the language barrier in respect of admission of students from Trust Territories to educational institutions in Burma. We are confident that other countries, who have offered educational and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories will also be able to find ways and means of overcoming this particular difficulty so that their offers can be utilised to the fullest extent.

There are other difficulties, prominent among them are those relating to travel facilities and travelling expenses. We have no doubt that Governments offering scholarships are conscious of the fact that the absence of the provision of travel funds for possible beneficiaries may sometimes result in the non-utilisation of their offers and are considering ways and means of getting over this difficulty. Might I suggest that where a host Government does not find it possible to make a provision for travel expenses and a candidate is unable to meet them himself, the Administering Authority might usefully consider what financial assistance it can offer from its own resources to enable him to avail of the offer.

Particularly deplorable, in our view, are cases where candidates are debarred from availing themselves of these offers on account of the denial of passports and other travel facilities. The Secretary-General's report mentions two cases, among others, in which students who were awarded scholarships by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could not make use of them as they failed to obtain the necessary travel documents. In his statement before this Committee the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics referred to a case where a student from Tanganyika could not make use of a scholarship offered to him because he was required by the Administering Authority to furnish a security of 200 pounds sterling for possible repatriation-and this when the scholarship included full cost of travel both ways. This kind of difficulty should not arise, and we hope that the Administering Authorities will see to it that there is no recurrence of this kind.

Further analysis of the Secretary-General's report reveals that no applications were received for 31 scholarships offered by 4 countries. Furthermore, only 18 applications were received in respect of 36 offers made by another 4 countries. Thus, Sir, we have in effect a situation where only 18 candidates applied for 67 offers of scholarships and fellowships. What is more, out of these 18, according to the information available in the Secretary-General's report, only 2 scholarships were awarded and were actually utilised.

We fear that the most important reason for this regrettable situation might be the lack of adequate publicity and information about these offers. It is the obligation of the Administering Authorities to publicise these offers in the Territories for the administration of which they are responsible. Conjointly with several of our friends and colleagues we have submitted a proposal concerning the dissemination of U.N. information in Trust Territories, and the adoption and implementation thereof, we believe, will assist in this direction.

We hope that it will not be argued-it cannot in fact be argued-that any action on the part of an Administering Authority which results in debarring a candidate from availing of a scholarship for which he has the requisite qualifications is consistent with the interests and needs of the Territories and their peoples-the expression used in Resolution 1277 of the XIII Session.

I might, perhaps, at this stage, say a few words about the scholarships and other educational and training facilities offered by my Government. Detailed information concerning our offers and their utilisation is available in the Secretary-General's report. In 1958-59 the Government of India had offered 8 scholarships to students from Trust Territories : subsequently it was found possible to award one more scholarship, and all 9 awards have been utilised. Six scholars out of those listed in document T/1462 have already left India on the completion of their studies. For the year 1959-60 my Government has already announced awards to 11 students; originally 12 were intended but one candidate from Togoland under French Administration could not make use of the scholarship awarded to him. Under the scheme for 1960-61, 9 scholarships are for the present, earmarked for students from Trust Territories. I might, perhaps, add that the Government of India are meeting the cost of airfares of three candidates selected this year from the British Cameroons.

Mr. Chairman, our own national scheme of scholarships for students from foreign countries had been put into effect long before the Assembly adopted its resolution 557(VI) and we were happily, with Yugoslavia, the first to respond to the appeal made in that resolution. Within our limited resources we have done our best to assist in the provision of much needed facilities of higher education for students from Trust Territories, and in view of our ever-increasing interest in the welfare and advancement of Trust inhabitants and other dependent peoples I hardly need to reassure you and this Committee that, within our capacity, we shall continue to offer to them such facilities and assistance as we can. It is a source of the

410

great satisfaction to my Government that our offers are fully utilised. We earnestly hope that similar satisfaction will not be denied to those other governments which have come forward with generous offers of help in response to the Assembly's resolution 557(VI) and subsequent resolutions on the subject. It is, in our view, truly anomalous that while normally it is the educational facilities which lag behind the demand, here we have a situation in which for one reason or another, demand is kept below the facilities that are so generously and so readily made available. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the views that I have expressed my delegation will support the resolution that has been placed before the Committee on this subject in paper A/C 4/L. 605.

On November 30, 1959 Shri Rao made the following statement on educational and other conditions prevailing in the Non-Self-Governing Territories:

It was three years ago that the Committee on Information last gave particular attention to the educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In considering the Committee's report then, the General Assembly had by its resolution 1049 (XI) reiterated the objectives of educational policy laid down in resolution 743 (VIII). The Assembly had also pointed out that for the attainment of those objectives it would be necessary to establish systems of primary, secondary and higher education which would meet the needs of all, regardless of sex, race, religion, social or economic status, and provide adequate preparation for citizenship. The Assembly had also recommended that, according to the requirements of the population of each Non-Self-Governing Territory, the Administering Powers concerned should consider the formulation plans, with targets and dates, for various aspects of educational development, including the establishment or extension of universal, free and compulsory primary education and general literacy.

My delegation, Mr. Chairman, welcomes the statement in the Report of the Committee on Information that the Administering Members generally subscribe to these principles and objectives of education set forth by the General Assembly; and that they seek rapidly to achieve the broadest possible extension of full educational opportunities to the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. And yet if one peruses the summaries and analyses of information, the studies prepared by the Specialised Agencies and the summary records of the proceedings of the Tenth Session of the Committee on Information, one cannot help noticing the vast gulf between the policies and the objectives proclaimed and the results achieved in their implementation. The overall picture that emerges from the Committee's Report is both stimulating and disconcerting. It is stimulating in the sense that it conveys the impression of a growing consciousness on the part of the people of the Territories of the value of

411

education, and an ever-increasing demand, an almost maniacal passion, if I may use a bad expression in a good cause, for more and more education; it is. a disconcerting picture, on the other hand, because the pace of development of educational facilities and the spread of education have been painfully slow. Indeed, there has been some progress in these last years, and we are glad to acknowledge it. But this progress, viewed in the context of the needs of the people or in the light of the objectives set by the Assembly or the goals laid down by the Charter, and what is even more important compared with the growth of social and political awakening in these Territories this progress is of a comparatively restricted scope and limited character.

The educational opportunities in a large number of Territories do not meet the needs of the people and their urgent demands for education. If we take all these Territories with their population of some 150 million together, less than 10% of the children of school-going age are today attending schools. Indeed there are Territories like the Somaliland protectorate where the percentage of illiteracy is 99. The number of girls in primary schools in many areas is but a small fraction. of the number of boys. In several Territories, secondary school facilities are available for less than 3% of the primary school population, and only an insignificant number of girls continue there education beyond the primary level. In some Territories, as pointed out by the Committee in its report, the quality of education requires considerable improvement. If, as is admitted on all hands, education is the key to social, economic and political advancement of under-developed peoples, then with the state of dissemination of education at its present level how soon and in what manner is the principle of the

paramountcy of the interests of these dependent peoples to be vindicated, and the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of these Territories-to borrow the language of the Charter-to be fulfilled ?

Mr. Chairman, democratic governments, for their very functioning, can no longer depend only on educated "elites". The general education of the bulk of the population is of fundamental importance, as education is of the very essence of democracy- Appropriately, therefore, this is the central theme of the Report on educational conditions now before us. Before I offer my delegation's observations on the various sections and sub-sections of this Report, I would like to say that my delegation generally agrees with the recommendations and observations of this Report and we would commend them to the urgent and careful attention of the Members responsible for the adminstration of dependent Territories.

Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of my delegation full application of the principle of universal, free and compulsory primary education is the basic first step which must be taken to achieve effective progress in the field of education. We therefore, note with satisfaction in paragraph 65 of Part II of the report of the Committee on Information that it is the ultimate objective of the educational policy of the Administering Powers to introduce universal, free and compulsory education in the Territories under their respective control.

However, Sir, we are concerned over the fact that in many of the Territories progress in this field, to quote from the report, "is not rapid enough to justify the expectation that it will be possible to introduce universal, free and compulsory primary education in these Territories in the near future". We do not wish to minimise in any way the advances made in this respect in some of the Territories, but the picture, as a whole, Mr. Chairman, leaves much to be desired.

We are conscious of the immense problems involved in implementing a programme of universal free and compulsory primary education the chief among them being that of financing such a programme. These problems and difficulties are frequently reiterated by Administering Powers. We are also not unconscious of the financial and technical investment made in this field in NonSelf-Governing Territories. It is difficult, however, to draw up a balance-sheet of what colonial powers invest in their colonies and what they take away from them. While we are told of their investments, the benefits they derive through the exploitation of the raw materials of the colonies, through the export of consumer and other goods manufactured in metropolitan countries and in other ways are not always made known to us. We have to assess the extent of the fulfilment of their obligations from the results actually achieved. My delegation therefore, fully associates itself with the Committee on Information when it reiterates in paragraph 68 the view expressed in 1956 on this question, namely, that "it is a responsibility of the Administering Members to assist in the provision of adequate resources for the development of education, which forms an important part of the foundation of new societies in Non-Self-Governing Territories." On the other hand, there are instances of Territories with financial surpluses, like the Territories of Sarawak and Brunei, where financial difficulties do not exist and yet the advances in the field of primary education are exceedingly limited. We hope that effective

412

measures will be taken for the introduction by rapidly succeeding stages of universal, free and compulsory primary education without much delay in these Territories.

In the field of secondary education, the Committee's report records a continued expansion in secondary school facilities and in enrolment over the past three years. Sir, while this is so, it is also a fact of cardinal importance that these last three years have witnessed a unique acceleration of general political and social awakening, which has, naturally, stimulated the demand for further educational facilities in this field. On the other hand, we have a situation in certain Territories where the existing facilities are not fully utilised and are at least, in part, wasted. This, in our view, results from the fact that often secondary education is of. an academic type and is not related to the day-to-day life of the students in order to make it popular and useful.

I may recall here an excellent definition of the objectives of secondary education which was given in the declaration of policy contained in the 1957 Report on American Samoa. "The basic approach to education in American Samoa" according to that declaration, "is to provide training which enables people to serve more effectively within their social, economic and political structure and at the same time to provide the suitable background for those, who will find it possible to take advantage of opportunities for higher education." This is a commendable definition of the purposes of secondary education ; and we hope that other Administering Powers will also adopt and implement it in the Territories under their respective administrations.

My colleagues will have noted the Committee's view-a view which we fully endorsethat "education is interdependent at all levels, that the vicious circle of educational inadequacies can be broken only by simultaneous action at many different points, and that higher educational facilities should, therefore, be developed simultaneously with secondary schools." As the Non-Self-Governing Territories come closer to their goal of self-government and independence, their needs for highly educated and trained personnel for the various services, will keep growing. It is essential, therefore, that proper facilities must be provided on an ever-increasing scale to meet the needs for such personnel. In the light of these considerations we note that there is by and large a great dearth of institutions of higher learning in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In the words of the Committee on Information "a sense of urgency is necessary" in dealing with these, problems if events are not to outstrip the measures devised to meet them. We also agree with the Committee that this sense of urgency applies especially to higher education, on which, in quality and quantity, the entire educational system depends.

Mr. Chairman, it is from this inadequacy of the facilities of higher education, or vocational training, that one of the greatest impediments to the development of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, namely, the lack of adequately trained teachers, arises. My delegation has urged in the past that as a first step in solving this problem the teaching profession should be made more lucrative. We have expressed the view that teachers as a class are entitled to Government protection. We note that the - Committee on Information has made recommendations along similar lines. The Administering Powers must create unified cadres of teachers with prospects of advancement and promotion in order to attract sufficient numbers of qualified persons into this profession. This coupled with the provision for more training facilities for teachers, would go a long way in providing more teachers for these Territories.

In our statement in the general debate the other day, Mr. Chairman, we offered out observations, at some length, on questions relating to the education of women, the education of workers, the importance of non-racial policies, and I shall not touch upon them now. There is one matter, however, to which I would like to draw the Committee's attention and that is the "training of medical and health personnel" dealt with in Section XII of part II of the Report. The Report observes, and I quote :

"The information before the Committee shows that the development of schools for the professional training of physicians and higher medical personnel has been slow and difficult."

This is rather under-stating the situation. The stark fact of the matter is that today in the Congo under Belgian administration there is not a single, well-trained, fully qualified African doctor, and the situation with regard to this matter in several other territories is not far different. For admission to the medical faculties in institutes of higher studies in the Congo, candidates are required to possess knowledge of Latin or Greek. The purpose of this requirement we fail to understand the effect of this pre-requisite on prospective candidates must necessarily be discouraging. Speaking from our own experience in India I

413

can say that our medical institutions have not found the absence of Greek, Latin or Sanskritfrom their curricula to be a handicap in the teaching or practice of modern medicine.

I would also like to draw the Committee's attention to the World Health Organisation's substantial offer of fellowships to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories for study abroad in this field. This is a constructive and generous gesture on the part of the World Health Organisation, and we should hope that it will be fully availed of. We would appreciate a report from the World Health Organisation to the eleventh session of the Committee on Information showing the progress in the utilisation of this offer.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to deal briefly with social and economic conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories. It is obvious that in its consideration of these conditions the Committee on Information was handicapped by a lack of additional information or any special documentation. It had, naturally, to rely on the summaries of information transmitted under Article 73(e) of the Charter since the establishment of the United Nations and much of this information was out-of-date. It had no information before it from any of the Administering Authorities with regard to the steps taken by them to implement the recommendations of the 1957 and 1958 Reports of the Committee on Information.

At the ninth session of the Committee on Information and in this Committee last year my delegation had stressed the importance of Community Development to the social advancement of under-developed peoples. We are constantly reminded that the main obstacle to development in any field is the lack of funds. We believe from our own experience in India, Mr. Chairman, that well coordinated plans of community development is what the vast rural populations of these Territories need most of all. The whole concept of community development is based on the idea of self-help. Community development aims at mobilising indigenous resources and manpower. With a little assistance and some guidance from the authorities in initial stages much more rapid progress can be achieved in this way than is the case at present. Community development aims at the creation of self-reliant communities working for their own betterment at village level. Since the economic, social and educational life of a village community is closely integrated, such development works for integrated advances in all these fields at the same time.

While we welcome the information that some such projects have been established in some Territories, notably those in East Africa under the United Kingdom administration; much yet remains to be done in this regard in many other Territories and to extend their scope in the Territories where experiments have already been made. The limited success already achieved in some Territories should warrant a better coordinated and more extensive planning in this particular field.

Of special note, in our view, are the programmes, limited though is their scope, of rural development in Papua. The role played by local government Councils in these programmes is a particularly healthy feature. Labour, agricultural and other cooperatives work together to promote these programmes of rural development with commendable results. We hope that experiments in this form of development will continue in Papua and we would commend the methods used there for adoption in other Non-Self-Governing Territories also.

Numerous social problems of great magnitudes have arisen in these Territories in recent years from urbanisation and industrialisation; and among these problems are displacements of populations, disturbances in family life and juvenile delinquency. Urbanisation is known to bring these problems in its wake; and these are similar in nature to the problems and difficulties experienced in 19th century Europe in this connection. The Administering Powers with their experience are in a position to assist in their solution, and my delegation hopes that in the light of European experience a scientific and wellorganised attack will be made on these problems, and that these Territories in Africa and Asia and elsewhere will not have to go through the same long and painful processes of trial and error in finding solutions to these problems as were witnessed in Europe a century or more ago.

Despite the growing trend towards urbanisation, the fact remains that by far the largest proportion of the populations in these Territories are in rural areas, and that they depend on land for their livelihood. The problems relating to land-tenure, land-alienation and land-utilisation are, therefore, of the highest significance. The traditional values and institutions and the very lives of these vast populations remain inextricably linked with their lands. It is, therefore, to be regretted that there is little evidence of sufficient attention having been paid to the social problems relating to and arising from land-legislation and land-tenure. It would be useful to have a

414

comprehensive report either from the Secretariat or from the Specialised Agencies on the state of rural economic and social development of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

In the sphere of industrial relations, Mr. Chairman, progress in recent years has been even less encouraging. While, from the information made available, the right of association for workers would appear to be provided in several Territories by legislation, in actual practice there is an absence of vigorous trade-union movements. In several Territories, the various I.L.O. conventions concerning the freedom of association and the right to organise have been made applicable; and yet there are complaints-as in the case of the Bahamas-that labour legislation is not in conformity with I.L.O. requirements. In Hong Kong the working hours in the Textile Industry are still, perhaps, the longest in the world. About 40% of the workers are women, and they are required to work nearly 12 hours a day under conditions and for wages which leave much to be desired; and they are entitled to four holidays a year! We hope that this situation will be remedied without delay.

Sir, today the I.L.O. African Advisory Committee is meeting at Luanda in Angola. This event marks a new stage in the activities of the International Labour Organisation in Africa. We hope that the I.L.O.'s interest and efforts in promoting the welfare of labour all over the world will soon succeed in restoring to African labour the dignity, justice and fair-play which are its inherent rights.

Mr. Chairman, as regards economic development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the most important of the objectives laid down by the Committee on Information, in our view, is the removal of the obstacles to economic development by modifying, where necessary, the basic structures of the economy of these Territories. The most serious of these obstacles, in our view, is the dead-weight of subsistence agriculture. Only by a shift from subsistence agriculture to the production of cash-crops can cash surpluses be obtained which could be used for the formation of capital for investment purposes. Investments in agriculture should be intended not only to raise farming productivity but also to render possible the domestic production of industrial goods for which the farmers would themselves furnish a consumer market.

There is evidence of efforts-sometimes sizeable efforts-in the direction of this shift from subsistence agriculture to cash-crop production. Unfortunately, however, in a number of Territories it appears to be the policy to preserve cashcrops production, or ownership thereof, to alien elements of the population. aid to allow the indigenous peasant to continue with subsistence agriculture. As a result, the extent of the benefit which indigenous populations might receive from this shift is considerably decreased, and what is more important, the processes leading to the integrated economic development of a people or a territory, as a whole, are hindered.

In some of the Territories, on the other hand the necessity of maintaining a proper balance between cash-crop production and food production is ignored with the result that while an exportable surplus of cash-crops is created the Territory has to depend on sizeable imports of foodstuffs, and the essential purpose of the shift from subsistence agriculture to cash-crop production namely to develop export surpluses for the import of capital goods so necessary for industrialization is lost.

Another defect of the economic policies of the Administering members in these Territories is that there is an unhealthy dependence on the production of raw materials for export to metropolitan countries. There is an undue emphasis on trade. It is necessary, in our view, that processing industry based on primary and secondary products should be developed in the territories themselves to enable them to produce articles of daily consumption and also to export finished or semi-finished goods. While there has been some improvement in industrial production in these Territories, such production relates almost entirely to raw materials. The price market of raw materials is controlled not by these Territories but by the importing countries of Europe with the result that while in recent years exports from Non-Self-Governing Territories have considerably increased, the earnings of the Territories have decreased because of the falls in world

prices of raw materials.

On the other hand, there have been noticeable increases in the imports of consumer goods in almost every Non-Self-Governing Territory. Often these imports relate to consumer goods which could easily be manufactured in the Territories themselves. If processing industries are not developed in the Territories and they continue to import primary products, it is our fear that the stagnation of their economies is likely to be perpetuated, and, therefore, special efforts are needed not only to develop and expand the production of raw-materials in these Territories but to instal light industries without delay.

415

A careful perusal of the summaries of information reveals, Mr. Chairman, that little attention has been paid, in African Territories in particular, to develop infrastructure, especially communications. In a majority of Territories there are no long-term plans of integrated economic development. There are, of course, projects --and even plans--of one kind or another, but it is our impression that these are conceived in isolation one from the other. So long as that is so, it will be impossible to ensure the integrated development of Non-Self-Governing Territories. In most of the Territories there is a complete absence of surveys, statistics and other scientific data so essential to planning and to the implementation of plans. Existing research facilities are meagre, though efforts are now being made to expand them. We would suggest that more comprehensive planning should be undertaken not only in individual Territories, but also on a regional basis, specially in areas where separate Territories happen to be of a small size. We are glad to note that the first session of the Economic Commission for Africa held recently in Addis Ababa took a decision to "arrange for meetings of experts and officials responsible for the execution of development programmes and ... arrange for training in the techniques of planning." Under the auspices of the United Nations' Economic Commission for Africa a conference of government and university representatives from several African Non-Self-Governing Territories and independent States is due to open in Addis Ababa today. We hope that the work of this conference will fill some of the gaps in economic planning in Africa.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom had informed the Committee on Information at its 199th meeting that it was his government's policy to rely on private investment and private loans rather than on State investment. It is our view. Mr. Chairman, that whatever the merits of that policy as applied in the conditions prevailing in the United Kingdom it is not in our view the most suitable policy for Non-Self-Governing Territories which are so obviously and so deplorably under-developed. Private investment in these Territories must necessarily come from abroad ; it is regulated unduly by considerations of profit, and is, therefore, fitful. In the conditions prevailing in these Territories, it is necessary that governments should themselves take the initiative and through State investment offer competition to private investment. The system of private and State investments complementing each other in healthy competition has worked satisfactorily in our own country. and the conditions in most of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, today, are not different from those prevailing in India.'

Mr. Chairman, it is the common experience of most of the newly independent countries, which were formerly Non-Self-Governing Territories, that upon the attainment of independence development in all functional fields assumes new proportions ; and strides are made in comparatively short periods in economic, educational and social advancement, which appeared almost impossible before. This is the case in Ghana, in Guinea, in my own country, and in Nigeria, which is now on the eve of independence. From this common occurrence we have formed the opinion that speedy advancement is usually obtained when there is the widest possible participation of inhabitants themselves in political organs empowered to formulate and implement development policies and to vote development budgets. While we do not question the good intentions of the Administering Members and their paternal interest in the development of the Territories under their administrations, we feel that this concept of paternalism is out-moded and what is needed today is effective participation of the peoples themselves in the shaping of development policies and plans and in their implementation.

In a number of Territories, as the Committee

on Information points out in paragraph 29 of part II of its Report, educational and other policies of the Administering Powers have failed to enlist the understanding, enthusiasm and support of the inhabitants. The reason for this is that these policies are regulated sometimes by racial considerations, sometimes by the interests of foreign communities settled in the Territories, and not unoften by commercial interests in the metropolitan countries. The policies often adopted are not the ones which the representatives of the indigenous inhabitants would have formulated if they had the opportunity of participating actively in their making. It is, therefore, necessary, in our view, that the administering Members should delegate much of the responsibility for planning advances in education and in social and economic reconstruction to the local and central representative organisations of the peoples themselves. This will mean a transfer of political power and authority to indigenous inhabitants at various levels, but that is also envisaged in Chapter XI of the Charter; and though we do not discuss political and constitutional affairs of these Territories in relation to the reports of the Committee on Information, it cannot be gainsaid that economic, social and educational advancement of Non-Self-Governing Territories cannot take place without equal political advancement. Nor can

416

one be isolated from the other. In all these fields, therefore, we would recommend that the Administering Members mobilise the. effective participation of the inhabitants by transferring real power to them at the earliest possible time.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CAMEROON MALI SOMALIA GUINEA ITALY FRANCE WESTERN SAMOA NEW ZEALAND CONGO NAURU AUSTRALIA BELGIUM PERU BURMA YUGOSLAVIA RUSSIA BRUNEI BAHAMAS ANGOLA ETHIOPIA GHANA NIGER NIGERIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri J. N. Sahni, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the United Nations on November 12, 1959:

Mr. Chairman, speaking earlier on a general review of the Budget, my colleague of the Indian Delegation drew pointed attention to difficulties members of this Committee have experienced in making a more realistic assessment of budgetary commitments as a result of the new form of Budget presentation which was adopted on an experimental basis in 1957. We note with some satisfaction the Secretary-General himself is not completely satisfied with the present form of presentation and we have no doubt that he had in mind some of the difficulties which had been expressed earlier in this Committee when he said, and I refer to paragraph 15 of the Report of the Secretary-General, document A/C. 5/776, that, and I quote "a further improvement could be to supplement the present analysis of the estimates on the basis of (a object of expenditure, (b) fields of activity, by an additional annex, which would show the tentative allocation of resources to each particular office location."

We also find that the difficulties to which reference was made by my distinguished colleague of India are also to a degree shared by the Advisory Committee. Commenting on the form of the Budget, and I refer to document A/4228, the Advisory Committee, while agreeing that the new form of the Budget is satisfactory in terms of the Secretary-General's experience from an operational and administrative point of view, remarks, and I quote, "It is equally important, however, that the new form should facilitate the understanding, review and control of the Budget by the General Assembly and its budgetary organs." My Delegation, Sir, attaches very great importance to this observation.

The fact is pretty obvious to all of us, but is sometimes not so very pointedly realised, that the Fifth Committee acting on behalf of the General Assembly is the last, but the most vital, and I may even submit, most decisive point of remote control in making annual commitments on behalf of the United Nations for practically \$ 110 million. I refer, of course, to the Budget of the United Nations and of the Specialised Agencies. In fact, the picture will be still more complete if we realise that the total expenditure of the United Nations and the Specialist Agencies are made up of nine different budgets, based upon regularly assessed contributions and almost 35 extraordinary budgetary funds.

In terms of these astronomical figures with which we have to deal, I may state, incidentally, that my faith in astrology has been progressively increasing since I have had the privilege of sitting on this Committee for the last three years. The only essential item in my horoscope which lent hope and confidence to my parents, in what seemed an otherwise pretty dismal but average future, was a statement casually made by the author, that in the later years of my life millions would flow out of my hands. Projecting my mind through the periscope of a professional journalist, I could never conceive of such a bewildering prospect. But sitting here, Sir, during the last three years I have had the sense of a prophecy coming true. In fact, I have no doubt that if the author of that horoscope had been employed by some of my other illustrious colleagues on this Committee, he would have made the same prophecy in their case.

I have not made any serious research on this subject, but going through it rather casually, the figures of 1957-and these happened to be at the time readily available to me, showed that the Budget estimates of 1956/57 were disposed of in exactly seven meetings of the Fifth Committee practically at the rate of \$7 millions per hour. I assure Mr. Turner that I will be only too glad to make any adjustments of \$1 million or so per hour in case of any miscalculation. Normally, national Parliaments which have to deal with much smaller budgets take a couple of months in disposing of annual budgetary grants.

I do not wish to suggest by implication, Sir, that I think that the Fifth Committee consists of super wizards, or that we are in any manner negligent of our obligations to our countries, or to the General Assembly; my only purpose in drawing attention to these obvious facts is to say that even with all the will in the world on the part of the Secretary-General and on the part of this Committee, the time available to this Com-

417

mittee is very limited in which it has to exercise its functions of scrutiny, assessment and control.

Besides, Sir, we do not function here on a Paliamentary pattern. Our functions are not even those of a Board of Directors or a Board of Trustees. Considering, therefore, the limitations of time and the extraordinary pattern of our functions, it becomes all the more necessary that the form of the Budget should effectively convey a clear and comparative picture of the manner in which expenditures are incurred, the purposes for which they have been incurred or are intended to be incurred, and the resultant maintenance or achievement of targets of programmatical activity at a particular cost rate.

At the time the new form of the Budget was decided upon, on an experimental basis, the Secretary General expressed the view, and I am referring to document AC.5/662, that he had two objectives in view. One was, and I quote, "to assist him towards a more flexible administration of the staff and of credits voted by the General Assembly", and the other was to, and I quote, "improve the Budget presentation" to enable for supplying as accurate information as possible on the main fields of activity.

So far as the first purpose is concerned, we have the authority of Secretary-General that the new form of the Budget has permitted him the desired flexibility, and such flexibility has enabled him to exercise better control of expenditure through utilization of his resources of money and personnel more effectively, and to effect economics which otherwise may not have been easily possible. My Delegation has already expressed its appreciation at some of the salient results thus achieved. So far as the second undertaking is concerned, there has been an improvement in the manner of presentation of the general heads of expenditureand I must say to the credit of the authors of document 5A/4110 budget estimates for 1960, there has been genuine evidence of a painstaking effort to provide valuable. The foreward by the Secretary-General which appears in this document as compared to the forewards of some of the years previous to 1957, is definitely more elaborate and reveals a very valuable trend in budget presentation which should be continued. I am sure a still more comprehensive and detailed elaboration of the foreward indicating comparative figures in terms of broader activities to explain variations or to explain variations in terms of budgetary appropriations, would be greatly appreciated by this Committee as a valuable time saving effort.

Unfortunately, Sir, my Delegation cannot say the same regarding the rest of the presentation, nor regarding the information annexes.

The Advisory Committee expressed the view and I am quoting from document A/4228.

"The choice of a particular form for the budget of the U.N. must be governed first, by the extent to which it facilitates the understanding, review and basic control of the budget by the General Assembly and its budgetary organs; secondly, by the scope which it offers for a continuing application of priorities and an increasingly flexible utilization of staff and other resources; and thirdly, by the simplicity and the effectiveness which it can be administered by the Secretary-General with due regard to the financial prerogatives of the General Assembly".

As I have already stated Sir, the Fifth Committee is not a national Parliament nor can it function as a Board of Directors or as a Board of Trustees, but it has to operate to a pattern of its own, in either laying down the form budget presentation should take, or in adopting effective means for assessment, scrutiny and control. In that background I can say that the Advisory Committee has very ably, effectively and with appropriate emphasis enunciated these three guiding principles. Wisely enough they have given priority and to No. 1 and I quote.

"The extent to which it (the Budget) facilitates the understanding review and basic control of the budget by the General Assembly and its budgetary organs."

As I have already stated, the new form does not facilitate fuller and rapid understanding of the various items of expenditure. It does not easily indicate the separate activities to which they relate and does not make a comparative study easy, or offer a clear picture of priorities, targets and results.

I am reminded of a story of an indulgent husband who rarely questioned but often when a new domestic appropriation was required, glanced through the items of expenditure preferred by his better half. One of the items which continuously appeared in the accounts and represented a fairly large appreciation in the domestic budget was under the mysterious heading "GOK". More out of curiosity than as a complaint, after several months, the husband found courage to inquire as to what was the item listed as "GOK" which seemed to swallow a great part of the domestic budget and yet did not seem to have contributed

418

in any known manner to domestic bliss. The wife with remarkable innocence, explained that "GOK" only indicated items of expenditure incurred in moments of forgetfulness and was an abbreviation of "God Only Knows"!

I do not suggest that despite our love of abbreviations in the United Nations, there is any item under "GOK" in our budgetary appropriations but I do want to emphasise that many times under the pressure of our obligations in this Committee, supporting a particular grant of a few million dollars has been more an act of faith than understanding.

The guiding abbreviation in our case being "ACKB" namely, the Advisory Committee Knows Best.

I may confess that as an Indian, I share with many other delegations who have had to contend with colonial budgets of imperialist governments an allergy for a form of budget presentation which does not enable, to use the purely commercial phrase, cost finding for activities proposed and programmes carried out.

Having had as editor to deal with several of such budgets. I remember how it used to be an adventure into the realm of discovery to scrutinise annual budgets, to co-ordinate figures and create out of a jigsaw puzzle a realistic picture. To give a few illustrations, luxury special trains maintained for the Viceroys and Governors were shown under the heading of "Railways, sub-heading Maintenance cost for coaches.' Roads and communication facilities required entirely for the Army, but not appropriated under Defence expenditure, were put under communications ; palatial club houses set apart exclusively for top civil servants were shown in the common pool of expenditure for Labour Canteens employees amenities. I have not given these illustrations because they have any bearing on sections or items of expenditure with which we have to deal here, but only to show how mystifying budgetary presentation can become if a genuine, serious and continuous effort is not made to present it in a manner which is the most essential factor, so far as this Committee is concerned, to give a clear, lucid and detailed picture of the manner in which appropriations have been utilised, or with sufficient approximation they are expected to be utilised for various activities. For specific purposes, quite casually on one occasion I tried to trace the pension commitments for the ex-Secretary General and found that this simple item of expenditure was to be traced, with difficulty, to part 3, Secretariat, Section 7-"Common staff costs", Chapter II Social Security payments, and Article 2-Annual Retirement Allowances for former Secretary-General. If again I have to refer to a Secretary-General, it is only illustrative of my curiosity. in the new form of the Budget it is practically impossible to trace at a glance expenditures concerning the Secretary-General, his personal established allowances, etc., unless one was to spend. In the estimates of 1957 such expenses appear under a single heading.

Section 6 of the Budget estimates for 1960 has three chapters-(I) Established Posts, (2) overtime and Night Differential, (3) Temporary Assistants.

In the Budget estimates for 1957 the expenses were shown separately : (under) Section 6 for the offices of the Secretary-General, Section 6 (a) Secretariat, and the Military Staff Committee, Section 7-Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Section 8, Department of Trusteeship Information, and so forth.

It is not merely in terms of sectional appropriations that the new form is unhelpful, but it is also not a useful guidance in terms of assessing results achieved or costs of activities, at least, easily, with some amount of certainty and comparatively over a period of years. For example, this Committee approved a decision for curtailment of documentation. While available figures might convey an overall picture, it is not possible to know the effect of this decision within the various agencies and sections. To take another example, activities of O. P. I. which is being appreciated and may need to be extended further. But it is not possible for a delegation to determine as to how far, with the increase of activity, the overall expenditure of a per hour unit broadcast has decreased or increased and as to what will be possible commitments if any further increase was suggested.

Take television, for example. While figures convey the impression that the service is earning its way, it is difficult to find out from the present form of the Budget as to how much of the overhead expenditure has been assessed to this activity, how much has been assessed for accommodation rent, for depreciation costs, before reaching the conclusion that it is paying its way. A revenue of \$ 49,000 has been shown from the Dining Room, Bar and Cafeteria, but it is difficult to find out from the figures in the way they have been presented as to how much of overhead costs, capital depreciation, rental in terms of space, have been included in cost finding. Firstly,

419

in terms of services on a comparative basis and secondly in terms of anticipated profits.

Sir, I apologise for having had to take so much of the time of this Committee, but in doing so I have acted in the belief that the difficulties experienced by my delegation are partly, if not substantially, shared by other distinguished delegates in making a quick, clear, comparative and confident appraisement of budgetary estimates.

In asking for more details, I would like to make it clear that it is not the intention of my delegation to alter the method of appropriation adopted two years ago till the Secretary-General has had sufficient time and this Committee has had more experience to suggest appropriate alterations. What we do wish to suggest is that in presenting the information annexes, a pattern approximating to the 1957 estimates adopted to the altered form of appropriation should be more desirable. As my distinguished colleague from India pointed out earlier in his speech and I quote:

"The budgetary decisions which the delegations desire to make, are broadly related to the functional activities of the organization. They would like to know how much is being spent on economic and social activities, on trusteeship on public information and how reallocation of funds among the different appropriations would affect the programme."

He said further and I quote

"Economies in departmental expenditure could be enforced only if expenditure is shown departmentwise, and in comparable form. Compensation of departmental expenditure over a period of say five years could reveal the treatment in the department and help in the analysis of proposals for economy."

I find Sir, that the Advisory Committee also while remarking that there had been some, "but pot enough, progress along the directions in which improvements had been anticipated, state and I quote from A/4228 :"

"At the same time the Advisory Committee would suggest that the presentation might be further improved somewhat along the lines of para. 15 of the Secretary-General's report A/C.5/776, by the inclusion of more detailed information annexes, showing analysis of budget proposals, and estimates by organizational, segments and by location. This may be done by consolidating the information relating to each area of activity or each office rather than exclusively by a source of summary detatils, expenditures and several budget sections." They further remarked that this would and I quote :

"Facilitate a closer and more meaningful analysis of future estimates by field of activity."

Sir, in conclusion I will again repeat what I said earlier, that considering the enormity of funds involved and the shortage of time, any cooperation the very able colleagues of the

Secretary-General acting in conjunction with the Advisory Committee could offer, in giving the budget a more understanding form to lighten the work of this Committee and to increase its confidence in the correctiveness of its decisions would be most welcome.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri J. N. Sahni's Statement on Freedom of Information

Shri J. N. Sahni, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Third Committee of the General Assembly on November 30, 1959 on freedom of information :

Madam Chairman:

My delegation has listened with intense interest to the distinguished delegates who have spoken earlier, and we are particularly grateful to Mr. Lopez and Mr. Barodi, for having given to this committee the background history of the manner and methods whereby the draft Convention of Freedom of Information took form and shape and is now before us for our consideration.

It is not my intention to recapitulate any part of this history, but in the light of this historical background, it is necessary, among others, to emphasize some of the elements and phases of this background to place the whole position in a proper and balanced perspective. Article 19 of Human Rights Declaration was adopted in 1948. The Declaration of Human Rights was hailed as the Magna Carta of a free and civilised human society. It was also a declaration of the common aim of the United Nations to work out at the earliest, by mutual consent, measures and covenants designed to implement, to give body and shape and form, to this Declaration to make it the touchstone of human relationship and international society such implementation at the same time be-

420

coming a barometer of democratic progress. Article 19, which in its turn is an amplification of some of the clauses and the underlying spirit of the Charter itself, proclaims thus : "Everyone has the right to freedom of information and expression ; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

Much water has flowed "over the Midtown Tunnel" since the passing of the Declaration of Human Rights. Human society has not been static. The caravan of nations has kept pace with the passing of time. The United Nations has found politico], economic and cultural solutions to many international problems while at the same time being confronted with fresh ones. Old systems of Government have changed and new free countries have come into existence. Media of information and communication, of international. contact and communion have been undergoing a rapid revolution. So much so that we have been almost stretching for the moon. And yet, in contrast with this propelling dynamism, stands out the object reality of our still not having been able to advance far enough to give shape and form to one of the most cherished freedoms of civilised society-the freedom of opinion and expression.

It is not as if the United Nations have not actively pursued this purpose; and here, Madam Chairman, I come to the second point which has to be borne in mind by us, namely how in the pursuit of these purposes the draft Convention which is before us assumes a key almost fundamental-I would say, imperative importance both in terms of time and in terms of fact. Side by side with setting up the necessary machinery for the formulation of the Convention, the draft of which is before us, various agencies of the United Nations have been engaged in taking this problem from different angles. To sum up briefly, these have consisted of firstly, recommendations to Member States to remove specific barriers to the free flow of news, elimination of political and

economic factors which impair international understanding, measures to facilitate the functioning of professional personnel within and across national frontiers; secondly, studies by the Secretary-General, the specialised agencies and by experts of legal, political or technical hindrances to the free flow of information; thirdly, drawing up an acceptable code of correction to prevent perversion or distortion of information; fourthly, the elaboration of studies and projects of technical assistance to under-developed countries in developing their media of information thereby creating the material basis for the promotion of freedom of information; and lastly, the drawing up of an exhortary Declaration embodying and reiterating the basic principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights.

The progress in the directions summarised by me has in some cases been substantial, in others depressingly slow, but the important fact which needs to be emphasised is that the progress in most of these directions, if not all, would be considerably accelerated, probably is even contingent on the progress we make in drawing up and in giving form and shape and sanction to the Convention of Freedom of Information. I do not wish to take the time of the Committee to go into details as to how every single step in the directions I have indicated depends on the passing of such a Convention, but I would draw the attention of the Committee to a very important statement made earlier by the distinguished delegate of the Philippines, Mr. Lopez, whose personal contribution to the subject to which we are applying ourselves has been considerable namely that the amalgamated Convention, which includes the right of correction even though it has been adopted, awaits ratification after the adoption of this Convention.

This, Madam Chairman, is a second reason why it is imperative that we should go ahead with the adoption of the draft Convention which has been before us for more than three years. There is a third fact deserving our attention, and one which should be taken into account in our approach to the draft Convention we are now considering. Mr. Lopez, the distinguished representative of the Philippines, and Mr. Barodi, the distinguished representative or Saudi Arabia, have already given us a detailed history of the checkered phases through which the proposals before us have undergone, an idea of the years for which the subject has been studied, the number of expert minds drawn from different countries, experts of specialised agencies, and the Committees and Commissions which have bestowed their knowledge and have given very serious thought and devoted hours of discussion in elaborating the text which we are now considering I emphasize this fact, because in elaborating this draft the combined intelligence of exports and representatives from these many countries must have taken into account the vast disparity that exists in the laws of different countries regulating freedom of information and freedom of expression of ideas, the different systems of Government and even their ideological basis, the disparities that exist between the media of information in the advanced countries of the world and in the less advanced countries,

421

including the manner in which these media operate and are controlled, they must have taken into account not only all these factors, but several others which add up to the diversity of the problem in placing before us this very important document. Speaking on behalf of my own delegation, Madam Chairman, and having read very carefully the very interesting documentation on this subject, the discussions which centre around words and phrases extending over several days, I am willing to assert, not that they must have done what I have indicated, but that they actually did take into consideration every major and minor element in this diversity. And even though the progress was slow every effort was made to harmonize differences to find a common language of approach, to search the greatest common factor of acceptance, and to evolve something which while offending least the needs of the most advanced helped greatly the requirements even of the very backward. This is an extremely important consideration. It is not like our considering a document prepared in haste by a few well-meaning intellectuals. In its preparation has gone the knowledge and ability, the resourcefulness and ingenuity of experts drawn from advanced and backward countries from the east and from the west, and from countries with different ideological systems. All these persons, by a prolonged process and patience and mutual tolerance, by generous give and take, have evolved something which should be judged not entirely

in terms of national advantage, or disadvantage or for that matter not in terms necessarily of national benefit, but in terms of the following tests. First, does the draft Convention taken as a whole, offer the most acceptable basis for implementing the spirit and the scope of the Charter and of Article 19 of the Declaration of Human Rights ? That should be our approach to the preamble. Second, freedom if it has not to assume the dangers of license must be regulated involving essential but the very minimum limitations and restrictions. Consequently, as we go along, we have to decide whether the regulatory clauses, the restrictions and limitations are essential and in the circumstances the absolute minimum enabling the acceptance of this Convention by the largest number of countries and its operation on a global basis.

Just now, Madam Chairman, we are concerned with the preamble. It may be that in their superior wisdom some of the distinguished delegates may be able to suggest an amendment here or there, or an improvement in some expression in one place or the deletion of an expression in another, and while we would give the most earnest consideration to any of these suggestions, my delegation feels that the preamble is as perfect in its draft in interpreting and enunciating the spirit of the Charter and Article 19 of Human Rights as any document can be, considering the diversities of the problem, and the global orbit of its approach. I would even say that we are proud that we have been called upon, through the coincidences of history, to offer our endorsement to a preamble which if adopted by us, after many years will rank conspicuously among some of the great documents enunciating human freedoms which civilised man treasures as the Charters of a better society and the embodiment of great ideals. It recalls the preamble, Madam Chairman asks us to bear in mind the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, reiterates that freedom of opinion expression both in the national and international spheres is fundamental, expresses the desire for international co-operation to guarantee these freedoms, and while recognizing that in order to achieve the above aims, and this, Madam Chairman, is very important, I repeat, in order to achieve the above aims, but not to curtail or restrict any of them, and, further recognizing, I quote : "that

the media of information should be free from pressure or dictation, and that these media by virtue of their power for influencing public opinion bear a great responsibility to the peoples of the world", accepts the provisions laid down in the nineteen Articles that follow.

By virtue of the first test, therefore, the preamble is unexceptionable and I would almost be tempted at this stage to formally move that it be accepted. This brings me to the second test. This applies mainly to the substance of the various Articles. Some of these articles, as for example, Article 1, are intended to secure among contracting states for their own nationals and for nationals of contracting states certain basic freedoms-the freedom to obtain and impart information, freedom of communication and of movement, and so forth. It calls for these freedoms without discrimination on political grounds on the basis of race, sex, language or religion. Some of these articles also call for the preservation of existing freedoms in the form in which they exist. These are positive articles intended clearly to give form and shape to the human right of freedom of thought and expression, to give it substance and reality, to enable it to become a basic principle of all civilised society rather than remain a privilege for those who live in advanced countries. In our approach to these Articles, we should not be guided by the fact that in our own countries we enjoy all these and even more freedoms, or even more than those enun-

422

ciated in these Articles, but by the fact that in adopting this Covenant, we would be helping to Jay down a vardstick whereby people not so politically and economically advanced can make claim to these freedoms and thereby share and help in the overall advancement of all people towards a better life, towards better understanding and towards greater goodwill. As I have already stated, unregulated freedom can become licensed, and it is for this reason that certain other Articles have been introduced common intelligence of its framers to regulate the conduct of those engaged in the gathering and transmission of news recognizing that, and I quote again from the preamble "by virtue of their power for influencing public opinion, bear a great responsibility to the peoples of the world" and hence should conduct themselves in a manner which, helps to advance the

objectives of the Charter. Also they be prevented from utilising these powers their great influence and their great capacity from acting in a manner prejudicial to the spirit of the Charter, prejudicial to better understanding among people, races and religions, prejudicial to democracy, to public order and peace, prejudicial to common morality and social well-being, and prejudicial to national dignity, for otherwise these freedoms can become a menace to world society.

The distinguished delegate from Saudi Arabia. in the course of his speech, referred at great length to some of these dangers. Nothing that I can say as a professional journalist who, for 35 years, has functioned as editor of some of the leading newspapers in his country, can better illustrate these likely defaults and dangers. But as a professional journalist, it is my duty also to assert that the picture drawn by my distinguished colleague from Saudi Arabia has too forcefully focussed our attention to the intellectual delinquency-I was almost going to repeat his phrase "juvenile delinquency"-of which irresponsible members of the Press and of media of information are capable. It is a picture which draws attention more, and perhaps even rightly, to the drains, the sewers the marshes and the cesspools in an otherwise healthy city. It is not the picture, Madam Chairman, of the healthy Press- as it normally functions in democratic society. Every country has its yellow journals and its yellow journalists, who, taking advantage of democratic freedoms, tried to pander to the sensual, to the sensational and the obscene, and even would slander to build circulations and acquire material gain. On the other hand, all over the world, in all countries, exist media of information-and fortunately these exist in greater abundance- which have endeavoured within human limitations to gather correct information to give objective news of world events and occur rences, which have offered sound leadership to national and international public opinion Just as-and again, fortunately-there exist, and they have existed all over the world and also in greate abundance, writers and journalists who have used their eyes and ears conscientiously to impar information, who have spurned temptation and sacrificed attractive opportunities in the search for truth. Persons who have risked their lives for gaining more and correct information, who have suffered imprisonment, who have not compromised

with truth and have many times resisted ever their own proprietors at the risk of their jobs so that they would not become the instruments of misinformation. In wartime and peace, in the building up of great nations and the building up of national freedoms, the Press of the world, as we know it today, has played a great and conspicuous part, and, lest we lose our clear perspective it is necessary that we bear this in mind.

In fact, it is with the purpose of allowing such a healthy Press to grow where it has not grown, to mature where it has not matured and to overpower the black legs in our international family, that the Convention for the Freedom of Information is intended.

The restrictions contemplated in the Articles, or I may say, the regulatory clauses, are not intended to modify, limit or restrain the healthy growth and development of this major section of the world Press. They are intended for the black legs, the defaulters, those who mix the poison of propaganda with information, those who sacrifice integrity for sensationalism and who use cheap slander, obscenity, contempt for other people's sentiments as instruments for journalistic gain.

In my country freedom of the Press and freedom of expression are guaranteed as an inalienable fundamental right. We cherish this freedom deeply, but we do not want to jeopardize this freedom in the Constitution. But we also do not want it taken advantage of by unscrupulous people for anti-national purposes. We therefore have certain regulatory laws. It is for the same reason that we agree by and large to the very restricted-to my mind very important and very essential-regulatory clauses which have been included in the later Articles. Some of these go further than our national laws, but which seem to us desirable for an international development of freedom of information. I submit, in judging these limitations, we should not be guided, and I am speaking of countries where Press freedom is as great as in my own, or even greater, by the

423

freedom we enjoy or would like to have in our own countries, but by the needs of the smallest and the most backward of free countries. It is by their support, their goodwill and their cooperation, that free flow of information on a global basis can become a reality. I emphasize this the more so, Madam Chairman, because there has been a reluctance on the part of some of the advanced nations to accept on an international basis limitations which their own citizens would not accept. My appeal is, therefore, addressed to them, to the citizens of these countries, to the members of these countries, that in accepting the greatest common factor of necessary and essential minimum limitations, they are not compromising with their ideals or reducing the scope of their own national freedom, but India will are helping to create common standards in the preservation of which the most backward and the least developed can cordially co-operate. Madam Chairman, I sincerely apologise for a long intervention which frankly was not originally intended to be long, but which has extended itself, partly on an impulse of spontaneity, partly as an expression of professional experience and approach and partly because my Government whose leaders have witnessed both the dangers of repressive Press legislation and the uplifting national impacts of a free Press, has been intensely interested in promoting measures for the implementation of Article 19 of the Human Rights Declaration on which this Convention is based and which it considers the Charter of a free world and a free society.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ITALY PHILIPPINES SAUDI ARABIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Border Demarcation

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 27, 1959 speaking on an adjournment motion on India-Pakistan border demarcation:-- I enquired into this matter. This area is near the Patharia forest. It is 178 square miles, and not five square miles as was suggested yesterday.

This area, according to the Radcliffe Award, falls definitely in Pakistan. This is a fact admitted by both parties, and no one has challenged that. It, however, remained in Indian possession, because we said Pakistan was holding on to other areas, which it should not; and if other matters were settled, and Pakistan gave them up, then we shall do so. So, there was no dispute about the maps or anything about this area, clearly. When all these other matters have been settled, there was no point left for India holding on to it. In fact, this point was so clear that it was not even discussed at the last conference. It was an admitted fact.

Now, in accordance with that, it is proposed to demarcate this, and then to hand it over. There has been no demarcation yet. There is no question of handing anything over today. Our military people who are in charge had a meeting, and it is proposed to start demarcation on the 15th December. I do not know how long it will take; whether it will be two weeks or three weeks, I do not know. Till then, the territorial jurisdiction of India will remain. All that has been done in this area thus far is for the removal of one check-post that we had there. That has been withdrawn.

Even after demarcation, according to the ground rules agreed upon at the last conference, necessary time should be allowed to farmers to harvest their crops, before transfer of territorial jurisdiction. Also, there are clauses in those ground rules about the special responsibility of the party concerned for the protection of person and property of the population, so that their interests might not be prejudiced.

Now, if any kind of Territory has to be exchanged and handed over as a result of an award, decision or whatever it is, obviously the people living there are affected by it. Now, three things happen. In this case, you will be pleased to notice that in effect, the decision was taken not today but by Mr. Justice Radcliffe many years ago, but because of various complications and conflicts it was not given effect to as in other cases. Now, the people are affected. The people can have a choice of three things. One, of course, is that they choose to become the nationals of the country to which that little area goes. The second is that they remain Indian nationals but continue living there as foreign nationals. The third is that they change their habitate. These are the facts that I have been able to obtain.

Replying to a question by an Hon. Member of the House whether it is correct that

424

there are 370 families in this area, and whether they will be given rehabilitation loan or they will be rehabilitated in other places, Shri Nehru said : Till the exact demarcation is complete, we cannot say how many villages or people are involved. Normally, of course one does not expect large numbers of people to come across. They have their lands etc. They should remain there, even if they like, as Indian nationals ; they can remain there. If any. come across, what the Hon. Member has suggested will naturally be considered.

Replying to another question whether if anybody chooses to come over to India, he will be entitled to the full benefits of rehabilitation which the other refugees have received, the Prime Minister said : No. I am quite clear about it. This matter will have to be considered de novo. There is no question of old benefits being attracted by it. They dealt with other questions, other circumstances. Here are people, who, I presume are in possession of land. It is open to them to continue in that land, to remain there. If they want to come away, they may try to sell the land if they like. There is no pushing about, I mean; in given circumstances, they can either remain there, as I said, as Indian nationals or as Pakistani nationals or come away. If they come away, they can sell the land-, they can make some provision, or whatever it is ; conditions are quite different. As I said in reply to the previous Hon. Member's question this matter in the shape in which it comes up will, no doubt, be considered by the Bengal Government. But I want to make it perfectly clear that the old rules etc., affecting the refugees will not apply to them.

The Prime Minister continuing said: cannot rule out the possibility of their or anybody else's not having fair chances of living there. But after the agreement that has been entered into, the kind of pressures that were brought to bear upon the minority communities will not presumably be there. Apart from this fact, I am told that about 60 per cent of the population of these villages is Muslim. All these factors come in and there is no particular reason why those people, at any rate, should want to come over. I cannot say more on this. If in spite of this, some people come over, their cases will be considered favourably.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indo-East Pakistan Border Conference

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on November 16, 1959 on the Indo-East Pakistan Border Conference, which was held both at Delhi and Dacca from October 15 to 22, 1959. The statement says :

The House is aware that the Prime Minister of India met the President of Pakistan at Palam Airport on September 1, 1959. During their talks it was agreed that a high-level conference at Minister level should be held to discuss the disputes and incidents on the Indo-East Pakistan border with a view to eliminating, as far as possible, the causes of these disputes and devising procedures for expeditious demarcation of boundaries and for dealing promptly with any disputes and incidents that may occur.

This Minister-level conference was held from 15th to 22nd October, 1959 ; discussions were held at Dacca from 18th to 20th October and at

Delhi on other days.

I am taking this early opportunity to place on the Table of the House the following documents, which embody the agreements reached at this Conference :

(i) Copy of the Joint Communique issued by the Governments of India and Pakistan on 24th October 1959;

 (ii) Copy of the agreed decisions and procedures to end disputes and incidents along the Indo-East Pakistan border signed by the Secretaries of the two Governments;

(iii) Copy of the Ground Rules formulated by the Military Sub-Committee of the Indian and Pakistan Delegations and other detailed arrangements arrived at to maintain peaceful conditions along the Indo-East Pakistan border areas; and

(iv) Copy of letters exchanged between the Secretaries of the two Governments on the further follow up of transit and visa facilities and promotion of trade between West Bengal and East Pakistan.

The Principal features of these agreements are:

(i) Pakistani authorities withdraw from the portion of Tukergram taken over by them last year.

425

(ii) Government of Pakistan drop their claim to the villages in the Kushiyara river region.

(iii) Government of India agree to adopt a rational boundary in the Patharia Forest Reserve region so that the current difficulties of the residents of East Pakistan regarding supply of bamboo, and small timber are remedied and there is no dislocation in the life of the border population. This rationalization of the boundary will give to East Pakistan about twelve square miles of the Patharia, Forest Reserve proper and about five square miles to its north.

(iv) Detailed agreed procedures for expediting demarcation work, for orderly exchange of territorial jurisdiction followwing completion of demarcation and for maintenance of peace in the border areas so that there is no dislocation in the life of the population of these border areas.

(v) Re-affirmation by both Governments of their determination to implement the Nehru-Noon Agreement in full and to devise legal and other procedures necessary for expeditious implementation. Necessary preparatory studies for implementation of the various items of the Nehru-Noon Agreement will be undertaken by both Governments, though field operation, in connection with the implementation of that Agreement, will have to await the advice of the Supreme Court on the reference made to them and the enactment of necessary legislation in accordance with the advice of the Supreme Court.

The distinguishing feature of this conference has been the spirit of mutual accommodation in which agreements have been reached by negotiation, This, to my mind, is the best guarantee of effective implementation of these agreements by both sides.

The implementation of the agreements has already begun. The Pakistan authorities are withdrawing this morning from the part of Tukergram occupied by them.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Replying to a two-day debate in the Lok Sabha on November 27, 1959 on a motion on India-China relations, the Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must express my gratitude to you and to Hon. Members of the House for this debate which has been taking place for the last two days. May 1, right in the beginning, say that I am sorry that some words I used on the last occasion when I moved this motion had slightly upset some Hon. Members opposite. I talked about a motley crowd with motley ideas or some such thing. I did not mean any disrespect to anybody. What I meant was that people who ate of entirely different opinions and groups had gathered together in a resolution, which was not a disrespectful thing to say.

Yesterday, Shri Asoka Mehta referred to a friend of his, Shri M. R. Masani, and said that Shri M. R. Masani's economic ideas would be pushed into the dustbin of history. I would not have ventured to say that, although I entirely agree with that statement. Therefore, it surprised me that some remark that I made without any intention of hurting any Hon. Member was resented. Anyhow it was not my intention. I am sorry.

In the course of this debate many things have been said, and many criticisms have been made, and yet, the major fact stands out, namely, on the big issues before us there is practically unanimity in this House. I was a little surprised when Acharya Kripalani accused us of treating this matter lightly and casually as a small issue. I can assure him that whatever other mistakes we might have made we have never considered this question as a small question. In fact, perhaps we might have attached a little more importance to it than even Acharya Kripalani, because we had to give earnest thought to all the consequences, to where it was leading us and to what might happen not today but in the months and years to come. In fact, if I may say so, there came for me one of these peak events of history when a plunge has to be taken in some direction which may have powerful and far-reaching effects not only on our country

426 but on Asia and even the world.

It was no small matter that we considered. I can assure him that it was not casually that we considered it. We considered it, keeping all these far-reaching aspects in view, keeping in view all these processes of development in India, and five year plans and everything. All this picture came before me and before my colleagues when we discussed it. So, let us be clear about it, namely that we are dealing today not with a small or a casual matter but a matter of the utmost significance to the present and the future of India and Asia. That is the approach.

Another thing that struck me very agreeably and pleasantly was the almost unanimous affirmation of what is called the policy of non-alignment. I think perhaps some Members who have affirmed it might have done it may be with some inhibitions or limitations in their mind. That is possible, even with some different viewpoint. But the fact is that barring perhaps one or two Hon. Members I forget the names-everyone in this House belonging to every party said that there was no other policy open to us but that of non-alignment.

Even those who perhaps cast some doubt on it seemed to me to be labouring under some misapprehension. When they talked about Panch Sheel or the five principles, they seemed to imagine that that involved our forgetting the recent developments or ignoring them and finding it impossible to co-operate with the Chinese Government in many ways and generally to carry on in the old way. But the two points are quite different; the policy of non-alignment and of having friendly relations is, I believe, basically a right policy under all circumstances, whatever happens. That is true.

But the policy remaining like that, if two countries fall out, let us say, two countries in the extreme extent, go to war, obviously that policy does not apply to them. It is absurd to say it does. If peace is broken, we deal with the situation in so far as we can. The policy remains good all the same, and it applies to the rest of the world, and later to that part of the world too, because war is a bad thing-anyhow it is not a permanent phenomenon. People think that what has been happening on our borders and elsewhere has made no great difference. That, of course, is not correct. It has made a tremendous difference, not only to Government and to our present relations with China, but to what might happen in the future too-that is quite obviousthe wide-spread and deep-seated reaction in our country. There is no doubt about that. From almost, you might say, a little child in a primary school to a grown up man there has been this powerful reaction.

I have ventured sometimes to ask people to be calm about it. That is true. But, I might tell you that I was proud of that reaction. I did not wish that reaction to go in the wrong direction, because, I was afraid that we might fritter the vitality and energy that we may have into unnecessary and even undesirable activities, thinking that we are doing something. The issue was so grave in my mind, so big. Here we are sitting on the edge of history and all kinds of things are going to happen in the future. Are we going to think that we are solving these problems by organising students' demonstrations, or coming in front of Parliament House and waving flags? That way, it does not help. That is minimising the issue. If we are straight about it and if we really feel like that, we shall have to change the millions of people in this country. It is not a question of some additional armies. These are minor things. If this unfortunate thing occurs, we have to face this and we shall become a nation of armies, every man; let there be no mistake about it. But it is not by petty things that we shall do it. Every single activity, every single thing that we do, planning etc., would have to be conditioned by one major fact, because that will be a struggle for life and death ; not as Hon. Member says-forgive my mentioning it-"go and occupy that land; force them out". I am surprised at the casual way such things are thought over and mentioned.

Therefore, may I point out to Acharyaji that we have not casually considered this question, and it is because of its importance and vital effect in the future for all of us in this country, that we have given this matter so much attention ? If two of the big countries of Asia, biggest countries, giant countries of Asia, are involved in conflict, it will shake Asia and shake the world. It is not a little border issue that we are troubled about. We are troubled about the border issue of course; that is a different matter. But the issues surrounding it, round about it, are so huge, vague, deep-seated and far-reaching, inter-twined ever, that one has to think about them with all the clarity and strength at one's command and not be swept away by passion into action which may harm us instead of doing us good. All these are considerations, and we have, in our little wisdom, however limited it may be, tried to consider these aspects. And we shall continue them.

They are too big for any Prime Minister or Government to deal with. We are small men

427

facing great events and great decisions'; and we can do very little without the support, the fullest support, of this Parliament and of the people. That support, I believe, is there and will come.

When I appealed to this House two days ago about united effort etc., I meant it in a very much deeper sense. I did not mind all the speeches made here or there, although sometimes those speeches influence public opinion. They indicate to the outside world that we are not united, that we are quarrelling and that we are weak, which is a bad effect to create on our people or on the outside world. They are misled by it, because the reality is that on a subject like this India is bound to be united and nobody can break that unity when the danger comes. But there is this to be said. If this House thinks-you will forgive me for being quite frank-that the manner our Government carries on this particular work is not satisfactory, then of course, it is open to this House to choose more competent men in whom it has faith, in whom the country has faith. That I can understand, for in a crisis there can be no, shall I say, personal considerations by way of courtesy when we face these matters. But if, in your wisdom or in the balance, you feel, this House feels, that this Government has got to face this challenge, or this Prime Minister has to face it, then hold to him and help him, and do not come in his way. I did not mean at all that there should be no criticism. Criticism, of course, there should be. But there are criticisms and criticisms. In a moment of crisis one should not do anything to encourage the opponent or the enemy. One should remain on one's toes, I admit, our people and this House, certainly, should remain on their

toes and be wide awake to correct mistakes, to point out mistakes. I do not want any Government, least of all the Government of which I have the honour to be the head, to be treated as if we are all-wise. We are not all wise ; of course not. We are rather common mortals facing great events. Sometimes, of course, the mere association of great events makes a person greater than he is, as many of us grew greater in the old days when we associated ourselves with the struggle for India's independence. Small men and women that we were, we became bigger in stature because we associated with those great events.

Now also there is a challenge of those great events and if it is your will and pleasure that I should serve in this capacity in which I have been placed, I am not going to shirk it, and I am going to serve with all my strength and such competence as I have. But if you make me the instrument of your will for this purpose, do not blunt that instrument; keep it sharp for the work that it is intended to do.

So, we really have to consider this issue in all its ramifications, to which reference has been made in this debate, and many other ramifications. But, in the final analysis, you have to consider it in this much deeper sense of the biggest challenge that they could have, a challenge which may make history for good or bad. Let us not boast. The issues are too grave for boasting. Let us not talk about how we will go and kick them out. China is no small country, nor is India. They are both big countries, ancient countries, and in perhaps somewhat different ways, strong countries. It is absurd, I think, for the Government of China to imagine that they can sit on India, or crush India. It is equally absurd for anyone in India to think that we can sit on China or crush China.

Shri Nehru said : I am not accusing anyone. I am making a statement as to what we have to face. If the worst comes to the worst and a conflict arises between two mighty countries, it does not much matter if one country has got a few more guns, or a greater army; it may matter in a military sense, but basically when these two giant countries come into conflict in a life and death struggle, no one gives in. No one gives in when he is being crushed. Certainly India does not give in. Something may happen here and there on the borders. We take it. We deal with it as we think best always keeping in view this distant prospect of what might happen and how we should deal with it. It is therefore an issue of the biggest magnitude. We should not, I submit, however, big the issue, lead ourselves to cultivate or to encourage what is being sometimes referred to here as a war psychosis, because let us realise in all consciousness that such a conflict, such a war between India and China will be bad, terribly bad, a tragedy of the deepest kind-a tragedy for us, a tragedy for China too and a tragedy for Asia and the world. Therefore let us not think lightly of it. Let us not take steps which automatically push us in that direction.

That is one side of the picture. The other side is that when this challenge comes, when this danger comes we cannot be complacent. We have to be wide awake and prepared and do all we can to face it if it comes. These are the two sides of the picture and we have to steer a course avoiding extremes.

I am not going to discuss many of the suggestions and proposals made about developing the border and all that. Of course, it is true. Some of the suggestions made rather surprised me. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh said that we should industria-

428

lise NEFA, the Ladakh area and-where else ?

It is a noble ambition of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. But before we do that we have to think of the little country of India also. We have to deal with and industrialise it. We might concentrate on industrialising India first before we go across the Himalayas for that purpose. It shows the enthusiasm of our hon. colleagues here in this Parliament, but it also shows that in their enthusiasm they sometimes overshoot the marks and that is not helpful.

Then again, we have been charged : "Why did you walk out of Bara Hoti ? Why did you do this ? You made a statement in September last and in November you tell us that you walked out of there." Well, I venture to explain the matter. First of all, we have always walked out of Bara Hoti during winter because, broadly speaking- I do not say it is impossible to live there-it is unlivable and uninhabitable in winter. Of course, it is a conceivable possibility that if necessity arises and when there is vast urgency one can do anything. One can go to the North Pole or to the South Pole. That is a different matter. But we have retired and China has retired from there because the place is unlivable. So far as we are concerned, it is, roughly, approachable for five months in the year, that is, the approach routes to Bara Hoti, on China side too, are in other months difficult-the high passes which lead to Bara Hoti are blocked. A person may live there certainly, with difficulty, but he just cannot travel to and fro in the rest of India for seven months in the, year. As I said, one can always do everything if danger threatens and necessity arises. But the idea of living there or putting our people there, cut off from the rest of India for seven months more or less, unless there is urgent necessity, did not seem to me obvious at all or something that was demanded by the honour or interests or the defence of India.

Then again, we had arrived at an arrangement with the Chinese Government some two or three years ago-three years ago, may be-particularly about this matter that they would not put any armed personnel there and we would not do so. Of course, you will say "Why did you come to such an arrangement"? Well, I am sorry that I disagree. When there are any disputes-I am not talking about these big scale border troubles and almost a mountainous invasion and all that that is a different matter-but when there are disputes as there are plenty of disputes between two countries they have always to be discussed and arrangements are arrived at. All that is a common factor everywhere where such disputes arise. So, we agreed with them that neither they nor we will send armed personnel there. We have both kept by that in the last two or three years. In summer we go. We did not agree about our withdrawal or not-there is no agreement-but it was by force of circumstances. They withdrew. We withdrew. So, we have been sending our civil personnel there-not that the civil personnel do any civil administration there, but they sit there and they will sit there, of course.

So, I submit that by attaching too much importance to these matters and becoming touchy about them rather distorts the picture in our minds. We seem to think that we are going to decide these major matters by, let us say, what they did in the old days. Two persons would fight if a moustache was a little longer or shorter or a little higher or lower. That kind of thing does not apply to these grave national problems.

Some Hon. Members talked about common defence with Pakistan. Now I do not wish to discuss that matter, but I would remind the House of the statement that appeared only two days ago-I think day before yesterday-that President Ayub Khan made when he was asked about this letter that I have sent to Premier Chou En-lai. He said that Pakistan would not recognise this because she had a claim to Ladakh, that is, because Pakistan had a claim to Ladakh, he said that I had no business to make proposal to Premier Chou En-lai and that he does not recognise my letter. I am not discussing this. But I am just pointing out the inherent difficulties of the question of common defence. But people do not realise fully, what difficulties it involves.

Then, about war-limited war, leave out big war-we have had in recent years at least two important but limited wars. One was in Korea and the other was in Indo-China and great and powerful nations were involved in it. After lasting years, those wars ended in some kind of a partial settlement or some kind of a truce : some kind of a settlement, not a complete one, perhaps. The troubles have continued, tension has continued, call it what you like. But even there, there was a war in which great nations were involved and ultimately by force of circumstances they came to some settlements which were not very satisfactory to either of them, big nations as they were. I am pointing out that we have to look at this question not lightly, not vain gloriously, not boastfully, but still firmly and determinedly. It does not mean that we have to shout at the top of our voices in order to be heard. It is action and determination that counts and not a very loud and repeated assertion as to how we feel, although

429

that has to be done when necessity arises,

There is another thing. There has been a misapprehension evidently and people say that we are creating a no-man's land in Ladakh-it is true-and that we are thereby acknowledging China's claim to the frontier there. First of all we are not acknowledging it in the slightest degree. It is patent. Secondly, in effect, we are asking them to do what, I believe, was the desire of every Member of this House, that is, to walk out of the Territory of India, that we consider India's Territory. It is true that we are doing it in a polite way, in a courteous way, in an honourable way for both the countries, because that is the only way to do it. Of course, otherwise, you aim not at getting them to do something, but at a deadlock and war. Either we come to the decision that all this is nonsense as some people do say-you must not negotiate, you must not talk with them until they do this or that. I believe that in this matter, as in some other matters, the Chinese Government has been in error, has behaved badly; it has not behaved fairly to us, has committed, what I might say, a breach of faith on us-not a breach of faith of my particular word or document, but broadly speaking breach of faith. I believe all that.

But, do you treat a Government or do you expect to be treated in a way to be ordered about ? Then, you are in the wrong. No country likes being ordered about. A great country to be ordered about is not either the way of diplomacy or dealing between two countries. Therefore, to say as some Hon. Members have said, I am sorry to criticise them, that they must do this or that,in fact, if you analyse what they say, they must surrender and then we go graciously to talk to them-that is not obviously a feasible proposition. It may please us. We will be very happy if that happens. But, that kind of thing does not happen even with small countries, much less with a great country-deliberately asking the other country to do something which it considers humiliating. There are very very few countries which tolerate thateven small countries, rights or wrongs apart. Therefore, either you aim at a complete deadlock with no way out except war or you aim at finding some doors and windows which might help in removing that deadlock, lessening it and creating an atmosphere where one can possibly get over it and settle the question to our advantage. It is a difficult matter. I cannot say now whether this can be done or not. But, one think I know absolutely and definitely : to accept the deadlock for ever or to suggest something which confirms that deadlock and leaves no doors open except war, is a bad step, dangerous step, an utterly wrong step, from any point of view.

That does not mean, of course, that we should weaken or we should-the word is often used-go

in for appeasement. I do not quite understand what meaning people attach to it. It is a bad word with bad associations. That is true. But, those Members who used it seemed to think that the alternative to any policy of negotiation or any policy of trying to find some way out was appeasement. That means that they believe in no other course but war. Let us realise it, because, they may not have used the word 'war', but the steps they suggested, if taken, inevitably lead to that. We must realise the second, third step. Therefore, I do submit that not only in this case, but always, we should be prepared to negotiate, we should be prepared to meet as we have met even when feelings were rather tense, representatives and leaders of Pakistan. I am prepared to meet them again. I may meet them if chance comes. I am not going to allow my sense of any personal prestige to come in the way of meeting any person anywhere if I think that the cause of my country is served thereby or the cause of peace is served thereby.

It is true that much as one might desire a meeting, that meeting itself, unless it is held under proper circumstances or a proper atmosphere, with some kind of background and preparation, may lead to nothing. It may fail, it may do harm. It is a different matter. It is a matter of judgment. It is true that any such meeting which has the faintest resemblance to carrying out the behests of another party is absolutely wrong.

I have said, in this particular matter, and the House will remember, Mr. Chou En-lai suggested an early meeting, I have said, "I should be glad to meet you." It seems to me that the meeting could only take place firstly when these proposals that we have sent have been accepted, there is some basis for meeting, tension becomes less or some other preparation is made for it. I do not wish to delay anything. I am not trying to escape the very idea of meeting. I want it, I welcome it as early as possible. But, as I have stated, there must be some preparation, some ground for it. It is a complicated issue. Leaving out the broad question of how the Chinese have behaved in this matter, which, I think, is very bad, even if you come to the narrow issue of the borders here and there, it is a fairly complicated issue, full of history, tradition, this and that and maps.

The Chinese Government has recently published a kind of an atlas-atlas is not perhaps the right word-a collection of maps, plenty of them. I think about two or three are their own maps. The others are maps taken from other countries, all maps, British maps, American maps,

430

French maps, wherever they could get hold of, which they thought, to some extent helped their case. Sometimes they help them a little, sometimes more.- Encyclopaedia Britannica, some traveller's maps, all that kind of thing. They have done it. We have plenty of maps, very good maps. I have no doubt that our case is a very strong one, broadly speaking. What I mean is, two countries, where there is a dispute, cannot refuse to talk. That is not a legitimate way in modern world or at any time to deal with. If you are strong, you can, of course, push aside your adversary, talk or no talk, get away. It is a bad habit even then.

In the present case, things have happened which have come as a shock to us. I have no objection to talks about Bara Hoti or one or two other places. These are limited cases of a border. Where there is a dispute, let us discuss it. How many Hon. Members here, who have warmly protested against our coming out of Bara Hoti, know even the facts about Bara Hoti? But, it is a resentment, a justified resentment because they feel that with the Chinese pushing themselves here and there, we must not put up. I can understand that emotional reaction to it. But very few of us here can discuss the question of Bara Hoti, what the facts are this way or that way, or any other question. So, I had no objection to discuss Bara Hoti or one or two other matters which I might mention. We have inherited the dispute not since the Chinese came but from before that.

But the question becomes an entirely different one as it is today; whether it is the so-called McMahon line or whether it is in Ladakh, it becomes different. Something has happened there which is not a minor border dispute, a minor transgression where there may be doubt about it or not.

Whatever the Chinese Government might feel in their minds, as I said the other day, they have an one-track mind more so than other countries. We all have one-track minds to some extent when our national interests are concerned, but I think more than other nations, the Chinese Government has that one-track mind, and that has been encouraged or developed or conditioned even more by the semi-isolation in which this revolutionary China has grown up in the last ten years with no contacts with others except a limited circle of nations.

I say this is on a different footing. Here we are for the last ten years talking to them, dealing with them, discussing the Tibetan Treaty with them, and so far as we are concerned, openly and repeatedly declaring what our frontier was the maps are there-declaring in Parliament and elsewhere, so that there was no doubt as to where we were.

I am for the moment assuming that the Chinese believe in their own case, and believed in their own frontier. Anyhow, they perfectly knew our stand while the way they put it to us was: yes, this matter, these maps require revision or reconsideration-something like that-which certainly did not close this argument, but broadly the impression created was that they hid some minor rectifications to suggest, no more.

In spite of all this, they suddenly, or gradually if you like, creep up and take possession of these various areas and Territories, I am not going into the whole history which the House knows. It does seem to me a definite breach of faith with a country which tried to be friendly to them. I think we have rightly tried to be friendly to them not only because of the past. but more so because of the present and the future, because I do not like, my mind rather does not like, the prospect of the future where these two giant nations of Asia are constantly at each other's throats. It is a bad future for us, and for them, if I may say so, and for Asia certainly.

Therefore, keeping all this in view, we followed a certain policy. There was no question of appeasement. Certainly it was a policy which objected to and disliked the other policy, what might be called anti-policies. We do not believe in anti-policies, broadly speaking, and we think anti-policies are necessarily based on hatred, which is the typical cold war approach to any problem. If you have an enemy you have to fight, go and fight that enemy, down him if you can, but this kind of cold war attitude is, I think, more pernicious than any straight out war. It perverts a nation and an individual who indulges in it. It is far better, as Gandhiji said, if you have a sword in your heart, take it out and use it, not nurse it in your heart.

So, there was no misunderstanding on our part about what China was as some people imagine. Perhaps we had given more thought to it than most Hon. Members here.

Even before the revolution, we developed, we tried to develop, friendly relations with the previous China, the Chiang Kai-shek China, not that we approved of Marshal Chiang Kai-shekit was for China to decide who should rule. But because we attached importance to China as a

431

great country, our neighbour country, the biggest country in Asia, we tried to be friendly with them, and we were friendly with them; it was not a long period, of course, since we became independent, because two or three years later came the success of this revolution there.

Well, when the revolution came, we discussed this matter, thought of it, with our Ambassador there and others concerned. It was perfectly clear that this revolution was not some kind of a palace revolution. It was what might be called a basic revolution involving millions and millions of human beings. It was a stable revolution with strength behind it and popularity behind it at that time, whatever might have happened later-there is no doubt above it. It produced a perfectly stable Government, strongly enough, entrenched and popular. That has nothing to do with our liking it or disliking it, that is a different matter. And naturally, we came to the decision that this Government should be recognised, and within two or three months we recognised it.

I might repeat here a phrase which has struck in my mind. Soon after the Chinese revolution-I forget, may be a year after, may be a little more, but about that-a very eminent statesman belonging to the Western Countries who did not like the Chinese revolution said in the course of a talk with some people. "We made a great mistake when the Russian revolution took place, the Soviet revolution ; that is, for years we behaved to them, tried to crush them, tried to, you might almost say, put an end to the revolution. We did not succeed in doing so, but we did succeed in embittering everybody and creating these terrible conflicts between us ("us" means those people, Western countries) and Russia." He said : "Let us not repeat that mistake in regard to the Chinese revolution." This was a person who did not like the Chinese revolution. He is an eminent statesman of the Western countries, but he was a wise man.

Now, it is pretty obvious, it was then and it is now, that you cannot deal with these revolutions because you dislike them, crushing them up and down, bell, book and candle; they do not cease to be. These are elemental things that happen in a country. You have to deal with them. If you like, you can fight them, but you cannot ignore them. That is why we have always been convinced that it is utterly wrong and harmful and dangerous for the world for China not to go into the United Nations. It is not in keeping with the facts of the situation, with the facts of life, it comes in the way. And so, this is what we have been saying in the last ten years and now. gradually, even those who have opposed this, have had to admit that it would have been better to recognise China : progressively they admit it. And indeed, China ought to have been there long ago but for certain complications that arise in regard to Marshal Chiang-Kai-shek, it is true

Take even the last meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations. When this question of China being seated there was brought up by some countries, including India, people were surprised. They said : "Oh, India goes on doing this in spite of what has happened in Tibet, in spite of what has happened on India's borders. How blind they are !" Well, it is not for me to say who is blind and who is not, but normally, we have found in the last ten years that what we have said, and what action we have proposed has been accepted by the other countries year after year, after much damage had been done, of course because of their not accepting that advice ; they have come round. And you will find that even in the last voting in the United Nations over this Chinese question, more people voted for it ; more people who had opposed it became neutral or abstained ; Those who had abstained voted for it

this time, that is, in spite of all these factors which had irritated the countries and irritated us against China, yet, the facts of the situation made people vote more for that in this last session, because there are statesmen there, there are people who think of the future and of the present; they cannot ignore these facts.

An Hon. Member : Is it because the Chinese are disappointed that the world is opposed to them that they attack their friends ?

The Prime Minister : I am afraid, with all respect I say so, that the Hon. Member's mind is astray at the present moment. It has nothing to do with what I am saying or with my line of argument. Perhaps, I shall be able to clarify the deep recesses in his mind presently.

Now, I am pointing out that you are dealing with enormous elemental phenoma in the world, with these big revolutions and others. You have to understand them and fight them, if you like but understand them ; you cannot fight without understanding.

Now, I shall come to another aspect of this question which might perhaps lead the lion, Member to have a slightly better understanding of the working of our minds. Ever since the Chinese revolution, we naturally had 432

to think of this major fact of this revolution and what this new China was likely to be. We realised that this revolution, apart from the changeover was going to be a very big factor in Asia and in the world too, and in regard to us. We realised, we knew this much history, that a strong China is normally an expansionist China. Throughout history that has been the case. And we saw, or we felt that the two factors taken together, the great push towards industrialization of that country, plus the amazing pace of its population increase, would create a most dangerous situation ; it was obvious ; it did not require much cleverness to think of that ; every intelligent person in the world more or less thought on those lines.

The population problem itself, a vast population and the pace of growth, greater than almost any in the wide world, creates an explosive situation ; it bursts at the seams, but a big population may be weak, of course, unless it is industrialised. And it is this industrialisation process that came in powerfully, that gave a push. And I said, the combination of that too, was likely to create, we saw eight, nine or ten years ago, that it was likely to create a very novel and a very dangerous situation, not so much for India, but for India also-that taken also with the fact of China's somewhat inherent tendency to be expansive, when she is strong. So, nobody was blind to this fact. We realised it. We have discussed it here, in other countries repeatedly, because everybody knew it. And gradually, as the years have gone by, this fact has become more and more apparent and obvious. So, if any person thinks that we followed our policy in regard to China, without realising these obvious consequences, he is mistaken. If he thinks that we followed it because of fear of China, he is doubly mistaken. It is not for me to say how weak or strong or fearful we are, but I think it may be said that at no time during these last ten years have we functioned under the urge of fear; not previous to these ten or twelve years, but since we formed a government, we have been conditioned not to function under fear. And something of that lesson and experience has still conditioned us and helped us. There was no question of fear of China. Certainly, there was an appraisal of a situation, of the consequences;that is a different matter-and further action taken, which helps to prevent a dangerous development of these steps, of course; every country has to take that.

So, I am putting this to the House as the background of our thinking, because people seem to imagine that either we live in a world of our own without thinking of what is happening elsewhere, without realising it, or that we are shrinking in fear. They are mistaken in both ways.

Another point that I might mention is these great revolutions like the Soviet revolution or the Chinese revolution, and at the same time, in a sense even a greater revolution, that is, the scientific and technological revolution that is taking place; all these have been round us in our generation. We have seen them, technological and scientific. It is only in the last few years that we are really making good. Previously, we had no chance. And we are doing pretty well in it, and I have no doubt that considering the material we have, we shall do well, given an opportunity.

Now, all revolutions, whether it is the French revolution or the Russian or any other, rather tend to function abnormally, obviously; a revolution itself is a departure from normal behaviour. normal development. They become abnormal; they become upheavals; they do not pretend to having drawing-room manners; in fact, they go against drawing-room manners and break things; they are destructive, although also these big revolutions have obviously something constructive in them, something which appeals to people, something which rouses their enthusiasm, obviously. And you see, therefore, these tremendous ferments and upsets and crude things and cruel things happening. Gradually, the revolution subsides, keeping many of the gains of the revolution, but becoming more and more normal, whether it is the French revolution or any other. Of course, it depends on other facts how soon it becomes normal. If conditions, external conditions, prevent it, like wars and tumults, it takes a long time; it is bound to, because people cannot live up to that pitch of excitement of a revolution. Now, we see that normalising process very much at work. So in the Soviet Union, I do not mean to say that that means they are going back, on their economic theories, although, without going back, they change them; as wise and pragmatic people, they change them somewhat from time to time, the basis remaining more or less the same.

Now, China is very very far from normality, and that is our misfortune, and the world's misfortune-that is, strength, considerable strength, coming in an abnormal state of mind. This is a dangerous thing. There it is. One has to face it, combat it, if you like. I am merely analysing the situation.

That is why you find a marked difference between the broad approach of the Soviet Union

433

to world problems and the Chinese approach. I do not think there is any country in the worldof course, all countries are anxious for peace-I do not think there is any country which is more anxious for peace than the Soviet Union. And I think that is the general view of people, even of their opponents. But I doubt if there is any country in the world, if I may put the other thing, which cares less for peace than China today. See the vast difference between the two.

One may talk of other things. Shri M. R. Masani may talk still of International Communism and others may talk of International Capitalism. There may perhaps be a grain of truth in what they say. But basically and fundamentally, these cries of these ideas are completely out of date and have no relation to today's world. However, it is not for me to argue it. I am merely stating a fact. The world is changing and I can conceive the two great colossuses today, the Soviet Union and the United States, coming very near to each other, as they are slightly coming. Essentially, these ideas of Capitalism and Communism are, as I said, out of date. You may quote scripture. I think Shri M.R. Masani quoted, what Chairman Mao said and somebody else quoted, Marx. Well, it is interesting to know what Chairman Mao said in the middle of a civil war-many things are said at such times. It may be that Chairman Mao will say the same today. I cannot say. But the fact remains that all these cries become out of date. They are out of date today in this world when you have reached the moon and other things happen. The fact of the matter is that the two countries at the present moment in a sense the most advanced technologically, scientifically and all that, are America and the Soviet Union. They both worship technology and the machine. They both think that they will get more and more out of it, and perhaps they both forget that there are some other deeper aspects of human life which cannot be ultimately ignored. So this talk about international capitalism and International Communism, repeating an old slogan, merely prevents us from thinking straight and understanding the changing World.

The Hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, expressed surprise and resentment at the letter I had written to Premier Chou En-lai which was sent on the 16th November, just the day this House reassembled. Could I not have delayed that letter for two days and get the sanction of the House ? I am surprised at this suggestion, as if diplomatic correspondence of any type, even of a trivial type and much more so of an important type, is going to be considered by Parliament before every letter is sent. It is impossible for us to carry on in that way. It cannot simply be done. I am sorry to say so. You have to trust to some extent these people whom you appoint to do this job. If they do badly, take them out, of course But you have to trust them. There is no other way. You cannot have these letters communications and despatches all the time put before the House.

That was the reason also why a number of these things were not placed before the House previously. I am accused of keeping things from the House, I did not deliberately do so. But I do not wish that before a thing was completed-the correspondence-I should put my letter and create perhaps a furore before I get a reply. One thing in which this argument or criticism may be applied was about the news regarding the Aksai Chin Road. Now, as I said, we wanted to confirm it. We sent our men there. It was only in October last year-about a year ago-that we had known that it was there and they had seen it. It was in our territory. Immediately we wrote to Premier Chou En-lai. We could of course have immediately announced the fact. But the possible result in such cases is that there is no room for talk left. Each side becomes rigid-I do not say they are flexible now. That is not my point, but I am talking of the general practice. Each side becomes rigid; publicity is given; national feeling is roused and the other country reacts to it. Then any talk, any flexible approach, becomes impossible. I may have made a mistake but I am merely explaining how one cannot all the time announce or publish these facts in Parliaments, the Press and the rest. But the broad principle, of course, is there that it is essential for Parliament to be kept in touch with events and there should be no secrecy ; there might be delays etc. in order to achieve a certain object.

Shri Nehru said : May I just say this to repeat that we have said previously that any aggression on Bhutan or Nepal would be considered by us as aggression of India. I know very well what all this involves-what I am saying. It is a very grave responsibility. But realising all this and thinking it out, we said so long ago and now I want to repeat it because not only of wider considerations but also because of considerations of India's security. If you ask, what will be done if this happens or that happens obviously I cannot say.

Now, the other day, referring to the illtreat-

ment of some of our prisoners by the Chinese, I mentioned in the Geneva Convention. I think Shri Asoka Mehta said something about that and asked whether China had signed it. I have looked that

434

matter up. It is the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, August 12, 1949. The Convention applies to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties even if the state of war is not recognised by one of them. The Convention was also applicable to cases of partial or total occupation of the Territory of a High Contracting Party even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance. No physical or mental torture nor any other form of coercion is to be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. It applies to this. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted or exposed to any other unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind. Apart from the present Chinese Government accepting it, Premier Chou En-Lai actually made a statement to this effect-I am not quite sure where but I think-in Geneva, recognising the Geneva Conventions.

I am very grateful to this House for the courtesy it has shown me.

I would again repeat that it is up to us to realise the gravity of the situation fully, because it is not only an army matter, defence matter, an all that, but it goes much further than that. affects all of us; it affects our production; affects all our planning; it affects the workers i the factory and the employers; it affects men i every field. All these and other demands that ar made will have to be conditioned by this new position. Strikes, hartals, lock-outs and all that will have to be viewed from this point of view. Students, wh I am glad to say have shown so much vitality over this issue will have to realise that that has to be shown in other ways also which would really help us. So, it applies to all our life.

So far as we are concerned, I cannot function and my Government cannot function in a big wayit can function normally-when these difficulties face us if we do not have the fullest cooperation from Parliament and the people. I appeal, there fore, for that co-operation, and I promise them that we shall keep them in touch with what happens to the best of our ability. I cannot promise that every letter I sent shall suddenly or certainly be placed before them, but it is impossible for us really to function with any kind of secrecy when such grave issues are at stake.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN KOREA RUSSIA MALI BHUTAN NEPAL SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Lok Sabha Motion on India-China Relations-Prime Minister's Speech

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, moved the following motion in the Lok Sabha on November 25, 1959 :

"That the White Paper II on India-China relations laid on the Table of the House on November 16, 1959 and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China laid on the Table of the House on November 20, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Continuing, the Prime Minister said

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in September last, about 2 1/2 months ago this House debated the question of Sino-Indian relations, more especially in regard to our border and the developments which have taken place there. We went into, at that time some past history and the House was concerned about the various developments. Since then, other events have taken place and other developments also and I have placed on the Table of the House various papers, correspondence, etc. which had occurred since our last debate. The House knows the background of all that has happened and I do not propose to go into that except perhaps to fill in some details here and there because it is important that this House and Parliament should have every aspect of the question before it. A great responsibility rests on us in Government but that responsibility can only be discharged if the House itself shoulders it in a very large measure, as representing the country. Therefore, it is my intention to keep the House informed of every development in this situation and take counsel with Members as to what policy we should adopt.

For the present, we have specially to deal with certain recent developments, the proposals made by Premier Chou En-lai and my reply to Premier Chou En-lai containing certain other and alternative proposals, and the House will no doubt consider them and express its views in regard to them. But behind these proposals lie certain basic approaches and basic principles; because we cannot act merely in a haphazard or spasmodic way reacting to events that happen. Naturally we have to react to them but that reaction has to be conditioned and controlled by the basic policies that we pursue and the objectives that we have. If we forget it or if we have no anchorage in basic policies and objectives, then our reactions sometimes may take us in the wrong direction or lead

435

us in a direction not of our choice. Therefore, I think it is important that these basic policies should be kept in mind.

Naturally, even basic policies have to be implemented in the light of conditions that arise and in this changing world and changing situations we cannot ignore what happens, but we have to measure what happens and respond to it in the light of any basic policy we might have. Therefore I should like this House to consider in all earnestness those basic policies which have governed-us and which, I hope and trust, will govern us in the near future.

If there is a vital difference in regard to those basic policies, then, of course, the steps we may think of taking may be different and may vary. It is necessary that that should be done more particularly now and not merely taken for granted. We have accepted certain basic policies in the past and the Government, under the directions of this Parliament, has functioned in accordance with those basic policies. In the old days, perhaps, as I said, they were taken for granted and not put to the test of experience and danger. They are being put to the test now and it is necessary, therefore, that we should not merely take them for granted but accept them or reject them as this House chooses. There should be no half-way house about our thinking when matters of such importance are at issue.

We are faced with grave problems. I do not mean to say that there is some immediate danger of any magnitude, but the gravity of the problems lies certainly in the present but even more so in the future, and any step that we might take will therefore be pregnant with future possibilities. It is a problem obviously of a much greater, much wider significance than what might be called party problem. It transcends all party issues; it comprises the whole country and, I may say so, to some extent, it comprises the issues beyond our country, that is, the issues of war and peace in the world.

Now it is a tremendous responsibility for any individual or group like our Government to have to shoulder and face these questions and decide wisely and firmly about that policy and about the steps we should take. No individual and, if I may say so, no Government even is good enough by itself to shoulder this grave responsibility, because the consequence that flow from it do not flow to the Government only; they flow to the country and to some extent to the world. Therefore, I would beg this House to shoulder that responsibility and tell us what we should do about it. If we can do it, carry out its directions, well, and good for us. If we cannot, then, let others carry those directions out. But let the directions be clear. We cannot deal with these matters in a half-hearted way, in a destructive way, in a party way, because, as I said, the issues before us are grave and vital, and every step that we may take, by that, we sow certain seeds for the future which may bear good fruit or ill fruit.

It is in this mood and with this feeling of a certain humility before those grave issues which affect the future of our country that I approach this Hon. House and seek its indulgence if I say what I feel about these matters frankly because frankness is desirable.

Now I shall discuss in the course of my speech the particular matters which are before us, but as I have referred to the basic issues, I shall begin by saying something about them. We have stood for a policy of peace, for a policy of friendship with all nations, even though we differ from them on a policy of non-alignment with power blocs and avoidance of military pacts and the like. It is not for us to judge what others do about it. May be circumstances may be different or difficult for them. The other countries have to judge about their policies and their alliances as they think best. Certainly I do not feel myself competent to criticise them as to offer them advice, but certainly I feel that so far as our country is concerned it is we who should judge, and we have followed this policy.

Now, recently, a cry has arisen in this country from some sources, some people, criticising and condemning that policy of non-alignment, that policy which has been sometimes referred to as one of Panch Sheel or five principles and the like. It has been said that that has collapsed because of what has happened vis a vis China. Some people have even allowed themselves the pleasure of being humorous about it. It was not particularly happy, being satirical or humorous on issues of this character.

As I said, this policy has been our consistent policy for the last ten years and indeed, even before; when the words Panch Sheel came into use they just described the policy that we were pursuing. Some years ago, other great countries in the world also spoke rather lightly and casually about our policy, imagining or thinking that it was a policy of weakness, of sitting on the fence and the like. But as the years have gone by, wisdom has come to other countries, not all, but many, and the biggest of them, and today it is one of the bright features of the developments

436

that take place before us, namely, that basically, that very policy has not only been appreciated in so far as India is concerned but is colouring and conditioning the activities of great nations. Let us not forget that. It is an important fact. That policy was against cold war and the like, because cold war necessarily leads in the direction of hot war and people came to realise that war of that type in the present age was a disaster, which could not have been imagined and therefore, steps must be taken to avoid it. Fear, apprehension and suspicions came in the way, but ultimately an effort is being made, which has met with some success already and which holds promise of greater success in the future, that we must put an end to this cold war and we must come to some kind of settlement, which removes these fears and suspicions.

There are innumerable hurdles and difficulties in the way, but I think we would be justified in a measure of optimism when the greatest nations of the world today, greatest nations not only in peace but in war, are thinking on these lines and are trying to come together, and I should like this House, even though we are entangled in our own problems and difficulties, to send its good wishes to the efforts of the great leaders of these nations who are working for peace.

During the last few years, we find the world has been on the brink of danger most of the time, because cold war is the brink of danger. On two or three occasions, it came very near toppling over the brink. There were talks of brinkmanship too as a policy. But the world as a whole has moved away somewhat from that dangerous edge of a precipice, but it is a strange turn of fate or circumstance that we in India, who stood for this policy of peace and worked for it with all our might, should suddenly be drawn into this dangerous situation which we face today. I am not for the moment saying whose fault it was. If Hon. Members or any Member wants to say that we are partly at fault, it may be, although I firmly believe that right policy is right and rightness should not be judged by the wrongness of other peoples' actions and that right conduct inevitably has right results. If you like, you may call me an idealist, but I have been conditioned to believe that throughout my life and I am not going to change at the age of seventy years. It is true that some Hon. Members may smile at this and may think it a sign, perhaps, of senility in me. Whatever it may be, the fact is that by a strange turn of fortune's wheel, fate or circumstance, we, who stood for peace, are faced by the possibility even of war.

I do not think war will come. I am merely

talking about possibilities. I do not think that the world or any country is foolish enough to jump over the precipice into war. But I say that these possibilities come into our minds and that is certainly strange. Those people who may imagine that this is due to our policy of Panch Sheel or non-alignment seem to me to think in a somewhat distorted and upside down way. I really do not understand that. I would say that any other policy will have brought infinitely greater dangers and brought them sooner and brought them when we would - not have had the prestige we undoubtedly possess in the world today because of our policies and the wide friendship that we possess in the world today.

Some Hon. Members sometimes talk of our not having any friends. Apparently their idea of friendship is some kind of iron chain that binds in a military alliance. That is their idea of friendship. It is feeble; that iron chain breaks often enough. It is not a chain of friendship, but a chain of compulsion of events. We do not want such chains to bind us. But we have the friendship of great nations and small, nations with whom we do not agree in many matters and yet we are friendly.

When people talk lightly, casually and scornfully of Panch Sheel, I should like them to tell which of those five principles they disapprove of, which of them they think is bad and which of them they think should not be acted upon. I should like them to tell that, because nobody has yet told me that. I say those five principles are right principles, inevitable principles, for rightthinking people, right-thinking individual, or right-thinking world. If you go away from them, vou move into a world of conflict and a world of conflict today is a world of doom. Therefore, I should like that to be considered. Let it not be said merely that this is silly. That is not good enough. We are dealing with various matters in a serious way and it is just not quite good enough-not that I mind it-for some kind of party advantage to be taken, because the country faces a grievous situation.

I have mentioned all this because I want this basic issue to be considered by this House in this debate and for a firm and clear opinion to be given on that issue, which will govern the activities of this Government. Naturally we have to act according to the directions of Parliament, which means according to the wishes of our country and countrymen, who are represented in Parliament. On this matter there should be no quibbling, no doubt. A straight forward direction

437

must be given that this is the basic policy that the country must follow. In a matter of this kind, I repeat again, whatever internal difficulties might be, whatever the internal controversies might be, which influence the action of parties, normally a country does not function in a party way when such problems are raised and the Parliament of that country decides something.

So, we have this curious situation that when in the western world, which means a large part of the world, there is a sort of improvement in their relations,-although there are doubts still, but nevertheless there is a basic, definite, deliberate and earnest desire to improve them-we have to face this situation. In a sense the danger zone shifts from other countries to our own borders.

I should like to add a little to the information I gave previously filling some gaps as to how this border situation arose. There is nothing new in what I am going to say. Nevertheless, I think Hon. Members should know it. The Government of India recognised the Central People's Government of China in December, 1949. Eight months later, the latter, i.e., the Chinese Government, expressed their gratification over the Government of India's desire "to stabilise the Chinese-Indian border" and the Government of India replied that "the recognised boundary between India and Tibet should remain inviolate." Then, some time later. in an informal conversation with the Indian Ambassador, on the 27th September, 1951, Premier Chou En-lai expressed his anxiety to safeguard in every way Indian interests in Tibet on which matter "there was no territorial dispute or controversy between India and China." He added :

"The question of stabilisation of the Tibetan frontier was a matter of common interest to India, Nepal and China and could best be done by discussions between the three countries."

I am quoting still :

"Since the Chinese army entered Lhasa" (i.e. in 1951) "in pursuance of the Sino-Indian agreement of 1951 to take up frontier posts, it was necessary to settle the matter as early as possible."

Now, this was in September 1951. On October 4, 1951, the Indian Ambassador in Peking, under instructions from the Government of India, informed the Chinese Premier, that the Government of India would welcome negotiations on the subjects mentioned by Premier Chou En-lai. This was previous to the agreement, which came later, about Tibet. In February 1952 the Indian Ambassador gave a statement of the existing Indian rights in Tibet and reiterated India's willingness to arrive at a mutually satisfactory settlement. Premier Chou En-lai replied that there was "no difficulty in safeguarding the economic and cultural interests of India in Tibet." He did not refer to the frontier question in his reply; nor did the Indian Ambassador raise this question specifically then. It was our belief that since our frontier was clear, there was no question of raising this issue by us.

When discussions took place for the Sino-Indian agreement on Tibet, seven subjects were dealt with-our mission at Lhasa, trade agencies at Gyantse and Yatung, a trade agency at Gartok, the right to carry on trade other than trade marts, postal and telegraphic installations, military escorts to Gyantse and the right of pilgrimage.

These were indicated to the Chinese Government as subjects for negotiation and ultimately an agreement was arrived at in regard to these matters. Our clear impression was that we had settled all matters relating to Tibet and India and that no frontier issue remained except some minor ones. The question of the frontier did not arise at all at any other time, except later in relation to some maps published in China to which we took exception. The reply of the Chinese Government to us was that these were old maps and their revision would be taken up later when they had leisure to do so. This objection was raised by us several times and the reply also was the same every time.

In March last, that is, this year, there was Tibet revolution. In fact, there had been uprising in the eastern part of Tibet for several years previously. In March this revolt took place in Lhasa and spread. This resulted in large numbers of refugees coming to India and the Chinese forces pursuing them, or trying to cut them off, and they also reached our eastern frontier, that is, what is called the McMahon line. Later they spread out to some other frontiers on the west. The story of subsequent events is clearly stated in the correspondence in the White Paper.

It was for the first time on the 8th September, 1959, that is, about 2 1/2 months ago, that Premier Chou En-lai, in a letter addressed to me, claimed the areas in India which had been included in the Chinese maps. Up till now there had only been this reference to maps and their telling us that they would be revised : in what manner, of course they did not say. But, for the first time, in this letter in September last, Premier Chou En-lai

438

made the claim on the basis of those maps, though he did certainly express his willingness to discuss the boundary disputes with us, presumably such disputes being of a minor character.

Now, in this brief account I have left out Aksai Chin developments. I shall now say something about them. In September, 1957, we learnt of an announcement by the Chinese Government that a road had been made from Yehcheng to Gartok in Tibet and that this would be open to traffic in October. As there were two alternative routes from Sinkiang to Western Tibet, we enquired from our Embassy as to where this road was. They could not send any precise information, but they sent us a copy of the announce. ment which had been published in the People's Daily of Peking which also continued a sketch on a very rough and small scale. In view of this uncertainty about the exact alignment, it was decided that before we send the protest to the Chinese authorities, we should have more reliable information about the alignment of the road. Two reconnaissance parties were sent to the areas in the summer of 1958, an army party towards the north and a police party towards the southern extremity of this road. It took some time for the police party to return as the journey was a long and arduous one. The army party did not return, and it was suspected by us that they might have been arrested by the Chinese authorities. In fact, they had been arrested and they were released somewhat later. From the police party we learnt that there was a part of this road in Indian Territory. This was a year ago, round about the end of September of last year when we knew with some definiteness that there was this road which had crossed our territory in Aksai Chin. On the 18th October, 1958 a little more than a year ago, we sent a formal protest note to the Chinese Government regarding this road and repeating that the road passed through Indian territory and asking for an early reply. No reply was received then or later to this note of ours. On the 14th December, 1958, I wrote a long letter to Premier Chou Enlai about the incorrect delineation of the Sino-Indian boundary in Chinese maps and the circulation of those maps. There was no specific mention in this letter of Aksai Chin as this matter had been referred to in the earlier letter. Premier Chou En-lai replied to this letter on the 23rd January, 1959. These letters are given in the White Paper. I then sent another letter on the 22nd of March. 1959 to Premier Chou En-lai. This letter dealt in detail with the boundary in all sectors, including Ladakh. This brings us to March of this year when we were trying diplomatically, through correspondence with the Chinese Government, for a settlement over this issue.

It has, been stated and the charge may be justified-that we failed in informing Parliament of this. As the House will appreciate, the matter came precisely in our knowledge in October, that is, a year ago. And we took immediate steps to enquire from the Chinese Government and we were corresponding with them for the next three or four months.

We felt, rightly or wrongly, that we should clear this up with them and then place the matter before the House. Now, in about the middle of March something else happened. The Tibetan Rebellion took place and a large number of other issues, border issues and other issues arose, with which we have dealt in all this correspondence. That is in so far as this Aksai Chin matter or road is concerned.

Another complaint has been made that we were not swift or quick enough to inform the country or this House-the House was not sitting -about the recent incident in Ladakh. That, I think, is based on a complete misapprehension. The incident took place on the 21st October. We gave the information to the Press, etc. on the 23rd October, that is, two days later. We heard of it for the first time on the 22nd October evening or late afternoon. It so happened that I was in Calcutta then. So was our Foreign Secretary. We board or we were told that a brief message had come, that there had been this conflict and that some of our persons had died. Further particulars did not come by then. We got it there. We returned early next morning. We got some other messages and we gave the matter about mid-day, maybe in the afternoon, of that day to the Press. There was absolutely no delay there.

People complained as to how did the Chinese send a protest note to us a little before, a few hours before. The reason is fairly obvious, namely, that our party had to return from the scene of accident or incident to its own base and then send the message while the Chinese got the message from their outpost or check-post, or whatever it was there. So this involved a few hours' delay, nothing great. The message came to us via Shillong. So there was absolutely no delay in that.

In dealing with these matters, I do not know how far the Hon. Members have felt this, but it is important that we should realise an inherent difficulty in dealings between India and China. May be, to some extent that difficulty arises in dealings between any two countries, more particularly when they are rather unlike each other. All of us are apt to think or look at the

439

world or look at any problem, naturally, from our point of view. The other person looks at it from his. Even geography becomes different, whether you are at the North Pole or at the Equator looking at the world. But that, to some extent, has to be faced. But in regard to China, I feel that we have to deal with, what might be called, an one-track mind, very much so. We all have to some extent one-track minds, of course, although I believe that we in India perhaps suffer from it a little less than other countries.-Not all of us anyhow. I was not excluding the opposition from my remarks, although sometimes I begin to doubt whether they do not have onetrack minds. However, it seemed to me in discussing these matters that one comes up against this wall of an one-track mind apart from

other things. What is more-I am not saying this as criticism but as some kind of appraisal, right or wrong-this is all a national trait which has existed for a considerable time past because China was a great, advanced and powerful country at various stages of history. It spreadand, of course, it spread by the normal Imperialist methods-by war and conquest and built up a great empire repeatedly.

Anyhow, from fairly early in history they had a sensation of greatness of the Middle Kingdom. as they called themselves, all the fringes belonging to lesser developed countries and human beings who paid tribute to them. It seemed natural to them that other countries should pay tribute to them. Then I think-I forget the exact date, but long ago-about 150 years ago or thereabouts when the British came, they sent an ambassador or an envoy with some gifts to them. The reply of the then Chinese Emperor makes interesting reading. He addresses them. He thanks them for their loyalty and subservience to him and he appreciates their gifts as from some country of which, in a sense, they were suzerain powers almost. Their thinking was that the rest of the world occupies a lower grade. Whenever any gifts were sent, even in Tibetan history you come across cases where these gifts were sent,-they always treated that as if it became a sign of their sovereignty or suzerainty. That was 200 or 300 years ago.

Now that has made it difficult for us to understand the working of their minds and, what is more to the point, for them to understand the working of our minds. It has been very difficult for me to explain to them that in this country our structure of Government is, what we consider, democratic, there are civil liberties and that civil liberties include the civil liberty or the right to misbehave, the right even to say highly objectionable things-that is part of civil libertythat there are parties here which function in their own way, rightly or wrongly, and that Government here cannot control them and cannot inhibit these activities unless they go beyond the pale of the law. They (the Chinese Government) cannot understand it.

Now take an incident that happened some months back-an incident when Chairman Mao Tse-tung's picture was set up and insulted and some tomatoes were thrown for about half a minute or for a minute when the police intervened. Now this incident created a depth of anger in China, which it is difficult for the people to understand because Chairman Mao was a symbol to them. The picture did not count. The symbols are more to them than even to us although we believe more in symbols. It was a symbol to them of everything and that anybody should insult Chairman Mao's picture made them livid with rage.

Now I want the House to realise what effect some things that we say or do unthinkingly or casually have. Therefore I have been venturing to say that in these matters we should weigh the words we use, the language we use and as well as the actions we take. I am not talking of China only now but of any country. It is a wrong and dangerous thing to deal with individuals there. What I mean to say is that to condemn individuals and Governments, more especially to condemn heads of governments, heads of States, because they are symbols, is bad because you create an unnecessary passion on the other side, which comes in the way of calm consideration of any matter, just as, you can well imagine the strength of feeling in India if in some country insults were hurled at our revered President. We would resent it. because he is the symbol of the dignity of our State. Therefore, we should avoid this. But this basic fact remains. I only mention this to help us to understand the situation. It does not solve it. of course.

We now face a situation which is partly a political situation, but partly also a military one; not military in the sense of war coming, but military in the sense that we have to take military steps to meet it and be prepared or all contingencies', in that sense it is a military situation. Now, obviously, this House will not expect me to tell it what arrangements, military and defence arrangements, we are making. That kind of thing is not publicized. But I can tell this House that at no time since our independence, and of course before it, were our defence forces in better condition, in finer fettle and with the background of far greater industrial production in the country to help them,

440

than today. I am not boasting about them or comparing them to other countries, but I am quite confident that our defence forces are well capable of looking after our security.

It is easy to say, but does the House realise that we have 9,000 miles of frontier? It is a pretty big link-not the frontier with China; that is 2,600 miles, a little over 2,600 miles-but all the various frontiers that we have running to 9,000 miles. Some people seem to imagine that our forces should stand at guard along all our frontiers, nine thousand miles.

An Hon. Member: Not all; nobody says that. Only where they are threatened.

The Prime Minister : Quite so, quite so; I accept the amendment. So they rush to guard that place. Then the other party goes to some other place; then we rush to that place; our time is spent in rushing to all manner of places at the bidding and command of others ! Any person with the least acquaintance with military matters, of war and other things, would not make such a suggestion, I can assure this House. It has no meaning, running about like this, dispersing your forces over wide areas and getting entangled here and there and reducing your capacity to hit out wherever you want to. The main thing is to hit out when you want to, not to stand in a row like in the streets of Delhi when some procession goes by.

An Hon. Member: The best thing is not to guard anywhere so that we can concentrate !

The Prime Minister : This is a matter in which I cannot express an opinion, because I do not consider myself an expert in it. I have to take the advice of the experts who advise me or our Government; naturally, discussing it with them, naturally, putting one's own view-point, but in the final analysis accepting their advice as to how to use the resources at our disposal. Obviously, the, resources are not infinite, are not just that you can draw upon them; there is a certain limitation upon those resources, and we have to use them to the best advantage.

But, apart from. these border conflicts, the real strength of any army or defence forces, it is wellknown, is the industrial background of the country. If you think in terms of war, it is the industrial back-round that counts. If the last Great War, the Second World War, was won by a certain group of nations, of course many factors counted, but it was the enormous industrial productive capacity that counted most. If some powers today, like the United States or the Soviet Union are very great powers, super powers, it is because of the industrial and scientific progress that they have made. It is obvious, their scientific and industrial progress have made them such tremendous powers. We have a greater population than either of them. Population does not make it, or merely giving a rifle to every individual. It may help in some matters. And, therefore, the whole question of defence has to be considered in all these various aspects, and among them the basic aspect is the growth of industry, industrialisation; and, industrialisation not meaning merely some kind of defence industries-that is important of course-but you have to create a background to industrialisation all over the place, and more particularly in matters relating to industry ; but you cannot separate these things.

In the past we have discussed our defence estimates here, and this House has seldom wanted them to be lowered much. Sometimes some criticism has come. At the same time we have resisted-I want to be quite frank with you-we have resisted the normal tendency of our defence apparatus to spend more and more. In every country there is that tendency. We have resisted it. Last year we reduced our estimates, not because we wanted our defence to be weak, but because we knew that the strength of defence is the development, the Five Year Plan, and this and that. That is the real strength of the defence. It is true that when we are certainly faced with a dangerous position, well, you have to make the best of it with whatever you have. But if you are always making the best of it at the moment, that means that you are never preparing for the morrow with greater strength.

Coming to these letters, Premier Chou Enlai's letter to me and my reply to him, they are both before the House and Hon. Members must have read both of them. It is not my purpose to go into details, and I should not. But I do feel that the approach that we have made in our letter to Premier Chou En-lai is a fair and a reasonable one. It is an honourable one. It is an honourable one certainly for our country, and I would repeat that it is an Honourable one for China too. Because, unless you are bent on war and you merely want drumbeating all the time and strong language-well, that is a different matter. I regret to say that I do not agree with that, and I think it is a wrong policy and a dangerous policy. War is a dangerous policy. But if war is thrust upon one, one has to defend it. If war is thrust upon us, we shall fight, and fight with all our strength. That

441

is a different matter. But I shall avoid war, try to prevent it with every means in our power, because it is a bad thing, it is a dangerous thing. Shri Masani smiles, because he evidently thinks differently ; he likes war, or he may think that some of his friends from other countries will come and help if there is war here. If that is the view of any person that we should become just a weak nation, shouting loudly and expecting others to come to our defence, I hope India will never degrade herself in this way.

You have to be logical. Either you have to have a bellicose, warlike mentality, a short of what is normally associated, let us say, with Hider or Nazism. Then you definitely work for war. Of course, Hitler had the strength to do so although he was defeated ultimately. I find here people exhibiting a strange situation : not having the strength and yet talking like Hitler. It was a most most amazing phenomenon. It was bad enough for Hitler who had the strength to do so. Without strength, for a person to talk like Hitler seems quite extraordinary. However, my point was, if you do not aim at war, you have to face a dangerous situation from what you do.

Naturally, inevitably, you take every step to protect your country, because, war does not come or not come because of your wishes. Only you may help or prevent the process. It is the other party that may bring it about in spite of you. Therefore, you have to keep that in mind and therefore you have to prepare for it to the best of your ability. That is admitted. If it comes, you have to fight to the best of your ability. Nevertheless, you have to work for avoiding it. If you are working for avoiding it, the preliminary steps that you take should also keep that in view. Because, if you talk in too loud a voice about these matters, if you go on denouncing everybody, if you create an atmosphere which must inevitably lead to warlike thinking, exciting people in your

own country and irritating beyond measure people in the other country, whether you want or not, you are taking that country step by step to that position. That is inevitable I do not myself see why the strength of a country should be associated with the beating of drums. I have heard of this being done in the old days. Nowadays, strength is represented not by drum-beating or slogans, but by whatever it is, your army, your industrial apparatus or morale-all these things. Build them up certainly and stand firmly before any intruder. I can understand that. But, keep the facts of life in view. Do not ignore life as it is, the world as it is, everything as it is.

I can recognise one thing. There are some things which no nation can tolerate. Any attack on its honour, on its integrity, on the integrity of its territory, no nation tolerates, and it takes risks, grave risks even, to protect all that. Because, you cannot barter these things, yourself-respect and honour. One has to stand for them, whatever the consequences. That is all right. But, in standing for them, if one takes some action which puts the same dilemma before the other country and the other country thinks that its honour is being attacked and its self-respect brought down, you shut all the doors to any kind of approach or talk. I should like the House to appreciate this distinction. Firmness and building up of strength is obviously necessary and right and inevitably when we have to face a crisis of this kind. But, firmness and building up of strength does not mean doing so in a manner which may worsen a situation and which may shut all possible doors to a peaceful settlement. I think, whatever the circumstances, whatever the conditions that might arise, always there should be an attempt at a peaceful settlement, provided always again that we are not going to barter our honour, our self-respect our territory. That proviso always remains. Otherwise, we are talking childishly-I hope you will forgive me for using this word-in this world talking without understanding the consequences of our words or what action we are apparently suggesting. It becomes then something, the defence of the country being put on the level of, let us say, a demonstration in Delhi city. Defence of a country is something different; not a speech in the Ramlila ground or drum-beating somewhere or slogans somewhere. It is far too serious a matter to be treated in this casual way. So, I have endeavoured in my reply to Premier Chou

En-lai, in all my letters that I have sent to him, to state our case with as much clarity as I could command, but always with politeness, always with a view that I might help in solving this problem however difficult it might be. If it is beyond solution, we face that. But, we shall always go on trying to slove it.

Some people come to me and say "Why don't you eject everybody from Indian territory?" Occasions may arise in war when one tries to do so. But one does not do so except in war. If it is war, then, of course, one tries it. In peace, one tries other means. Otherwise, it is war. People seem to think that we need not go to war. but we may have some kind of petty campaigns here and there. I do confess that this is beyond my understanding.

There are one or two matters that I should like to mention specially. One is the treatment of people of Kashmiri or, more particularly,

442

Ladakhi origin in Tibet by the Chinese authorities. This has been very harsh and unreasonable. Our Trade representatives in Gyantse and Yatung, etc. also have had any amount of pinpricks and difficulties from day to day. It is interesting to contrast this with the Chinese claim to the Indonesian Government for the treatment of people of Chinese origin in Indonesia, because there is a very great difference between that and the treatment they are giving to those people of Kashmiri or Ladakhi origin. Also we have been much disturbed by the treatment received by these prisoners taken by the Chinese in the Ladakh incident According to the accounts that we have received, it is bad treatment. Some of these people have got frost-bitten toes and all that, chiefly because of that. Also, it appears from these reports, and indeed from the whole account given to us even by the Chinese Government that these people were subjected to repeated and constant interrogation. Now, there are rules and conventions about these matters. Of course, there are no special rules relating to people captured in this way. The rules and conventions apply to prisoners of war. We are not at war with China, but I take it that it is in our favour. My colleague, the Defence Minister, tells me that they apply in civil commotion also.

The Prime Minister said : I was telling the House that the conventions and rules of war lay down certain ways of treating prisoners. They lay down specifically that prisoners should only be asked their names, parentage, association or the unit to which they belong, some specific details about themselves, not about any other question. They should not be interrogated in this way. I merely wish to bring this to the notice of the House. I do not know, but I suppose they have not signed that convention very probably, but these people were treated badly. Now, there is one thing. I was talking about onetrack mind and the like, and I was not understanding the Chinese attitude and they are not understanding ours. But it often happens. But there is one aspect of the question which I wish the Chinese Government and indeed other countries might try to understand. Any border trouble, any border dispute raises passions in any country. It is so everywhere. But there is a peculiar feature of this particular matter to us, because it deals with the Himalayas. Now the Himalayas are high mountains, of course, but they are something much more to us and more intimately tied up with India's history, tradition, faith, religion, beliefs, literature, and culture, than, to my knowledge, any other mountain anywhere. Whatever to other mountains may be, the Himalayas are something much more than mountains to us; they are part of ourselves. And I want the other people to realise how intimately this question affects our innermost being, and quite apart, even from a pure question of border.

I am greatful to you and to this House for listening to me with such goodwill all this time. I would again repeat that a tremendous responsibility rests on this House at the present moment, because it is this House which shall give the lead to the country, and the responsibility is not limited to some step that we might take today but to see the perspective of the future and how we are to deal with it, because as I said, a step today may have good consequences or bad consequences.

Therefore, I hope that this House will consider this matter and discuss it, keeping this perspective in view and remembering the grave issue that are involved and remembering also what this country has stood for not only in the recent past but even in the distant past.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEPAL INDONESIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 16, 1959 on the India-China border, while replying to an adjournment motion :

This motion for adjournment as well- as a large number of others all relate to these border incidents and happenings and I entirely agree with some of the Hon. Members, who have put them forward, that these matters should be fully discussed in this House. It is not a question, as one Hon. Member just asked me, that we will have a debate on external affairs, but I am going to suggest that there should be a special debate on this particular matter of the border areas, and that this debate should not take place for one full week for the reason that I want this House to have all the papers in this connection. Then the debate will be more fruitful and Government will have the benefit of the advice of this House on the steps which it has taken or intends to take.

Some of the papers are going to be placed before the House when I place the White Paper on the Table of the House ; but, naturally, events take place with such rapidity sometimes that one cannot keep pace with them. So, the latest

443

papers are not included in these. Some have appeared in the public press, like a letter addressed to me by Premier Chou En-lai. Now today, a little while ago, an answer by me to Premier Chou En-lai was handed over to the Chinese Ambassador in Delhi to be forwarded to the Chinese Prime Minister. It would be helpful, I think, if the House knew the contents of Government's reply to the Chinese Government's letter. But it would not be proper for me to publish the letter or place it on the Table of the House before it has been received by Premier Chou En-lai. That is not the custom. I have to wait,. therefore, till it is received by him. Then I should gladly place it on the Table of the House as well as some other papers. The House will then be in a better position to discuss it. I have no objection to a discussion at any time, but the discussion will be somewhat inhabited by the fact that an important document is not before the House. That is my only difficulty. I was therefore, going to suggest to you, Sir, that, we should fix a date convenient to the House and to you, Sir, but allowing adequate time for this letter to be delivered there. Then we can place it before the House and other papers. So my own suggestion would be to have the debate early next week, preferably on Tuesday next week. I do not want at the last moment to find that I have not got the papers ready which I have to get.

Also on Monday the other House is starting and there are various statements and other things to be made there-not in this connection but other matters. So, I was thinking that Tuesday might be the proper day for it. But I am in the hands of the House and you, Sir. I do not think anything will be lost by having a full debate on this early next week, while something might be lost by our trying to have the debate before we have all the facts before us.

There are some other factual matters in this connection which I intend to say. If you permit I shall state them now. It is not merely an answer to Acharya Kripalani's motion, but some facts and statements which I wish to make, most of which are really known to the House. But I thought I might put them in order.

Since this House adjourned at the end of the last session there has been an important and tragic incident in the Ladakh area, which incident had occurred on October, 21 in Chang Chengmo valley resulting in the death of nine members of the Indian Police patrol and the capture of ten members of the party by the Chinese forces. Apart from this, one constable Makhan Lal is still untraced and unaccounted for. The news of this incident, as the House knows very well, was received in India with great surprise and resentment. It was a matter of grave concern to the Government of India. A strong protest was lodged with the Chinese Government, who gave a different narrative of events in regard to this incident.

Thereafter, the Ministry of External Affairs sent a note to the Embassy of China in India dealing with this incident and connected matters in some detail. All these papers are given in this white Paper which I should subsequently or now place on the Table of the House.

Subsequently, a letter dated 7th November from Premier Chou En-lai was received by me. It has not been possible to include this letter in the White Paper, but the Chinese Government has already given publicity to it and it has appeared in the Press. I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou En-lai to this letter through the Embassy of China in India. As I have said, it will not be proper for me to place copies of this reply on the Table of the House before it has been received by Premier Chou En-lai. I hope, however, to do so within a few days.

I do not wish to discuss at this stage the contents of my reply as it would be better to do so when the full reply is available to Hon. Members. I might mention, however, that Premier Chou Enlai had made certain interim proposals with a view to eliminate the possibility of any border clash in future. We agree that it is highly desirable to take necessary steps for the avoidance of any border clash and to follow this up later by attempts at a peaceful settlement of the disputes relating to the frontier. But the proposals that Premier Chou En-Jai has made in his letter, which has already been made public, seem to us to be impracticable. We have, therefore, made some other proposals which, in our opinion, are practicable and which would put an end to the risk of a border clash.

Premier Chou En-lai also suggested in his letter that the Prime Ministers might hold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as we want it to, we should first concentrate our immediaite efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested. Further, sonic preliminary steps are necessary to lay the foundation for our discussions. It should be remembered that there is a mass of

444

historical data, maps, etc. in connection with the frontier.

On the 14th November, the Chinese authorities handed over to our police official the ten prisoners they had taken and nine dead bodies of our men. One constable named Makhan Lal is still unaccounted for and it must be presumed that he has also died.

According to earlier reports, we had been led to believe that Shri Karam Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, had been killed in the course of this clash. This report has been found to be incorrect as he is among the prisoners returned to us. He has been suffering from severe frost-bite. We are expecting a report from him. Communications have been difficult lately owing to bad weather.

After the Longju incident it had been decided to place the entire frontier of India in direct charge of our army. Further steps have been taken to this end.

I would submit, therefore, that we should consider this very important matter which has moved the entire country, and, of course, Members of this House, fully in a discussion in this House, instead of dealing with it in a piecemeal way in answer to questions. The house obviously realises the importance of this matter and the various aspects of it and I think we should consider it in all its aspects.

When his attention was drawn to press reports, that the ten Indian policemen were subjected to interrogation and confessions of an implicating nature have been extorted from them, the Prime Minister said : Our own information is, and in fact, it has been stated by the Chinese Government that they have received statements from some of these people, Indian police prisoners with them. That means that they must have been subjected to interrogation. Otherwise, they would not have received these statements. We have not received any full account of these statements. But, some brief accounts have, I think, appeared as far as I remember, in Hong Kong or somewhere, and we have also received some brief accounts. It is, I need not say, a very deplorable procedure to interrogate prisoners of this type. May I add, we have been anxious naturally to get a full report from these people who were released the day before vesterday, especially from Shri Karam Singh. But, we have not received any report yet from him, because, as I said weather conditions are bad for messages to be sent. I do not quite know how severe this frost-bite from which he is suffering is. Anyhow we have, been waiting for a report. That is another reason why I wanted to wait a little while to get a full report from our own men there.

An Hon. Member: The Prime Minister said that the defence have taken over the control of the entire border. Does it include the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan for whose defence we are responsible ?

The Prime Minister : So far as Bhutan is concerned, we have stated repeatedly that any aggression on Bhutan would be considered aggression of India, but we keep no forces in Bhutan, and there is no intention of sending any forces. It is for the Bhutan Government to decide when and what kind of help they require from us. We have given them help in the way of training sometimes. So far as Sikkim is concerned, of course that is included definitely in our immediate liabilities-protection, I mean.

CHINA INDIA USA HONG KONG BHUTAN **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 17, 1959 in reply to an adjournment motion :

There has been for some time past an agreement with the Chinese Government in regard to Bara Hoti, that is, that Bara Hoti being a disputed area no party should send any armed troops there. No armed troops have been sent there accordingly. Civil personnel have gone; this year, our civil personnel went there. They went there on the 27th of May this year and they withdrew six weeks ago; there is no question of withdrawing them now. They withdrew on the 13th September, conditions becoming very difficult. The Chinese sent as their representative, I suppose, of civil personnel, a Tibetan official, but no Chinese came this summer there at all so that we are functioning in terms of that agreement which said that no attempt will be made by either party to change the status of this Bara Hoti area unilaterally.

There are, of course, quite considerable difficulties about either, the Chinese or the Indians remaining there during this period. It was the high Himalays from this side and in view of that we may, and we shall naturally consider afresh

445

whether we should expect any permanent structures there which are capable of withstanding climatic conditions. For the present, we have abided by the treaty or arrangement arrived at with the Chinese, and in so far as we know, they are abiding by it also.

The Prime Minister said : In 1958, there were long talks between representatives of the Chinese Government and the Government of India in Delhi about this Bara Hoti area. They lasted for many weeks. The result of the talks was that they did not lead to any settlement; they were postponed, but this was agreed that there should be no unilateral change made there through army possession, and no armed forces should be sent by either party, but only civil personnel. As a matter of fact, China made a protest on the 7th September last, that is, 1959, protesting against our personnel being at Bara Hoti. We pointed out in reply that they were civil personnel. I do not think there is any contradiction in what I have said.

An Hon. Member: Our difficulty is this that the Chinese forces advance at some places, and then in the name of status quo, they want to continue there. This has been happening at a number of places, as we know, across our frontier. What is the position at Bara Hoti? Did they entrench themselves there last year, and if they have entrenched, have they moved out of that?

The Prime Minister : Bara Hoti is a place which has been in some kind of a dispute for a long time past, even before the Chinese came into the picture. It is a very small area, which is used for pasturage purposes during a few months in the year; otherwise it is almost unapproachable. In this place, the Chinese used to send a kind of a police party or a small party, and the UP Government also sent their police party. For two or three years running, both these parties sat there simultaneously facing each other in that little bit of an area, and it was then that it was decided that Armed Forces should not be sent there and that this should be settled by negotiation and not by unilateral action.

When we made that protest, it was that some of their police party had come earlier and sat there. In 1958, they withdrew and they did not send any party in 1959, that is, this year. The present position is that there is nobody, no armed personnel, Chinese or Indian, anywhere near that place.

An Hon. Member; Why has Bara Hoti been treated in an isolated manner? When the Chinese have not vacated their aggression on other territories, why should we refrain from sending our men to the place which belongs to us from time immemorial?

The Prime Minister: I am sorry I am not personally acquainted, as the Hon. Member appears to be, with 'time immemorial.' But I deal with historical periods. As regards this particular place, it is a minor dispute with the old Government of Tibet. About this little area it has been going on. We think our case is a good one and, therefore, we hold by it. But it has been a disputed area and long before the other incursions of the Chinese took place this matter was being argued. I mean there were no conflicts, but there were complaints by us to them and by them to us. They used to send their tax-collector who used to collect grazing fees and other fees. This has happened in several parts of the border for the last half a centurycertainly before the change in Government in China, even in the brief period in 1947-48-49. Then we had to deal with these problems in two or three places in the border, small problems relatively. There they were.

So it was a continuation of that. As I said, this was an isolated thing and we treated thisand there were two other places-as matters in dispute which had to be settled by negotiation. It had nothing to do with the major events that happened since then. In continuation of that, last year a Chinese representative came to India to discuss this matter. He did discuss it for a long time. It is true that the discussion did not lead to a successful conclusion. It was postponed further. There the matter stood. But it was decided, and agreed to, that neither party should send armed personnel to that little area, and that has been adhered to. In fact, as I said, we thought the year before they had sent some armed personnel. We protested against it. Later they took them away. This year they have not sent anybody. We sent civil personnel there which in the ordinary course has come away when conditions become too bad for it.

Shri Nehru said: The Military are in charge of the entire border, but the actual people there are still the police under the military. They function under the military. For instance, in the Assam border or the NEFA border, it is the Assam Rifles who are in charge, but they are under the direction of the military. In the Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Punjab borders, there are the" police under the direction of the military. That is, the military direct them, change them ; they can send their own people or keep the police, as they choose. The direction and command is

446

that of the military, but the police are there in all these places. In some places, in Ladakh, the military actually are there at the check-posts.

An Hon. Member: Over and over again, this has been China's insistence that we are infringing their territorial integrity. We have said : That is not so. You are wrong'. But they have nowhere accepted it. They have said that the status quo is to be maintained. Status quo would mean that this has been our territory, according to us, whatever be the claims they may have. Have they accepted that position? To every protest that we send, there is no reply. Everytime we have protested, the Chinese Government have ignored our protest. Whenever they have protested, we have tried to make amends; we have tried to rectify our position. We want to know where precisely the Government of China stand on this position.

The Prime Minister: I do not know what is the confusion in regard to this particular matter. It is quite clear. It does not matter what they have said in a particular document. The facts are there. Just as they claim, we have continued to stick to our claim and we shall hold to that throughout. It is an identical position in this particular matter-I am not talking about othersand there is no difference. We think our claim is a very good one and we intend to hold by it. Nevertheless, we have decided long ago-many years ago-as I said repeatedly, that this is being treated as a matter in dispute-I am referring to the Bara Hoti area-which should be settled by consultation. We decided about two years ago that neither party should send armed forces there. We have held by it, and apart from one or two doubtful incidents in the past two years, they have held by it. There the matter stands.

CHINA INDIA USA PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Road Construction by Chinese in Ladakh Area

Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha on November 23, 1959 on the construction of a road by the Chinese in Ladakh area, Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said:

The Sinkiang-Gartok Highway appears to run approximately 100 miles through the Indian territory in the Eastern extremity of Aksai Chin in Ladakh.

This area is completely uninhabited. The first suspicion that the road actually ran through Indian territory came to the attention or the Government of India in September, 1957. Since the exact alignment of the road was not known, the Government of India decided to send two reconnaisance parties in the following summer. As soon as confirmation was received that the road actually traversed Indian territory, a protest was lodged in a note presented in Delhi on October 18, 1958.

I have no information in regard to the exact date but the first information we received was an announcement by the Chinese Government that a road had been built connecting Sinkiang with Gartok. This was, as has been mentioned earlier, in the month of September, It was not clear to us then where the alignment of the road was, whether necessarily it passed through Indian territory or not. Therefore, it was decided, as I said earlier, to send reconnaisance parties to find out the alignment. They could not be sent during the winter-it is impossible-and so they went in the summer of 1958 and we received their report in the late autumn of 1958, saying that they had found the road. Soon after receiving that report, we sent a letter of protest to the Chinese Govern, ment about it. This was in the second half of October, 1959. We waited for answer to that but no definite answer came to that precise letter, but soon after-less than two months after or so, less than about six weeks-I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on the entire question of our border areas. These letters are given in the White Paper. Then the argument was about the entire border areas between the Chinese Government and us, and a couple of months later, in March; other developments took place connected with Tibet, the rebellion in Tibet.

As I have said earlier the first information about this road came to us through an announcement by the Chinese Government. The announcement was in connection with the engineering feats that they were performing. We did not receive any other report from Gartok or from the Kashmir Government. I am not aware of what the Kashmir Government was doing in previous years, whether it was collecting any revenues from there or not. I had not heard of it. It is true, however, that right in the heart of Tibet, that is, may be a hundred or two hundred miles were some villages which were a kind of-I do not know what the correct legal term would be-property of the Kashmir Government. Whether they were a kind of zamindari property or other property, it is not clearly defined but what the Kashmir Government used to do long ago was to

447

send every second or third year some officials there to collect a couple of hundred rupees or so from there more to justify that those areas belonged to them. They used to go there every third year or second year, may be often. I forget, to collect some kind of revenue but that is quite a separate proposition.

Replying to a question Shri Nehru said This road is, as many roads there have been, a kind of a caravan route for a long time past and we do not wish to come in the way of the use of the road as a caravan route but we object to its military use or anything like that. We do not wish to come in the way of normal trade in caravans but it should be treated, as I have stated earlier, just on the same basis as any other part of the occupied territory of Ladakh, as an interim measure.

Replying to another question the Prime Minister said : Many of the accounts that come from that area are only vague accounts. There are two kinds of accounts, our Governmental account or the Chinese Government accounts. The other is gossip in the Srinagar or Leh bazaar which it is very difficult to lay hold of and to trace from where it has arisen. It is impossible for me to say whether it is true or not and it is rather difficult for me to deny it altogether unless I go and inspect the place. So, I cannot say about these feeder roads but it is conceivable that some such roads might be built. When we talk about roads in these areas. it means only a slight levelling up, removing some stones. No regular road is built there. The ground is very hard because on the extreme rigour of the climate. If you have a relatively level place of ground, you put some mark there and it becomes a road. That is done. As for the Hon. Member asking me as to what I am doing about it, to prevent it, if the place is under the occupation of the Chinese Government or Chinese forces, I cannot prevent it except by military means and that is a step which one does not normally take so long as diplomatic negotiations go on. After that, it is a consideration for the military.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on alleged Chinese airstrips in Ladakh

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on November 19, 1959 speaking on adjournment motions and calling attention notices on the alleged construction by the Chinese of an airstrip in the Aksai Chin area:

The question raised in these adjournment motions is about a report that the Chinese authorities have built an air-strip in the Aksai Chin area. That is one thing. In some reports, it is further mentioned that such an air strip has been constructed near Chusul. In the third set of reports, to which the Hon. Member, Shri Braj Raj Singh referred, it is said that something was happening in the Malikshah region. Now the question is one of fact. I shall reply with such factual information as I have got. The inferences to be drawn from it naturally depend upon the correctness of the facts. I shall not go into inferences. Hon. Members will have a chance in four or five days' time to discuss this entire matter more fully.

So far as the Aksai Chin area is concerned, we have received no information about the building of an air field. We have tried to find out in so far as we can, and this report has not been confirmed. I cannot at the same time absolutely say that it is not so, because none of our people has been there. My information is that some travellers and others have said this in Srinagar. I do not know on what their information is based. The utmost I can say is that I cannot give any precise information, about the rumour that an air-strip has been constructed at Aksai Chin. We are still trying to get as much information as possible.

So far as the report about an air field near Chusul is concerned, that is definitely incorrect. There is no such thing.

So far as Malikshah is concerned, Malikshah is not in Ladakh at all. It is well within the Sinkiang region of China.

Shri Nehru said : It is a fact, which we may deplore, that in the Aksai Chin area there is no representative of the Indian Government. Neither is one there now nor has been there for sometime, except that occasionally patrol parties have gone in the past years; and we are not there. We can go there only, more or less, at the present moment after some kind of conflict and after exhibiting high mountaineering skill etc; we can, no doubt. There is a question of controversy and dispute now. Anyhow, the only possible way of discovering that would perhaps be flying over it and taking a picture-a low flight. That is a matter for our military authorities to consider, whether that is a right course in the circumstances to adopt or not.

448

An Hon. Member : Is it not a fact that the Indian border police have stopped patrolling the traditional border in Ladakh after the ultimatum given by the Chinese on the 26th October that if they continue to patrol on the traditional border, they will violate the McMahon Line and will come into India?

The Prime Minister: The Hon. Member referred to an ultimatum by the Chinese Government. I am not aware of any ultimatum. But it is true that in one of their communications they said something to the effect of what the Hon. Member has said. But that has no bearing on this matter at all. This is something which has had no effect on our actions and on whatever decisions we take.

Replying to a question by another Hon. Member of the House Shri Nehru said : So far as my knowledge goes there is no such air strip on Indian territory. About the place near Chisul which I have seen recently, I can say definitely that it is not there. But about places where I have not been or any of my informants have not been for sometime, I cannot be equally definite. That is why I answered in that way. But so far as we have been able to trace, there is no reliable information to the effect that there is such an air field. We have not been able to get any person who can be considered to have any knowledge of it. This report is sometimes circulated by travellers in the mountains. I cannot absolutely deny it. May I also say that the socalled air fields here or air-strips cannot be compared with any other air-strips. Nothing is done there except the removal of stones and boulders. It is a concealed thing and without any preparation something canland there. No man could deny that it may not have landed but I have no knowledge of it.

CHINA USA MALI INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Incident before Chinese Consulate

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 30, 1959 while speaking on an adjournment motion and a calling attention notice on the recent incident before the Chinese Consulate at Bombay:-

Sir, I can well understand the desire of the House to know about this. It is a very extraordinary occurrence that has taken place during the last 2 or 3 days in Bombay. It is an unusual type of thing. I cannot even now give any correct or official account because I do not know it. A good deal has appeared in the daily Press and I can only repeat part of that and can add to it here and there.

On the afternoon of the 27th November the U. S. Ambassador saw the Foreign Secretary and informed him that Chang Ching Yu, Bombay representative of the Chinese Import Export Corporation had requested political asylum at the U.S. Consulate General in Bombay at 11-30 hours, the previous day, that is November 26th. The Embassy had informed the State Department and asked for their instructions. In the meantime the Embassy wanted to inform the Government of India. The Foreign Secretary took note of the information but said that Government ought to look into the matter and would reserve their comments. Late in the evening the Minister (Consulate) to the U.S. Embassy reported to the Foreign Secretary that the Chinese who had sought asylum had gone back to the Chinese Consulate-General in Bombay and that an American national was being detained in the Chinese Consulate premises. He added that owing to some difficulties of telephonic communication he could not give the latest information.

On November 28, the U. S. Embassy lodged a formal complaint about the kidnapping and detention of the American national in the Chinese Consulate-General. On the 27th afternoon, that is, the same day, as we received the first information from the U. S. Ambassador, on the 27th afternoon, the Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in Delhi saw the Director of the Eastern Division in the Ministry of External Affairs to complain about the demonstration in front of the Chinese Embassy premises. He also mentioned that a member of the Consulate-General of China in Bombay Chang Cheng Yu had been kidnapped by an American the previous day.

On the 27th morning Chang and the American were passing in a taxi by the Chinese Consulate-General when Chang asked the taxi driver to stop and managed to get down. The American tried to drag him back. A scuffle ensued in the course of which the American was taken into the Consulate premises. The Consulate-General also informed the local police station at 1.30 p. m. The American was taken away by the Bombay police.

Further details of the incident were received from the American Embassy yesterday. The Embassy also sent the Ministry a full statement which they had issued on this incident. According

449

to these reports Chang Cheng Yu had voluntarily sought asylum at the U.S. Consulate-General in Bombay on November 26. He was kept at a cottage belonging to the Consulate-General on the sea-side where he spent the night. On the 27th morning he was found walking away with a portion of the tape on which his statement had been recorded. He was, therefore, followed by Mr. Armstrong, the Security Guard of the U.S. Consulate-General. Chang is reported to have told Armstrong that he was going back to the American Consulate-General to get something which he had left there. They both went in a taxi. As the taxi was about to venter the American Consulate-General Chang objected. He therefore went on and stood a few yards from the gate of Chinese Consulate-General. Chang then shouted to some people in the Consulate-General. Armstrong was then pushed into the Consulate premises. He was kept bound with a rope there and the Bombay police got him released at 1.50 p.m. Armstrong sustained some superficial injuries. The allegations are serious and are now being investigated by the Bombay police authorities.

Kidnapping and detention of a foreign national is clearly outside the functions of a Consulate-General and the complaints will have to be fully investigated. Meantime Government had advised the Consulates-General that the person involved in this incident should not leave India until investigation has been completed, without the concurrence of the Government of India. These are the facts. It will be noticed that the statements made on behalf of the two Consulates-General contradict each other in many important particulars. And, unless fuller investigation is made it is difficult to say which is more correct. In this matter the two principal persons concerned are obviously the Chinese gentleman, Chang Cheng Yu and the American, Armstrong. Thus far neither of these two have met the police or been examined although a brief statement was made by Chang Cheng Yu in the early stages.

There are, of course, other important witnesses, one of them being the taxi driver who took them. He has, I believe, made a statement to the Bombay police. So, this is a matter which requires further investigation.

This morning the Chinese Ambassador called at our Foreign Office and saw the Foreign Secretary, He formally complained that Chang Cheng Yu had been kidnapped by the personnel of the U.S. Consulate-General, at 11 a.m. on November 26 and was detained by them until 7 a. m. on November 27.

According to the Chinese Ambassador, on the 27th morning when Chang Cheng Yu was trying to ruin back into the Chinese-Consulate-General he was chased with a knife by the personnel of the U.S. Consulate-General in Bombay. The Chinese Consulate-General stopped the American and protected Chang Cheng Yu. He also informed the Bombay Police by telephone.

All this sounds more like some piece of fiction than reality. So, this is quite extraordinary that such a thing should happen. Such facts as are known to us have been placed before the House. Of course, we shall inform the House of any further developments when they occur.

Of course, there is a police aspect and an international aspect or diplomatic aspect of it. Obviously, the police aspect comes into the picture if either of the parties puts in a complaint to the police for an enquiry. Thus far neither party has done so except that they have come to our Foreign Office and made complaints-both the American Embassy and the Chinese Embassy here. The privileges of Consulates-General are more limited than those of Embassies, though a wide latitude is shown to them normally in regard to these privileges.

These are facts, Sir, so far as we know at present; whenever further information comes I shall place it before the House.

In reply to a question whether the U.S. Embassy here sought the reactions of the Government of India about the grant of a visa-it has been given in the Press that they wanted to consult the Consulate-General in Bombay-to a Chinese national in view of the strained relationship which exists today between China and India the Prime Minister said: I have just informed the House that on the afternoon of the 27th the U.S. Ambasador saw the Foreign Secretary and informed him of the previous incidents-the other incidents had not occurred by then-and the Foreign Secretary took note of it. He said that he had come to inform our Government as he had to inform the State Department and the Foreign Secretary told him that the Government would look into the matter, it was a complicated matter and so on and he reserved his comments.

Replying to another question about the placing of an armed guard at the Chinese trade agency in Kalimpong, Shri Nehru said: May I just say, Sir, to remove any doubts that may be there, that the placing of an armed guard in Kalimpong has,

450

of course, nothing to do with this. It has little to do even with the charges that have been made of Chinese propaganda etc. It is placed there almost entirely to protect the Chinese Consul in Kalimpong because there is a good deal of feeling and therefore it has been placed in order to avoid incidents. The Hon. Member knows that Kalimpong has often been mentioned here in connection with all kinds of special activities and all that. Also, really, our own trade agents in Gyantse and Yatung, for the same purpose, have the so-called protection as armed guards have been placed around them by the Chinese authority there.

CHINA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on India-China Relations

Intervening in the two-day debate on India-China relations in the Lok Sabha on November 26, 1959 Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Union Minister of Defence, made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister will be replying to, the debate tomorrow and therefore it is neither necessary and proper for me to traverse the whole ground of the arguments in this debate on various points nor it is my intention to make any debating points on a matter of this kind.

We are discussing the issue of the integrity of this country and the threat that has been immediately posed to it by an attitude and action on the part of a neighbour with whom we have not only prefessed but practised friendly and neighbourly relations. Much has been said about the defencelessness of our frontiers and that the Defence Ministry is going to sleep about it and soon. As a member of the Government, and recognising collective responsibility, the Defence Minister, like every other Minister, accepts full responsibility for whatever that policy was, and so does Parliament. Because, times without number, it has been stated in this House, and in public-perhaps there was not any contradiction from anyone-that we have no military development anywhere on our international frontiers.

It is one thing suddenly to wake up to the facts when a new situation arises and another, just not to accept the position that this was the policy of the country. The policy of the country was not to deploy military troops on our international frontiers, whether the frontier is with Goa, with Pakistan or Burma or China as the case may be.

So far as China is concerned, my knowledge of history may be imperfect, but even in the British days, apart from leading punitive expeditions across the Himalayas. I have no knowledge of any military action in that area; so that frontier has been left not to police protection as some people make out, but has been very much like the frontier between Canada and the United States in the hope that neighbourly relations will prevail and no cause for military action would arise. There have been checkposts on this frontier but those check. posts were not of a defensive or a military character. Their main purpose was to guard the trade routes, protect the merchants and probably deal with the customs and other matters. I have no doubt that they would have been used also as a means to gain such information as they could. Therefore, to regard them as positions inadvertently left weak would be an error in fact.

Incidentally, reference has been made to the fact that I said there was no aggression on this country. First of all, I have no recollection of using the term 'aggression'. The United Nations have been sitting for seven years trying to define what aggression is ! Each year they postpone it to the next year. All I said was, this country was not invaded. It may be wrong, at a meeting where about a hundred thousand people are present, to say anything else. The invasion of the country is very different from incursions upon the border, even though casualties are inflicted and military action has to be taken.

So, when this new situation arose both in regard to Pakistan some time last year and now in regard to China, Government came to the decision that with its limited resources, what could be done at that time was to take over what was called over-all control of the border, viz., to see that such police action-State police or Central police-that was taken was not of a character that would be wasteful in fire-power, that would be in the wrong places and perhaps taken without knowledge of consequences. So, we did that in regard to Assam some twelve months ago, when there was serious trouble.

I want the House to be aware of the fact that taking over border control does not mean displacement of all the bodies. It simply means over-all directions, because the displacement of all the bodies and placing them on a war, footing would require resources of a character far different from what it is now. The House will not expect me, I am sure, and it will not be consistent with one's responsibility to go into the details of deployment of troops their numbers, etc. The previous speaker

451

referred, to the size of the Indian army. I have no desire either to affirm it or contradict it. Many people have been trying to find out what it is. We have not given the figures.

At any rate, when this situation arose nearly in September, the Government decided that the Armed Forces of India should take over the over-all control of this border. Now that has been done, but it is a progressive position. It is not as though overnight something can be done or should be done, because India has other frontiers as well. Moving the army just does not mean, as Hon. Members very well know, moving a few people over there. The ballistics and the logistics connected with this have to be taken into account.

It has been the concern of my Ministry, recently at any rate, to recognise the fact that a modern army, even an army as modern as ours, can only effectively function with the necessary equipment. Our army has been based in the past upon the United Kingdom; that is to say, the resources in the way of equipment came from the War Office. If it was not here, we could indent on it. The same applies to our coastal defence and what not. Therefore, a considerable amount of energy had to be devoted to that purpose, not at the expense, as someone suggested, forgetting other matters; but one thing could not go without the other. So far as border defences are concerned, all I can say in the House, consistent, as I said, with my own responsibility and what the House will expect, and not to give unnecessary information to these who should not have it, is that the necessary adjustments are being made. I cannot say whether the best way of defence of this frontier is by checkposts or in some other form. Equally it would not be possible for me to affirm or deny whether their number should be hundred, as the previous speaker said, or less or more. All one can say is that the necessary troop movements consistent with our resources have taken place.

If I may say so with great respect, I have no desire and I do not intend to answer anything of a character of personal reference or the question of one's integrity or patriotism. When the time comes, when I have to carry the card of patriotism it would not be worth carrying it, though other people think it necessary to proclaim it. At any rate, the movement of troops is a matter in which even the newspapers should not be allowed to publish full information; I mean it should not be given to them, when I say they should not be allowed to publish it. What I said in Bombay was that the necessary adjustments in this matter were being made. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, responsible members of Parliament would appreciate that.

Now, it is not the policy of the Government either to surrender territory or to take action which in the short run and in the long run it cannot defend. We cannot lock up too many troops in places where they may be wasteful; equally we cannot be too conscious or, what you call, too concerned about not taking some risks. So, a balance has to be struck between these and that is what is being done.

Reference has also been made to the position at the United Nations. I think it was said, yesterday that we lost a number of votes and that shows our lack of prestige. If you contest an election only on the certainty that you win, there will be no parliamentary contest at all. Somebody must fail for us to come in here.

So far as the position of the Government calling for the discussion of the subject of the representation of China in the United Nations is concerned, it would be a mistake to regard this as though we were oblivious of the new circumstances or doing something arising merely from our special relations with China. Our China policy in the United Nations and the world is governed by world considerations and the United Nations could not command the strength and could not achieve the purposes of the Charter, unless, as the former Secretary of State of the United Nations said, the world as it is, and not the world as some would like it to be, is represented in it.

It is not possible, for example, to disarm the world or take any steps towards it unless China is equally committed. Otherwise, it would be as though those who abide by the law would be deprived of the arms and those who would not would have the arms. It would be an unfortunate state of affairs. So, our attitude towards China's representation in the United Nations has been governed by just considerations. I beg to submit that if, as a result of the recent position on our frontier, we resiled from it, we would have been regarded as acting wrongly and would have lost very much the position and the prestige we had.

I do not use the word 'prestige' in the wrong sense. It would be an entirely wrong act, because year after year, we have told other countries, including the Western group of countries, that irrespective of their attitude to the internal system in China, we are not asking them to be friendly with them; but, we have to strengthen the United Nations and, therefore, they should be allowed to come in. Recognition should not mean approval; it simply means, they ought to be there.

452

Secondly, looking from a narrow point of view, whether in regard to the situation about Tibet, however, it is interpreted, or in regard to their attitude towards us or breaking of any Conventions-whether the Geneva Conventions or the Charter of the United Nations-we would be in a far better position to deal with it, if China were there as a member of the United Nations and be amenable to world opinion on the one hand and answerable for her conduct to a certain extent. That has come into this debate, because I represent this country in the United Nations and also because China is the issue involved.

Reference has been made to one of the speeches I made in Bombay. There about hundred thousand people were present and they did not take this view. First of all, I did not make any reference to aggression. I did say that the frontiers of countries have been violated, but the speech must be read as a whole. The frontiers of other countries, by and large, are violated; our frontiers have been violated and, therefore, we must take action against it.

Our position is that we should not in any way be intimidated by the Chinese, either by their size, or there capacity for quick movement, being a country with a different form of Government. It is possible that they have, in the short time, achieved result quicker than we can. But we are not to be intimidated by this position. We would maintain the sovereignty and integrity of our territory. The Defence Minister, or anybody else, would be either a fool or a knave, or both, if he were to guarantee what would be the results of any military action. All that he could do is to say that all the resources would be put into it and as wisely as people concerned understand them. The results of deployment of military troops, even in the case of large countries, are judged by a number of circumstances. So far as we can judge at present it is possible for us with the limited accentuation on our resources, within the time, as progressively as possible, to take on this limited task, and to that task the armed forces are applying themselves. But it would be very difficult for any Defence Minister, this one or any other, to come and say to this House "this and this is being done"

Yesterday, some Hon. Member asked: why did we not bomb the road ? I can answer it. But it is not wise to answer. Therefore, that is the position in regard to the frontier, and there is no question of our running away from any resistance that is required.

The Indian defence forces have been conditioned, not for the purpose of a foreign adventure or of marohing into other peoples' territories, but for the defence of our frontiers, and that task they will seek to perform as best as possible If the Mon. Members were to consider the kind of concern-not concern but feeling, I think-that they expressed, that is not likely to improve the morale of the armed forces.

Now three things required in defence in our context are material, men and morale. So far as material is concerned, we, both on account of our economic circumstances, our national policy and, what is more, the deficiencies created by our past history, could not concentrate on this. So, we have gone into production on a comparatively large scale, improving some-where from about Rs. 14 crores of production in 1956-57 to Rs. 26 crores this year. So, in a gap of 28 months or so, this has been achieved and, this has not been done by any increase in the staff of the personnel, or the total commitment in regard to ordnance factories. Furthermore, I would like the House to know, that today it is estimated to the satisfaction of the correct authorities that for every hundred units in money of products we are getting 130 in value because of the re-organisation in this way. Now especially because of the present circumstances by a certain modification of our procedures, and the recognition of urgencies, we would probably be

able to improve it better.

Acharya Kripalani yesterday referred to the fact that ordnance factories-I may be mistaken ; I stand corrected if I am mistaken-were being turned on to civilian production, while they can be used for something else. I would like to make two observations in regard to that. If it were possible to us in normal times to turn ordnance factories on to civilian production, it is good for defence because, if there were a larger capacity it can at once be adapted for defence purposes. But, unfortunately, we have not got that capacity. We have absorbed all idle capacity that existed and all that we have now is, in terms of money, Rs. 9 lakhs worth of idle capacity.

But in those years I am speaking about, in the ordnance factories, as production has gone up to Rs. 20 crores, out of that the civilian production has been Rs. 3 1/2 crores, and that Rs. 3 1/2 crores includes metal for the Commerce and Industry Ministry, brass and various other things. Then there is a certain amount of by-products which can only be used by civilian industries, explosive factories or otherwise. Equally, in the last 12 months we have moved away from dependence on other countries from the vital elements of production and have concentrated on our own. Then, while it may not be strictly relevant to the more

453

colourful part of this debate, it would be impossible for our armies, our fighting forces, to function without any confidence if they were not sure of replacements. Then, I think we have to face the fact that this is a very hostile terrain, where it is impossible, where it is very difficult-I do not think I should say impossible-to plan in terms of war positions; and the lines of supply necessarily must he long, even if they are not as long as the crew flies; because, length can only be measured in this sense, not by the length in the sky but by the time taken to cover the distance. I will not go into greater details in regard to this. And no army can afford to lengthen its line of supply more than its resources would permit. These are the positions one has to accept, even though they may not be colourful in many ways.

I have nothing to apologise for in the speeches made in Bombay, or America, or anywhere else, and I have, to the best of my ability, reflected the policies of the Government, and these policies our Prime Minister expounded yesterday and so many times before.

Acharya Kripalani asked whether non-alignment meant non-alignment with ourselves, on the one hand-now I have no desire to split hairs on that-and whether it also meant that we may not take equipment from elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, it must be within the knowledge of this House, from the numerous questions asked and numerous replies given, that the military supplies-by military I mean all the defence forces in this country-have been received from several places. The only thing is that we do not seek aid in a particular way.

There is nothing wrong in our policy, there is nothing wrong in our conviction, to prevent us from getting defence equipment, or weapons, or whatever it may be, from wherever we choose at whatever time, whether it be the East or the West. The only thing is that we would like to pay for it, and not come under the internal legislation of these countries. It is probably not understood that the receiving of aid is covered by certain domestic legislation in that particular land, because their legislatures have to pass them. Therefore, while on the one hand our defence may not be dependent, either on the capacity of any other country to shut off supplies, or, on the other hand, by the conditions that they may impose in regard to procurement we have done everything we can to obtain them from wherever they can be obtained, at the most economic prices or what we call conditions best to ourselves.

Therefore, there is no question of our saying that we shall not touch such and such equipment because they come from somewhere else. And what is more, it should be recognised that the Indian Army was not born yesterday, or after Independence. It has its equipment and its standardisation, and it is committed to a certain pattern, and without considerable expense and the passage of a fair amount of time, it would be impossible to alter that situation. Therefore, that alteration takes place gradually without impairment of our defence.

I think it will be a mistake, if I may say so, to convey the impression to our fighting forces that there is some lack of confidence on the civil side of the administration, apart from the armed forces. I have no desire to go into the question which has implications in that direction. So long as there is a parliamentary system, the policy of defence would be decided by the Government, and just as the civil service carries on the civil side, the defence services will carry them on the other side. That is the only way we can do it now.

Then, in spite of whatever may be said, whatever you may hear and whatever you may read, with great respect I would like to repeat what the Prime Minister said-I believe he said that yesterday here and in other places too-that the morale of the services has never been higher at any other time. The question of emoluments, their hope of security and the respect that belongs to those who are prepared to make this supreme sacrifice, they have been consolidated very much more than ever before, because of the changing conditions of the world.

It would not be in my province, specially when the Hon. Prime Minister is winding up this debate, to go into the question of higher policy as to how to resolve these border disputes. But I hope I may be permitted to say that the frontiers of the country can only he settled in two ways, either by conquest, by one party or the other or by negotiation. There is no other way of doing that. Either you conquer them or they conquer you.

We have never said that these frontiers are not known. We have said that they are determined by history, as Shri Asoka Mehta said this morning, I believe, by convention, by practice and by our own experience of what we see. We are quite conscious as to what are our frontiers. We have not said that they are not known. We have said that it is wrong to say that it is not delimited It is not demarcated. They are two different things. Demarcation has to be carried on by a process of negotiation and it must be left to the wisdom of the Government, if you accept it, as to

454

what is the best way of establishing that negotiation. Negotiation, on the one hand, cannot be brought about by an attitude of undue aggressiveness nor on the other hand by an attitude of surrender. I believe the Government is following what the Hon. Prime Minister a couple of months ago said here, what is called the dual policy. A dual policy is not a double policy or a doublefaced policy. Dual policy is a policy with two aspects. Both aspects are equally important and one corroborates the other.

CHINA INDIA USA BURMA PAKISTAN CANADA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Trade Agreement Signed

A new Trade and Payments Agreement between India and Poland was signed in New Delhi on November 2, 1959.

Mr. J. Burakiewicz, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Poland, who led his country's Delegation to the trade talks, signed on behalf of Poland. Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary Minister of Commerce and Industry, signed for the Government of India.

The new Trade Agreement envisages considerable increase in the present level of trade between India and Poland. The Agreement which will be in force for a period of three years commencing from January 1, 1960, will replace the current agreement which will expire at the end of this year.

Under the terms of the new Agreement payments between India and Poland will be in nonconvertible Indian rupees and trade will be on a balanced basis. The Indian rupees, which Poland will earn by exports to India, will be utilised for buying Indian goods of equal value.

Poland will supply to India, among other things, industrial raw material, pharmaceuticals, ships and tankers and complete machinery plants like coal mining, machinery, machine tools and machinery for foundries. Indian exports to Poland will comprise of items like tea, spices, cotton manufactures, mica, shellac, coir products, castor oil, oil cakes, iron, palmyra fibre, textile machinery and accessories, shoes, handicrafts and sports goods.

In 1958, Indian exports to Poland were valued at about Rs. 92 lakhs. Imports from Poland during this period amounted to Rs. 2.26 crores.

During the first seven months of 1959, exports to Poland were of the order of about Rs. 1.04 crores. Imports from Poland during the corresponding period were valued at about Rs. 2.97 crores.

POLAND INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Tax Agreement Signed

An agreement for the avoidance of double taxation between India and the U.S.A., was signed in Washington on November 10, 1959 Mr. Herter, U.S. Secretary of State, and Shri D.N. Chatterjee India's Charge d' Affaires in Washington, signed on behalf of their respective Governments. The signing of the agreement was announced simultaneously in Washington and New Delhi.

An important feature of this Agreement, not found in agreements entered into by the U.S.A. with 21 other countries, is a scheme for affording credit for tax spared. This will be a stimulus to U.S. investment in India.

Under the Credit for Tax Spared (C.T.S.) Scheme, the U.S. Government will allow, against the U.S. tax on income earned by American concerns in India, a credit not only for taxes actually paid in India, but also for the tax which would have been paid, but for the concessions given by the Government of India to aid American investors, So far, the U.S.A. gives credit against U.S. tax liability only for taxes actually paid in India.

The Agreement designed to foster international flow of trade and investment and the exchange of technical, educational and research

455

services. It contains provisions relating to business investment and personal-service income, official salaries, pensions and annuities, remuneration of teachers and remittances to students and apprentices.

It also contains a provision regarding administrative procedures including exchange of tax information between the two Governments.

The agreement applies, so far as United States taxes are concerned, to the Federal income and corporate taxes. In India, the, treaty is, likewise, applicable to all taxes on incomes of persons and companies.

The Agreement, after approval by the American Senate, will be brought into force by the exchange of Instruments of Ratification and will be effective in the U.S.A. for taxable years beginning on or after January I of the year in which such exchange takes place.

It will be effective in India for previous years beginning on or after January 1 of the year in which the exchange takes place.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Supplementary Agreement Signed

India will procure 150,000 metric tons of rice under a supplement to the P.L. 480 agreement or November 13, 1959, signed in Washington on November 23, 1959. The new supplementary agreement is valued at Rs. 8.8 crores (\$ 18.5 million) including cost of ocean freight. Together with the November 13th agreement, the value of assistance amounts to Rs. 122.2 crores (\$257.3 million).

Under the agreement earlier this month, India will receive 3 million tons of foodgrains, mostly wheat and 100,000 bales of cotton. The value of wheat is \$182 million and that of cotton \$14 million. Other commodities covered by the agreement are tobacco valued at \$500,000 and maize worth \$4.7 million. Ocean transport cost is estimated at \$37.6 million.

The agreement signed earlier this month combined with today's supplementary agreement provides the largest single grant of assistance to India so far made by the U.S.A. This amounts to \$102.9 million worth of rupees.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid Agreement Signed

Under a new P.L. 480 agreement between the U.S.A. and India signed in Washington on November 13, 1959 India will receive three million tons of foodgrains, mostly wheat, and 100,000 bales of cotton. The value of the foodgrains is \$182 million and that of cotton \$14 million. Other commodities covered by the agreement are tobacco valued at \$500,000 and maize worth \$4.7 million. The financing of ocean transportation is estimated at \$37.6 million,

The total amount of assistance under the agreement is \$238.8 million (Rs. 113.4 crores).

Out of this total, a sum of \$95.5 million (Rs. 45.3 crores) is the grant component and an equal sum represents a loan, repayable in rupees. Thus, 80 per cent of the total constitutes direct assistance for India's development programmes. Of the balance, five per cent will be administered by the U.S. Export-Import Bank under the Cooley Amendment of P.L. 480 for advances to the private sector. The remaining 15 per cent is allocated for the use of the U.S. Government in India.

The agreement provides the largest single amount of grant to India so far made by the U.S.A.

Note :-- 1. The speech made by Shri Krishna Menon at the Special Political Committee of the United Nations on November 5, 1959, on South Africa's Apartheid Policy, could not be included in this (November) issue of the Foreign

Affairs Record. It is being included in the December issue.

2. On November 4, 1959, the Prime Minister presented to Parliament White Paper II, which contains the notes, memoranda, and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China between September and October, 1959. This volume also contains a note on the historical background of Himalayan frontier of India and a map showing the

India-China boundary. The White Paper has been published separately.

456

USA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA CHINA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Indians in Burma

Replying to a question whether it is a fact that over 12,000 Indian cultivators in the Zeywaddy area in Toungoo district in Burma are facing the prospect of being prosecuted for non-' compliance with immigration laws of Burma and if so, whether Government of India have taken any steps in this connection, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan) said in the Lok Sabha on December 18, 1959 : "The large majority of about 15,000 cultivators of Indian origin in the Zeywaddy area have been there for three generations and under Section 4 (2) of the Burmese Citizenship Act are entitled to automatic grant of citizenship. About 8,000 applications for such citizenship are pending disposal. There area number of cultivators who, although entitled to citizenship, took out Foreigner's Registration Certificates either out of ignorance or a misunderstanding of the rules, and this fact has often been used against them in regard to their claim to citizenship. Efforts are being made by such persons or by local Associations of persons of Indian origin to correct these errors through legal channels. The Government of Burma have always appreciated the special position of these cultivators of Indian origin and hitherto the immigration laws and regulations have not been applied rigidly. The number of prosecutions under those laws have, therefore, not been large. Recently, however, there have been attempts to enforce these laws pore rigidly, with the result that a number of persons of Indian origin, who have been unable to meet heavy charges for registration as foreigners, have been put to hardship.

"Informal representations have been made to the authorities in Burma with a view to expediting disposal of the pending applications for Burmese citizenship and also with a view to more sympathetic consideration of the cases of those who took out Foreigner's Registration Certificates through error or misunderstanding".

BURMA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Indo-East German Trade Agreement Signed

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on December 18, 1959 between Mr. Erich Renneisen, Leader of the Trade Delegation of the Government of German Democratic Republic, and Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, embodying a Trade and Payment arrangement between the two countries. The new arrangement will be valid for a period of three years from January 1, 1960.

The current trade arrangement is due to expire on December 31, 1959. This arrangement was entered into in October, 1956 and was later amended by a supplementary arrangement in November, 1958.

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

India will export besides traditional items like iron and manganese ore, tea, coffee, spices, cashewnut, textiles and ready-made garments, jute manufactures, laminated jute bags, coir products, handicraft, sports goods, canned fruit and fruit products, shoes, woollen and silken fabrics, plywood and refrigerators. Exports of German Democratic Republic to India will mainly consist of machinery items like textile machinery with automatic looms, printing machinery, machine tools, complete installations and plants, raw films, precision and optical instruments and fertilizers etc. Under the new arrangement now finalised the volume of trade between the two countries will considerably increase.

457

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

•••••

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Apartheid Policy

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement at the Special Political Committee on November 5, 1959 on the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa:

Mr. Chairman, first it is my pleasant privilege and duty to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this Committee. The fact that you were elected as Chairman throws more into relief the subject we are discussing, while it proclaims to the world that the people of the continent of Africa are capable of building their own homes and living their own lives, your ancestors having built what was pro. bably the first African Republic on the African continent. We do not say this merely for the sake of placing the unfortunate position taken by the Union of South Africa in a bad light, but the facts of situation are that here you are as a representative of the first and well-loved African Republic of Liberia, presiding over the destinies of this Committee while it is discussing the very problem of members of your racial background and others of non-European origin who are not regarded as being suitable for firstgrade citizenship. We extend our congratulations to you both in your personal capacity and in your capacity as Chairman.

The Vice-Chairman comes from another part of the world where, so far as we are aware, race is not a consideration as regards preferment or responsibility.

The Rapporteur comes from a part of the Western hemisphere where, in the very short period for a few centuries, the problem of multiracial societies has been solved, not in the manner of tackling a disease but by taking it in its natural stride. In other words, if evidence is required for the rest of the world that those who come from different racial origins can find their new homes and live in peace with each other, and that the differences which are the basis of apartheid are in no way an impediment to their development, the republics of South America are an outstanding example. But there is this difference, that here we are dealing with a problem where the adverse impact of the policy is visited upon the people who are the original inhabitants of the territory of the sub-continent itself. The result of the policy, in a few words, is to make them foreigners and strangers in the land of their birth.

I hope the Committee will pardon my delegation if we try to treat this subject not merely in a brief intervention, but to deal with the position of my country, and, I venture to presume of a great many others, which has to be set out somewhat more fully.

The explanatory memorandum which is contained in A/4147 is a very important document from our point of view. To a certain extent it summarizes the position that should be taken on a draft resolution of this character. That is, it does not seek to. condemn; it does not seek to allocate blame or responsibility, but it only seeks to obtain appropriate recommendations for adherence to the provisions of the Charter. What is more, it finally declares that it is the purpose that the United Nations should continue to offer its assistance with a view to a peaceful solution of this problem. I hope we will not regard this as being merely a form of words. I hope that this approach will animate the spirit of our discussions.

It is also not without importance that in this explanatory memorandum, on page 2 of the document is set out the text of a resolution which originated not from a non-European country but from a European country, and a Nordic country at that, where there has not been an admixture with non-European peoples in, shall we say, at least 2,500 years, when I suppose, a very small stream of Celts came over the Asiatic continent into the northern parts of Europe. This resolution is important in the sense that it is not addressed to the Union of South Africa; it is not addressed to the European peoples ; it is not addressed to the American peoples ; it is not addressed to the Asian peoples. In the third operative paragraph of this resolution which has been quoted advisedly in this memorandum, it says :

"Solemnly calls upon all Member States to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms." (A/4147, page 2).

The importance of this paragraph is first of all to remind ourselves that we are not dealing

458

with an individual evil, we are not acting in a sense of bitterness, but we are dealing with the application of a principle to all Member States. What is more, it is a reminder to some of us on whom this doctrine makes an adverse impact that we may not practise apartheid in reverse. Racial discrimination, the attitude towards rare that is reflected in apartheid would be as much of a crime if it were to be practised by non-white races against the white race. This was the policy that animated the resolution adopted at Bandung, where there was, as was to be expected, a minority opinion, at least in the corridors, that wanted to take that attitude.

Fortunately for us, all delegations took the

view that we could not practise discrimination in reverse, because that would be applying a remedy that was the same as the disease.

Therefore, this explanatory memorandum, which will form part of the documentation of the United Nations, is an historic document in that sense. It summarizes our approach. As my delegation pointed out in its submission on the problem of South West Africa, it is not our desire to see a Member State put in the unfortunate position where the overwhelming majority of delegations here are in total opposition to its views, year after year.

Having said that, I should like to express my regret that our colleagues of the Union of South Africa are not present with us today. Their absence is regrettable from many points of view. There has never been an occasion in this Assembly when anyone has expressed any adverse view in regard to the Union's right to express its opinion, totally unacceptable as that opinion is, I dare say, to every Member State in this Assembly. That provides all the more reason why we should regret the absence of the Union's representative.

Furthermore, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, speaking in the general debate, had merely wanted his reservations on the legal position to be recorded. Therefore we hope that this will not be the position if another occasion should arise, and that the representatives of the Union will be present with us ; they will not be the recipients of any discourtesy of any kind because, even in their absence, that is not the practice of this Assembly.

I should like to remind the Committee of the history of this matter extremely briefly. This question was the subject of discussion among delegations for a long time before it actually came up as a resolution. It was first brought up before the seventh session by thirteen countries, including my own. On that occasion, the debate in regard to Article 2 (7), the debate with regard to dividing the Assembly on the lines of race, in which my delegation took a very considerable part, was very sharp and very prolonged. But in spite of that, a resolution which did not seek any condemnation, but merely wanted us to study the problem, was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions. I refer to this because, as I sketch the history, it will be found that there has been a progressive growth of opinion in this Assembly in regard to South Africa, in regard to apartheid, year after year.

Then came the eighth session, when Mr. Lester Pearson presided over the Assembly, and a similar resolution, providing for continuance of the Commission, was adopted by 38 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

Then came the ninth session. Again, the resolution was adopted, in much the same way-if any thing, opinion more sharply against South Africa.

Then came the tenth session, where the matter was continued. At the eleventh session three years ago, Indonesia and Pakistan and India requested the inscription of the item and introduced a resolution calling upon South Africa to consider its position and revise its policies. Ibis was adopted by 56 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

Then, in 1957, the position became more fully expressed when 59 States voted in favour, with only 6 against and 4 abstentions.

Last year, there was the highest record, when this Assembly adopted a resolution by 70 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions. We are not trying to create a voting record. But I hope that at the end of this debate, especially in view of the attitude taken by those on whom this policy makes an adverse impact-and it Would be only human nature to react to it with more hostility than we have-I hope that this resolution will have passed by a larger vote, and with no votes against it, even if one or two delegations, for whatever reasons, should desire to abstain.

I mention this because it is a matter on which the Assembly has very strong feelings, feelings which are not divided by the boundaries of continent or race or political opinion or by the unfortunate dividing line of blocs.

When our colleagues of the Union do not

459

participate in spite of the attitude we take, their action is not directed against those who submit this

item, it is not directed against what may or may not be the decision of the Assembly, but it is against the repeatedly recorded decision of the Assembly over a period of years. It is a question --and my colleague from Ireland will understand this reference-of everybody being out of step except my Johnny.

The Foreign Minister of South Africa, speaking in the Assembly, stated his objections on the ground of Article 2 (7). I have no desire to repeat the arguments brought in this Assembly time after time. I believe that it was at the eleventh session that my delegation discussed this whole issue of Article 2 (7), with all the documents of San Francisco, with the arguments for and against, with the relevant international law. At that time, text-book writers had not referred to this problem categorically. Since that time, there has been a new edition of Oppenheim's International Law. On page 320 of the first volume, that great scholar says :

"Although it is explicitly laid down in the Charter of the United Nations that it does not authorize intervention with regard to matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States, the provision in question does not exclude action short of dictatorial interference undertaken with a view to implementing the purposes of the Charter. Thus, with regard to the protection of human rights and freedoms, a prominent feature of the Charter, the prohibition of intervention does not preclude study discussion, investigation and recommendation on the part of the various organs of the United Nations."

I would commend this paragraph to the Assembly, and also the various footnotes that appear on that page in regard to it. Oppenheim then goes on to say, in another part of the book.

"The exclusion of the right of 'intervention' on the part of the United Nations must be interpreted by reference to the accepted technical meaning of the term."

It is a well-known proposition of law that any document, any word, has to be construed in the natural meaning that it bears.

Oppenheim goes on

"It excludes intervention conceived as dictatorial, mandatory interference, intended to exert direct pressure upon the State concerned. It does not rule out action by way of discussion, study, inquiry, recommendation, falling short of that type of intervention."

Perhaps, so far as this Committee is concerned this is what might be called pushing at an open door. But it is important to have this on record because the matter is of such consequence and because the Union of South Africa is not only one of the Members of the United Nations but is a country which has taken a very prominent part in the formulation of the Charter and, what is more important, has a record of loyalty to the League of Nations and to the United Nations itself except on this issue-and it is a very great issue. It is also important because of the statements made by Mr. Louw. The position or apartheid is regarded by the Union as merely an internal matter-except that the vast majority of the people concerned, even in a limited democracy or under a popular government of any kind, would not create laws against themselves. If it is accepted that it is a purely internal matter, then the whole of the Charter and everything that went into the formulation of the third paragraph,. I believe, of Article 1, would be simply a scrap of paper.

But what is interesting is that Mr. Louw regards the continent of Africa as being divided, broadly, into two areas. He says :

"There are the countries north of the Sahara, the majority of which border on the Mediterranean"--

the Mediterranean used to be called by the British, in ancient times, a British lake, but at any rate it is a European sea, because on one side is Europe and on the other side is Africa--

"and whose destinies have since the earliest days been closely linked with the countries of Europe. There is the further fact that the countries on the Mediterranean littoral maintain a close affinity with the Arab world"--

this has to be read with the statement made by the President of Guinea only ten minutes ago in another room-that is, this separation of sheep from goats is not going to get us anywhere--

"its heritage, religion and culture. Then there is the rest of the continent, generally described as 'Africa south of the

460

Sahara', though perhaps not quite strictly so in the cage of the Sudan and the northern part of Ethiopia." (A/PV. 811, page 12)

Now this is a very important part.

"It is particularly in the sub-Saharan Africa that important and significant changes and developments have taken place during the past two years. Three fully independent States, the Sudan. Ghana and Guinea, have come into being to join the Union of South Africa and Liberia, which until then were the only sovereign independent States south of the Sahara. The status of certain other African territories, including the former French colonies, has also undergone a significant change. Next year the already fully independent African States will be joined by Nigeria, the Cameroons, Somaliland, Togoland and possibly also the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland."

Would it not be right for us to enquire whether the Foreign Minister of South Africa, who welcomes these new States and does not preach the policy of apartheid in relation to them, should not realize that, on this continent where there has arisen these numbers of African republics, if a conference of the independent kingdoms of that continent were held, the apartheid policy would stand in singular solitary minority.

Therefore, how do these policies square with one another? On the one hand, there is the welcoming of these States. They have been voted into membership without adverse vote on the part of South Africa. They are regarded as adherents of the Charter, accepting its principles. They come here with a recognition that in this Organization and in the activities of this Organization the question of discrimination cannot play a part.

That is the only reference we have from the Union of South Africa with regard to this matter. I would like now to go back a little into the past, because it is not as though the racial troubles in South Africa did not exist.

Somewhere in the last third of the nineteenth century, the British Colonial Secretary, in order to assist the economic development of South Africa, persuaded the British Indian Government of that day to send numbers of people to work on the sugar plantations in Africa. From that time onwards there has been a racial problem in South Africa. Perhaps there was even one before that, but the newer view is that the Bantus tribes came after the Dutch. But I am not going into the history of this. There are two views about it. There was a racial problem and no one was aware of it more than General Smuts. But in spite of that and after the League of Nations had been founded, at which he made similar statements, and it died, and the problems of racial discrimination had come to the forefront under the benighted rule of Adolf Hitler, General Smuts, speaking in San Francisco, in words which should be inscribed in letters of gold, states : "The new Charter should not be a mere legalistic document for the prevention of war. I would suggest that the Charter should contain at its very outset and in its preamble. a declaration of human rights and of the common faith which has sustained the Allied peoples in their bitter and prolonged struggle for the vindication of those rights and that faith." Part of the vindication was the persecution of the semitic peoples in Germany by Hitler and also the rape of countries like Czechoslovakia, mainly on a racial basis.

Field Marshal Smuts went on to say: "In the deepest sense it has been a war of religion perhaps more so than any other war of history. We have fought for justice and decency and for the fundamental freedoms and rights of man, which are basic to all human advancement and progress and peace. Let us in this new Charter of humanity, give expression to this faith in us, and thus proclaim to the world and to posterity, that this was not a mere brute struggle of force between the nations but that for us, behind the mortal struggle, was the moral struggle, was the vision of the ideal, the faith in justice and the resolve to vindicate the fundamental rights of man, and on that basis to found a better, freer world for the future. Never have all peace-loving peoples been so deeply moved. This is what our men and women feel--meaning the men and women of the Union of South Africa-"they are fighting for on the war fronts. and have been labouring and slaving for on the home fronts in these long years of steadfast endurance. Let us put it into the Charter of the United Nations as our confession of faith and our testimony to the future. Our warfare has been for the enternal. values which sustain the spirit of man in its upward struggle toward the light. Let us affirm this faith of ours, not only as our high cause and guiding spirit in this war but also as our objective for the future. The peace we are striving for, and are taking such pains to safeguard, is a peace of justice and honour and fair-dealing as between man and man, as between nation and nation. No

461

other peace would be worth the sacrifices we have made and are prepared to make again and the heavy responsibilities we are prepared to take under this Charter."

It is hardly necessary to say that this was not a sermon for one day of the week. This was a statement made in the formulation of the Charter. But if that stood alone it would not be adequate. At another part of the session, at San Francisco, Field Marshal Smuts said: "Looking farther afield for precautions and remedies against war beyond the war machine itself, the Charter envisages also a social and economic organization of the peoples, intended to raise the levels and standards of life and work for all, and, by thus removing social unrest and injustice, to strike at the Very roots of war."

What other thing can raise greater social injustice and unrest than the doctrine of apartheid where the vast majority of people who live in their own countries are foreigners and strangers, outcasts, and where, what is more, any action which they take by not moving out of the house is crime under the law of the country:

Field Marshal Smuts states: "Great as our

achievement is, I feel that more is needed than a mere machine of peace. Unless the spirit to operate it is there, the best plan or machine may fail......And in our faith in the future we expect that those who come after us--I suppose this applies to us. We were here when he was here, but still we are after him now. ".....and who will have to carry our Charter in the generation to come, will also show no less goodwill and good faith in their part of the great task of peace."

So what we are doing here now has the authority of one of the greatest statesmen not only of South Africa, but of the world, who lived in the context of these racial troubles. I am not a moment saying that racial laws were not passed in his time. But here is a full statement of the case in which at San Francisco we were enjoined to carry out these principles into the open and to pass them on to posterity.

Last year's resolution stands with us in document A/RES/1248 (XIII). Since then what has happened? I shall not refer to all the past history, because that would take all day. Since then we have appealed to the Government of South Africa : "Solemnly calls upon all Member State's to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms." A large number of laws have been passed, of which I have noted nine. I want to preface my observations by saving that my country would be the last to question the right of South Africa to pass whatever laws it wants in its own territory. That Government has a sovereign right to do so. But we as adherents of the Charter also have equal rights to point out if those laws are violation of the Charter, and a total violation in the face of this.

I must say at this point that it is not sufficient to look merely at the titles of the laws in South Africa. They will be like the headings of items before the Security Council. For example, you may recall recently when there was the Egyptian affair the item was headed, I believe, incursion by Egypt, or something of that kind. Some of these tides might be misleading. During this period, nine measures had been under consideration of the South African Government, and some of them have been passed.

First, there is the elimination of non-whites

from "open" universities and the establishment of university-colleges for non-whites : If you look at it you think it would be a good thing to establish university-colleges for non-whites. But the essential part of it is that they cannot go into the colleges which they were in. This is in the one field of education, in the liberal arts, where people are discriminated against on the very grounds which are contrary to the studies of the humanities.

"The transfer of University College of Fort Hare, which was attached to Rhodes University, to the Department of Bantu Administration and Development;" It would look as though this great University was handed over by Administration by non-European peoples, according to the title of the bill. That was not what happened. What happened was that the non-European people were taken out of this great University and put out in segregation. In other words, the new arrangement is a ghetto not University ; that is what it comes to.

Another law is the "abolition of African representation in Parliament and the Cape Provincial Council". I shall refer to this, but it is not merely an objectionable law but a violation of undertakings given by the South African Government from time to time.

Another law under consideration is

"The strengthening of the powers of the Minister of Labour, so that he can apply job reservations unhindered by court decision,"

462

I am sure that the trade union movement of the world mill take vote of this; that is, whether courts decide the job is open for people or The executive can step in and say that a no European cannot take it. In the course of industrialization of South Africa, in order to prevent those who are discriminated against becoming sufficiently skilled and of sufficient force and power in the industrial community--discrimination of poeple in regard to this applied to certain imperial countries in a different way. But the question is not whether there is a man who is an eletrician or an engineer, but the question is: what is the colour of his skin or the colour of the skin of his parents?

Fifth, there is

"The establishment of a Bantu Invesment Corporation"-another misleading title-"the capital for which will come from, African savings and State contributions."

The effect of this is that the Bantu development must come only from that place. Again, this is putting apartheid into the whole business of economic development.

Then there is

"The transfer of Coloured special schools from the Union Department of Education to the Department of Coloured Affairs:"

That Also looks very good. It looks as though the so-called coloured people are going to a big show and look after their own affairs. What happens is this : the State as a whole and, its resources no longer become responsible for that but they are shunted off into an ante-room and become a kind of poor relation.

Then there is : "The extension of the concept of Bantustan to the towns."

That is the real building of ghettos, territorial segregation. Bantustan, I suppose, means the territory of the Bantus, borrowed from Indian analogies.

Next is

"Amendment of the Group Areas Act to overcome difficulties with local authorities in the establishment of townships for race groups."

The Group Areas Act is an old friend of ours. It was first introduced to remove the Indians from various parts of South Africa. The groups who are discriminated against were to be denoted by the executive. That is, the executive says, "you are a group that is of objected to, you must go from where you are". Then they are moved bag and baggage from the place. We have been asking them to withdraw the Group Areas Act in this Assembly time after time. It has been objected to as interference in the internal affairs of South Africa. In regard to the other problems of people of Indian and Pakistani origin in South Africa when Field Marshal Smuts was handling this problem, one of things he told us was, "Do not bring up the question of the withdrawal of the Group Areas Act. It is in our sovereignty. We negotiated it, so forget it", or something of that character. But, at any rat;, what has happened is, instead of withdrawing the Group Areas Act, which has been the demand of all concerned, they amended the Act so as to overcome the difficulties of the local authorities in establishing townships. It means that the power was given to them for forcible eviction and pushing them out from their original homes to the wilderness.

The last of these is

"The abolition of Native Advisory Boards when African representation in Parliament is abolished."

That is to say, any function that African peoples could have in regard to administration of Advisory Boards is a concomitant of the Abolition of their representation in Parliament.

Legislation in regard to three or four of them have been completed, and the other is in progress. Despite these new measures, it must be remembered that not only has there been no progress in this matter, but also there has been considerable regress and A total disregard of the resolutions. I will not try to analyse each of these laws, but I will merely quote the opinions of non-South Africans in regard to this matter, labour legislation. Mr. C.N. Millard of Canada, Director of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and Mr. P.H. de Jonge of the Netherlands, another official of the Confederation --this organisation has consultative status in the Assembly of the United Nations--came to South Africa in April 1958 to bear part of the debate in Parliament on this Bill. Mr. Millard said that provisions of the Industrial Conciliation Act and the amending Bill were in conflict both with the United Nations Bill of Rights and Convention 87 sought to safeguard freedom of association and assembly and the right of collective bargaining for all workers.

463

The provisions of the Bill were a challenge not only to organized labour in South Africa but to organized labour everywhere.

My Australian colleague win probably remember that this refusal of the right to form an association brought out large numbers of very distinguished stalwart fighters for freedom to the Australian continent which at that time was a penal settlement, and which was the forerunner of the present advanced Australian civilization.

In an exclusive statement to The Natal Mercury, Mr. Millard alleged that natives were

"Taken in the name of justice and law and threatened with gaol sentences unless they agreed to work on farms for 9d. a day."

This is forced labour, and this is the opinion not of the Indian delegation but of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He said that the men were virtually used as convict labour and he would take all available steps to expose "the harsh legislation which results in this type of thing going on". He further said :

"While African employees are ignored so far as the definition of employee is concerned, they do become employees for purposes of job reservation amendment."

When they are entitled to get something, then they are told that they are not an employee. But when they are excluded from something, then they come under the definition. Mr. Millard continued :

"This, of course, is completely inconsistent on the part of the authorities. We feel that it is very dangerous thing to allow the formation of African Trade Unions and, on the other hand, deny them the right of registration and the due processes provided by that registration. It is unpardonable discrimination. We feel that the rights of the trade unions in South Africa are being trampled under foot by the Government".

It is to the credit of the Union that this new kind of apartheid finds very considerable opposition and, what is more, opposition against odds, very courageous opposition from large sections of the white population of South Africa. In this connexion, I want to read the opinion of a person who had a special view about it. He is not a crank or anything of that kind. The Cape Times of South Africa as its name notes, is highly respectable. The Cape Times of South Africa, editorially commencing on the Job Reservation Bill in its issue of 22 April 1958, said :

"Apart from elementary questions of morals, expediency, commonsense and sanity, the feature of Mr. De Klerk's Job Reservation Bill is its naked authoritarianism."

That is to say, that is one of the concomitants, one of the by-products which has become larger than the tree of apartheid itself. It is authoritarianism in this Member State of our Organisation. The editorial continued :

"This bill is not a law as that term is understood in civilized countries. It is a naked grant of unlimited power to a politician to control, in general and in detail, the employment of any person by any other person."

If that is not forced labour or slavery in one sense, what it is I do not know.

The Natal Mercury of South Africa, while editorially commenting on this bill, said :

"There is no doubt about it that the Industrial Conciliation Amendment Bill is intended by the Government to entrench the principle of job reservation beyond challenge, whatever the consequences of this repressive regimentation may be".

I said a while ago that we should not be misled by the title of this bill. It is "Industrial Reconciliation".

Then I have referred to Bantustan, that is the territorial segregation. The bill promoted by the Union in April 1959 was called the Bantu Self-Government Bill-that again is entitled the Bantu Self-Government Bill. The Bill in its preamble says that the Bantu people of the Union do not constitute a homogenous people-of course all the white population do, only they come from different parts of Europe or elsewhere. As I said, the bill in its preamble says that the Bantu people of the Union do not constitute a homogenous people but form separate national unitsthey have national units but they cannot have national freedom-on the basis of language and culture. It divides the Bantu population intoeight Bantu national States. I will not read out all the names, but they are North Sotho plus a language. That is to say the attempt is to split up the Bantu populations not only as separated

464

from the rest of the people of South Africa but to reintroduce tribalism in its worse form.

Provision is made in the bill for the immediate appointment of five commissioners-general who will form a direct link for consultation between the Bantu units they represent and the Government ; that is on the Central Government, self-government has no impact; that is what is going to be done through an agent of the Central Government. The main feature of this bill is that it provides for the abolition of the existing representation of Africans in Parliament-that is what does not come out in the self-government bill-and the Cape Provincial Council at the expiration of the existing terms of office of these representatives. This act of the South African Government, we submit, amounts to the direct repudiation of the promises made to the African people by the late General Hertzog, who himself was a Boer and afterwards, after the Boer War became Prime Minister. At the joint sitting of Parliament in 1936, General Hertzog justified the terms of the Representation of Natives Bill on the ground that it would help to remove the white man's fear of being ultimately swamped by a vast black proletariat and that it was a reasonable equitable quid pro quo for the removal of the franchise that natives living in the Cape Province had enjoyed. The legislation which was passed at a joint sitting by 169 votes to 11 gave or promised the Cape natives three native MP's four senators and two provincial councillors, 7 million morgen of land for exclusive occupation by them, and the Native Representative Council, a truly elective body. This was in addition to those members of the Upper House appointed by the Government for "their special knowledge of non-European affairs". The whole of the Nationalist Party in Parliament at that time recorded their votes on the bill's third reading in favour-that is the present Government, not

only General Hertzog is committed to all these things, and the repudiation of the pledge given to the peoples in order to violate human rights. The whole of the National Party supported the bill. Ten years ago the Natives Representative Council was summarily abolished. By 1959 not much more than half the 7 million morgen of promised land had even been bought. And now by a simple majority, the three MP's, the four senators and two provincial councillors are thrown out. In return, the Africans, after 150 years of association with the white man, and after eighty years on the common roll are judged fit to be given only local committees membership of which is at the discretion of the Central Government. From common roll to tribal committees of government stooges in twenty-three years is the dazzling vision of progress which South Africa displays at present in the battle of Africa for the minds of 200 million men.

Now, there is another one here from the "Star" of Johannesburg-again, a highly respectable paper. He writes under the caption "The Great Illusion" on 25 March. The Great Illusion" advertises the considerable plan to promote autonomy for the native population in South Africa-that is the self-government bill. It turns out on a most cursory examination to be little more than a scheme to take away from the natives forever the meagre political representation they have gained after generations of contact with. Western civilization. As a substitute they are offered self-governing "rights" in their own areas which must necessarily be illusory for two reasons. These rights will always remain subject to the will of Parliament-that is, not their Parliament, the European Parliament in which they have no representation. It is not a Parliament so far as they are concerned. So far as they are concerned it is an assembly with autocratic rights. These rights will always remain subject to the will of Parliament and the Government in whose decision Dr. Berford's hypothesis, they are irrevocably debarred from having the slightest voice. And again, by the expressed terms, the whole shoddy arrangements, says the Star, the millions of natives going outside their own areas without even the semblance of self-government unless they solve the legal fiction of remote control by travel authorities with whom they are powerless to influence.

Now, I will readjust one more quotation be-

cause it is in regard to the application of this principle to universities. I do not want to lay particular stress on the iniquity of racial discrimination in universities. The International Committee on Science and Freedom which represents members of 296 universities-and in order that these names may not be misleading, I should say that this International Committee on Science and Freedom which represents 296 universities in fifty-two countries includes such moderate and liberal minded people as Professor Toynbee and Salvador de Madariaga. I say this because names of these associations are sometimes misleading. This Committee said that it is:

"a flagrant denial of human brotherhood which strikes at the roots of genuine university education and menaces the standing of South African universities as members of the world community of learning."

The Natal Mercury, writing on this bill, said:

465

"..... The fundamental objection is that university apartheid means direct interference with the right of access to a common fund of learning and denial of intellectual contact between white and black."

Regarding apartheid for the dead, a report on cemeteries and crematoria by the City Engineer of Durban published in June 1959, says that "in view of the policy of segregation of South Africa and the natural, racial and social differences in relation to funeral ceremonies"-how can there be natural differences in ceremonies, I do not know --"it would be undesirable to mix various racial ceremonies at the same crematoria." I suppose if you are burned, you are converted into phosphates and gases, whatever your race.

Now, those are the opinions of people who cannot be regarded as being in any way fanatical or extreme, who probably would not subscribe to an extreme resolution if they were in this Assembly. But then, I want to go on to the United Nations; that is the United Nations which never expressed any opinion on anything which we can understand normally, has produced something on this question. When I say "the United Nations," not us but Mr. Ralph Bunche and his part of the United Nations. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was asked to make an inquiry to find out-I do not know why this was asked-whether there was any scientific basis for any racial discrimination. It was stated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that the scientific material available at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences-I am not going into any argument about Mendel's theory and so on-are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and the cultural achievements of different peoples as groups. It does indicate on the contrary that a major factor in explaining such differences is the cultural experience which each group has undergone. Again it reminds me of what the President of Guinea was saying to us a quarter of an hour ago. The report states further that the available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development. I should like to say, how could it be because 500 million years ago our ancestors were the fish that inhabited the waters of the time-not even chimpanzees-and I suppose another 500 million years before they would want to be called a virus. The report continues that there is no evidence that race mixture produces disadvantageous results from a biological point of viewthose who are horse traders know that this is true. The report goes on again to say that the social results of race mixture, whether for good or ill, can generally be traced to social factors. This text was drafted by Professor Bergman of the Royal Tropical Institute of Amsterdam, and a long list of others whose names I shall not read. I commend this United Nations document, which is a rather scholarly volume, to my fellow members of this Committee.

Now, from there, I want the Committee to address itself to this particular problem : What is apartheid and what is it not in terms of law as we understand it, and if you like it, moral law ? Apartheid, taken at its best is not a discriminatory law against an individual. It is a law against a class. It comes into the same category of objection that we have two things like guilt by association, collective fines on villages and others of that character. Therefore, all the disabilities that arise from it have nothing to do with the performance of the individual. It is simply, "You were born in that stable and that is all there is to it."

Apartheid is a direct violation not only of human rights but of the rule of law as we understand it; that is to say, you visit penalties whether or not anything has been done just because someone belongs to a particular group. That is what apartheid is.

Now I would like to say what apartheid is not. There may be a case-I would not subscribe to it myself-as in the case of Liberia when Africans on the one hand whites and non-whites on the other may say, Well, we are equal but we are different. Therefore, let us decide to live differently." That is possible. But apartheid is not that. What it tries to do is to push one group into one place and not leave them alone; they are set upon by others on the top. Sometimes when we hear all this idea of not interfering with customs, putting them separately and so on, we would think it is a kind of complete autonomy. That is not the idea. If the expression is not to be misunderstood, it is to create what they would call a black Africa which is ruled by white Africa. It is the old, old story, you know-the white man's burden with the black man carrying it.

That is what apartheid is-on the one hand the negation of the rule of law and, on the other hand, fundamentally against the whole idea of self-government and self-determination. If the created a whole South African Republic, another Liberia in the South, then I personally would reject it because I believe that Africa must have a

466

multi-racial society. But there would be some justification for it. If the Union Government were to say, "There is so much land. You go and prosper otherwise, just as you are going to," that is a different question. But that is not it. There is no apartheid in trying to control them; I suppose they do it by remote control.

Last year the Independent African States passed resolutions in Monrovia, Liberia on 4 August. I do not say that any group of States of the United Nations gathered here or anywhere else can legislate for all of us ; but these are the people who wear the shoe more than most of us do and, what is more, they are fellow Members of the United Nations. They passed this resolution which notes

".....with concern the relentless manner in which the Government of South Africa is putting into practice its apartheid policy.

"Condemns the practice of racial discrimination and segregation in all of its aspects all over the world, especially in the Union of South Africa, in the Central African Federation, in Kenya and in other parts of Africa."

If I may comment on this first paragraph, it is not important for the strong word "condemns", but it is important for the fact that this is an infection that is spreading. We have seriously to consider whether one of the States mentioned here-it is not for Vie to say which-would not become another South Africa, would not be an apt pupil. It may likely be one of the States that apply for admission over here.

"Calls upon all Members of the United Nations and all peoples of the world to associate themselves with the resolutions passed by the United Nations and the Bandung......"

There is an expression of view by the Independent States who have come into being at this time. There is also a memorandum circulated to Members of the Organisation by the African National Congress which, I am glad to say, is a territorial congress. It does not exclude anybody on grounds of race. Not only non-white people but Europeans, courageous people, are members of the African National Congress, at least they used to be in my time anyway. This memorandum has been circulated and while it is not an official document of ours it can provide a considerable amount of information. I will read just two very small sections:

"At this time when more and more African peoples am receiving freedom and independence, the policies of the Union Government are becoming more and more intolerable than ever. Many countries, appalled at the consequences of this policy, are adopting concrete attitudes towards it. The utter contempt with which the Union treats decisions of the United Nations Assembly constitutes a serious threat to peace in Africa and therefore in the world."

This is the position so far as Africa is concerned. Now I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the hint, which I just, read out about race conflict. This does not come from South Africa; it comes from Oslo in Norway, a Teutonic country and, I am glad to say, without race discrimination. It is as follows:

"The race explosion"-this has nothing to do with the nuclear tests, you know-"in Durban is a sinister omen of the awful things which may happen if the present policy in South Africa is persued further."-The Norwegians will vote for this draft resolution ; they always do -"The systematic and intentional suppression by the white people of the black population must sooner or later result in an open clush which there is. reason to fear will take place in brutal forms. "What makes South Africa different from all other regions in Africa is that the negroes are gradually being debarred from every possibility of fighting for an equal position with legal political means."

Part of the parliamentary system, the democratic system of government, is that you can fight evil with the law. But if you are put beyond the pale of the law then there is no redress and there is no constitutional remedy. That is really an invitation to violenee.

"The apartheid policy is unfeasible in practice because the whole economy of South Africa is dependent on the working power of the negroes. It is economically completely impossible to separate the races from each other. The negroes would perish of hunger if they were forced into the reservations, and the economy of the white people would break down. The whole apartheid policy is only a

467

desperate attempt at making the supre-

macy of the whites permanent."

This is the occasion for me to deal with this problem from the point of view of the world as a whole. The vast majority of the populations are those on whom apartheid makes an adverse impact. They have to mine the coal, the diamonds and the gold, cultivate the fields, operate the elevators, cook, nurse the children and do everything else. I regret to say that the trade unions in South Africa are as much guilty of this or even more so than anyone else. Therefore, the whole economy of this region, where the world is short of food production and of all the resources that art required, would be affected by this. On the other hand, the pace of industrialization, partly arising from the desire of individuals, to amass profits, cannot be kept back. And when industrialization takes place in that way there will be created a vast proletariat which will have economic power and technical knowledge in spite of all these reservations, but which will be denied political power and be the subject of this kind of discrimination. What more is required to create social instability?

These are the reasons why we bring this matter here. year after year. It is not because this is a hardy annual. The draft resolution before us in document A/SPC.L.37 does not express the very legitimate indignation of large numbers of people. It does not express words of condemnation. It speaks more in sorrow than in anger. The reason why the draft resolution before us is drafted in this way is in order that the lowest common denominator of adverse opinion may make some impact, if not on the Government of South Africa immediately, on those large numbers of people who, as in Hitler's Germany, are against racial discrimination as such, a thing that cannot be worked. What is more, the other aspect of apartheid is that it places not only in the courts, not only in the policeman, not only in the arm of the law, but in the hands of every white citizen the power of coercion. It places it in their hands and therefore converts every non-European into a bondsman. That is the implication of this law. Therefore we have sponsored this draft resolution along with a number of other countries.

I hope that the restraint, the moderation, that is shown in these matters will not be regarded by those who do not agree with it as timidity. Our country does not believe that hard words find solutions, but there should be no doubt in the mind of anyone that this disease is fast spreading.

If I may say so, the representative of the South African Union has come here time after time and told us not only that apartheid is necessary for South Africa, a necessary evil, something that we cannot avoid, but that it should be a pattern for the world in the solution of racial problems, that it is the right pattern for places where there are mixed races or multi-racial societies. I suppose this is really addressed to the Latin countries and so on where there is no problem of this kind, so if they want a problem they can create one.

The draft resolution (A/SPC/L.37), therefore, is one that should meet with the approval of the Assembly, although there may be one or two countries, as we know, which for reasons totally divorced from the merits of this matter would not register their votes against it. My delegation desires particularly to express its appreciation of the attitude taken by Belgium, which has a very large number of African peoples as its citizenry, but for reasons which I do not hold as justifiedbut they do, and we must respect it-they at any rate are not going to oppose the draft resolution.

The draft resolution by itself may not do any good, but it does call upon

"... all Member States to use their best endeavours as appropriate to achieve the purposes of this resolution."

Now in the lobbies the question has been asked whether this last operative paragraph is a kind of punitive clause asking for sanctions of any kind. On the very face of it, it is an appeal that is made to Member States to do what they can. It maybe that one Government may talk to the Union of South Africa privately and say "you cannot go on with this in this way". Or they could communicate to them our reasonableness.

Having said this, my delegation wishes to make it perfectly clear that we could not solve this problem merely by setting up Committees from outside, writing the reports about them, not going into the anthropology or the physics or the chemistry of this business, We would be the last people to promote or encourage any move which recreates further hostilities. Our attitude is one of appeal to South Africa to join in this general attempt to remove these evils.

Secondly, we do not want it in any way to be understood by any one that these racial evils are a bolt on South Africa and South Africa alone. We have plenty of them in our own country. There are not many countries in the world anyway

468

where discrimination of one kind or another does not take place. But there is not a country in the world which defies discrimination. We all try, to getaway from the evil. We would not stand up on a platform and proclaim that discrimination is a virtue. We know it is with us, we fight against it, we organize our public opinion against it, we, even fight our own countrymen, our political colleagues, against it. But here not only, are we told that this has arisen in the context of history, and what are we to do about it.

That is not what we are told. We are told that there is apartheid, that there must be, apartheid, and not only that there must be apartheid in Africa, but that it must be everywhere else. I am glad to think that it would not be introduced into the Membership of the United Nations, because we have built more places for the sub-human kingdom separately. So, here we am not discussing merely an individual evil, against a group of people. I did not want to introduce emotionalism into this matter. I did not want to refer to the enormous amount of hardship it has cost the Union territory in the uprooting of peoples and families who have been in places for generations and yet being turned out into the jungles and prevented from having the opportunity of earning their livelihood, being separated from employers, who are humane people, who do not subscribe to this but who must obey the law, where bitterness is creeping in. All of those processes which make a society unstable is being promoted by legislation.

A distinguished South African Judge once said: "There are so many laws that have been made in South Africa that if an African gets out of his house, he can commit a crime". Because if you do something or look at somebody, or tilt your hat in the wrong way, or forget your passbook, or whatever it is, they are statutory crimes. You can also create statutory crimes in order to catch criminals.

We have moved from the time when the poll tax was the only inhibition in order to obtain control over the African peoples or populations of that character. We appeal to the Assembly to give full support to the draft resolution, and once again we would like to, say to South Africans who are hereby proxy that in spite of all that has happened, we fervently hope that whatever procedures they adopt, whether it be formal or informal, whether it be through those who are not so committed as we are, whether it be by any action they take themselves, whether it be by negotiations with their sister States in the African continent, whether it be by some convention', to which they could agree, that they would make a breach, create some disengagement of this probkm, so that it will prevent its spreading into the rest of the continent and will avoid the horrors of racial conflict.

In that connexion, I am instructed by my Government to draw; the attention of all of its to the fact that one of the evil by-products of this may be the division among the non-white peoples themselves. An old English. official once spoke of "A subject peoples speaking two languages, one for itself and one for the ruler." Similar, it is possible-it has happened in the questions in which we are more intimately related-that attempts will be made to create divisions among the people on whom apartheid makes its impact. There are always those who are prepared to buy a junior partnership in imperialism.

So far as the Indian populations on the African continent are concerned, it is the deliberate policy of our Government to point out to them that nationalism, is territorial. An Indian in Africa is an African-Indian or an Indian-African, just as you put it, the same way as the Dutch is an African. It is only on this basis that we can proceed. This is an evil doctrine that will not be confined to the corners of this continent. What is more, its implications should not be relevant either in the titles of the bills or in their present content. Its arms stretch very far. While we shall never be a party to proposals which inhibit the power of South Africa to function as a Member of this Organization, we would draw their attention again to the words of General Smuts, who happened to be a founder of this Organization and who deliberately subscribed to the clauses that operate against apartheid.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA LIBERIA INDONESIA PAKISTAN IRELAND GUINEA SUDAN ETHIOPIA GHANA CAMEROON NIGER NIGERIA MALI GERMANY NORWAY SLOVAKIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT CANADA AUSTRALIA THE NETHERLANDS KENYA BELGIUM

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in General Assembly on Election to Trusteeship Council

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the General Assembly on December 12, 1959 on the election of two members of the Trusteeship Council.

The following is the full text of this statement :

We had not intended to intervene in any debate preceding the holding of the elections to the Trusteeship Council, since India is a candidate for election and we would have much preferred

469

not to have to speak. But highly important issues have been raised before the Assembly, not only of a legal nature but also of a nature which concerns the whole future of the Trusteeship Council and its continued efficacy and capacity to discharge its supervisory functions on behalf of the General Assembly in respect of Trust Territories and towards the people of these Territories in their preparation for independence. We feel, therefore, that we should place our views before the Members of the Assembly on these issues. This has no relation to our candidature. As a matter of fact, we would have expressed our views more strongly were we not a candidate.

To our regret, we find ourselves in opposition to the views and attitudes embodied in the two draft resolutions, documents A/L.274 and A/L.-275/Rev.1. These, respectively, are draft resolutions of the delegations of the Soviet Union and, Tunisia, for both of whom my delegation has high regard and very friendly feelings. We have been assured by these delegations that the stand they have taken has no reference to our candidature. I can likewise assure them that our views have no reference to our candidature either, and what is more important, should not be construed as in any way hostile to them or to their attitudes.

Two proposals have been placed before the Assembly. I do not wish to repeat the facts which have been placed before us by the representative of Tunisia and by the representative of the Soviet Union. These facts are well-known and are not in dispute. The proposals, however, are first that there should be a resumed session of the General Assembly after 27 April 1960, when the last of the French Trust Territories, Togoland, becomes independent; secondly, that on 27 April 1960 and on 1 July 1960, when France and Italy, respectively, cease to be Administering Authorities, the composition of the Trusteeship Council should be redetermined either by voluntary retirement or by casting lots, with a view on each occasion to bringing down the number of non-administering elected members, so that parity should be maintained between the non-administering and administering Powers in the Council.

I shall take the second proposal first. The essential element of this proposal is that the Trusteeship Council will decide which of the nonadministering elected members will cease to be members, the decision to be taken by drawing lots. With all respect to the delegation sponsoring this proposal I must say that there is no legal basis for it. Elections to the Trusteeship Council are held by the General Assembly, and it is for the General Assembly to determine the composition of the Council. The Charter does not permit the Trusteeship Council or any other principal organ itself to determine its own composition. It is the totality of the Members of the General Assembly which must perform this function and there is no provision in the Charter for delegation of the General Assembly's-functions to the Trusteeship Council in this regard.

Secondly, there is no provision anywhere in the Charter for membership to be decided by lot. Such a decision could perhaps be taken with the express consent of the Members concerned in any particular drawing of lots, but it would be illegal and unconstitutional either to elect the Member to the Trusteeship Council or any other body by drawing lots, or to terminate the membership of any country, lawfully elected by the same procedure without the consent of the parties concerned. If that were possible, then we would not have had the recent repeated deadlock in the election to the Security Council. It would have been easy for the Assembly to decide who should be elected to the Security Council by drawing lots. It is doubtful, even if both candidates are agreed, that is to say, Turkey and Poland, whether the General Assembly would have wished to take recourse to this procedure or indeed whether it would have been legal to do so.

In the past, as between Yugoslavia and the Philippines, when a similar deadlock arose for election to the Security Council some years ago, lots were drawn to decide which country should sit during the first year and which during the second year, but this again was with the express consent of both countries and behind the scenes. My delegation even on that occasion explained its position that we did not recognize any method of election not expressly authorized by the Charter or outside the scope of the Charter.

My delegation is strongly of the view that a most unhealthy precedent, which will be unconstitutional, will be created if the Assembly gives any kind of endorsement to any proposal to determine the membership of any of the principal organs of United Nations on the basis of a lottery irrespective of the objections of the parties concerned.

Thirdly, there is the basic objection that there can be no curtailment of the three-year period during which a non-administering member is elected and which is mandatory under Article 86, paragraph 1 c of the Charter under rule 149 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, again without the consent of the member concerned. This three-year period is not the upper limit or the ceiling as some delegations have argued. Rule 149 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly says:

"A non-administering member of the Trusteeship Council shall be elected for a term of three years and shall be eligible for immediate re-election."

The footnote in the rules of procedure, to this rule, which members will no doubt wish to look into, says:

"Rule based directly on a provision of the Charter (Article 86, paragraph 1 c)".

It is clear that the Assembly has already accepted the obvious interpretation of Article 86, paragraph 1 c, namely that the three-year period is mandatory and fixed. No other interpretation is possible. And, If I might remind the represent. atives, the Assembly's rules of procedure were adopted not in 1945 when the San Francisco conference was being held, and the participants in that conference could not very well foresee what would happen ten years later, or that Trust Territories would gain independence so soon, but it was approved in 1949 when this whole situation was clear, and as everybody knows, the Assembly's rules of procedure were adopted after a great deal of deliberation in Committees and on the floor of the Assembly.

Indeed, once a country is elected for a threeyear period there is no provision at all in the Charter for premature termination of membership without consent, which would be tantamount to expulsion of the Member or Members concerned. The compulsive premature cessation or termination of membership would indeed infringe on the fundamental right of an elected member under the Charter. It is the view of my delegation that there is no possibility of reducing the term of the elected membership of the Council except by agreement among the, elected members themselves, including an agreement as to the manner in which such a decision should be made-and that Agreement may very well be the casting of lots. There is no easy solution and anything that looks like an easy solution would create complications of the most serious nature in regard to the application of the Charter not only on this particular

occasion, but on future occasions in different contexts in the United Nations.

As regards the proposal for a resumed session, there is no provision in the Charter, as I have just said, for premature termination of membership of those elected, under Article 86, paragraph 1 c, even under a resumed session or at a special session. The premature termination of membership without consent, in our view, amounts to expulsion, as I have just said, but expulsion of A Member from any of the principal organs of the Organization is a very serious matter, and we do not see how it can be brought about except for persistent violation of the Charter as contemplated in Article 6 of the Charter.

There is yet another difficulty of a serious nature about any resumed session to consider the question of future composition of the membership of the Council; and I think that has been very eloquently, described by the representative of Ceylon. Such a session will come up face to face against what after all is the real problem, namely the inadequacy of the Charter to meet the present situation and the need for amending the Charter to meet such a situation now. Actually, it is not a short-term problem. we have to deal with. On 27 April 1960, France will cease to be an Administering Authority; on 1 July 1960, Italy will cease to be an Administering Authority; when Western Samoa becomes independent in 1961, New Zealand can be regarded as ceasing to be an Administering Authority; it is arguable that for Nauru, for which New, Zealand is a partner in joint trusteeship, but which is administered by Australia it is the latter and not the sleeping partners in the Trusteeship Agreement for Nauru which is answerable to the Trusteeship Council and has the capacity to undertake the obligations of administering authority in the Council. I wish to make it clear that I am not pronouncing any definite opinion on this particular matter, but I am merely pointing out the difficulty of interpretation that may arise. Later, Tanganyika will be independent, which will mean that the United Kingdom will cease to be. an administering authority. Indeed, if at every point of time when a situation of this nature arises, there is going to be a resumed session and non-administering elected members have to drop out one by one, what sort of a Trusteeship Council shall we have left? In the very near future,

within one or two years, there may be no nonadministering elected member at all. The matter is really one of extreme difficulty and there is no easy solution that we can see. Indeed, my delegation has every fear that any resumed session such as contemplated in draft resolution A/L.274 runs the risk of becoming a Charter revision session. There may be a multitude of proposals including those for amending Article 86 of the Charter and we shall get into the same difficulties many times multiplied, as we faced on the agenda items, increase in the membership of the Security

471

Council and of the ECOSOC at the present session. These may well five rise to severe pressure of various kinds on various members such as the permanent members of the Security Council, the Administering Powers and others. That would be most unfortunate and might make such a resumed or special session prolonged, acrimonious and fruitless.

My delegation's view on the subject of Charter revision are well-known. We are against any over simplification of the problem and against any such pressures being exercised.

So whichever way we turn we come up against serious difficulties both of a legal and of a practical nature. It teems to my delegation that the best thing to do is not to attempt to solve this problem now, but only after the events which after all still lie in the always unpredictable and mysterious future and which will necessitate a reconsideration of the question of composition after these events have taken place. The time and occasion for this will be the next regular session of the Assembly. By then, the members concerned will have engaged in consultations among themselves and with others. At the next session, there will be more time. Foreign ministers will be present, and we hope that we could then settle this matter by unanimous consent.

It is also the view of my delegation that, though a trusteeship agreement may be terminated on a particular date, the obligations of the Administering Authority vis-a-vis the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council need not and in fact will not in most cases terminate on the same date. Article 88 of the Charter makes it mandatory on the Administering Authority to submit annual reports to the General Assembly. These reports must necessarily be examined by the Trusteeship Council. For the consideration of these reports, the presence of the Administering Authority in the Council is necessary and even obligatory. In the present situation, the final reports in respect of the French Cameroons and French Togoland and indeed of Italian Somaliland will not be submitted by the Administering Authority concerned until some time after these dates when the Administering Authority will be able to report definitively on the termination of trusteeship and the attainment of independence by the Territories, including the processes immediately preceding such independence. So far, General Assembly has received the Administering Authority's reports on Togoland and the French Cameroons and Italian Somaliland only tip to 1958 and 1957 respectively. Further reports of the Administering Authority in respect of these three Territories up to the date of independence are called for under Article 88 of the Charter. We submit that such reports are indispensable, if only for the record and to conform to the requirements, legal and other, neccessarily involved in the winding up of United Nations supervisory functions and of the trust undertaken by the Administering Authorities through the Trusteeship Council right up to the date of independence.

Therefore, it seems to us that them will really be no stretching of the Charter if the countries concerned stay on in the Council until the next session of the General Assembly.

New let us see what the position is under Article 86. Article 86 comes into play et the time of the election of non-administering members falling in its category, and When the election of such members is to be taken up, the Assembly has to look to parity as between the total number of non-administering members elected under Article 86 1 (c) and those who are members of the Council without election under Article 86 1(b) and the Administering Powers under Article 86 1(a). It is arguable that, after election has been made under Article 86 1(c), that section must be deemed to lie dormant until the time for the next election comes.

Article 86 1 (c) does not support the contention

that the composition of the Council shall be changed during the three-year tenure of office at every point of time when a Trusteeship Agreement is terminated and an Administering Authority ceases to be such. If that were the intention, Article 86 1 (c) would not have laid down a mandatory three-year election period, and instead would have made specific provision for charges during the three-year period if certain events took place. The Charter could not have intended synchronization of the date of independence of Trust Territories with the date of elections under Article 86 1 (c), and thus by implication discouraged the emergence into independence of Trust Territories on an intermediate dates. To suggest that at every point of time when et Trust Territory becomes independent and an Administering Power ceases to be such there should be a meeting of the General Assembly to decide open the future composition which would inevitably mean expulsion or removal of one or other of the Members elected for the mandatory three-year period is not a practical proposition, nor is it one strictly warranted by Article 86 1 (c).

It has been argued that the principle of

472

parity in Article 86 1(c) is paramount. I do not know what the support is for this proposition. We have read and reread Article 86 1 (c) and there is nothing in it to show that the principle of parity has to be given precedence over the principle of the mandatory three-year election period.

There is an important precedent with a bearing on this issue which has already been referred to by the representative of Indonesia and which should not be lost sight of. A perusal of General Assembly document A/PV. 109 will show that in 1947 the United States of America was a non-administering member of the Trusteeship Council under Article 86 1(b). Subsequently, with the approval of the Trusteeship Agreement in respect of the Pacific Islands on 18 July 1947, the United States became an administering mem. ber of the Council with effect from that date. Consequently, an imbalance was created in the Council's composition in favour of the Administering Members. If the logic or the line of argument now presented to the Assembly had been held valid at the time, the Security Council or the Secretary-General should have convened a

special session of the General Assembly on 19 July 1947 to take measures to restore the balance in the Council's composition, or two of the Ad. ministering Authorities should have been ballotted out by the Trusteeship Council. - Neither of these steps, however, was taken. The pro. cedure adopted was that the Secretary-General notified the Members of the United Nations in document A/356 of 25 August 1947 to the following effect :

"...The Trusteeship Agreement for the Pacific Islands having entered into force on 18 July 1947, the United States of America, which was already a member of the Trusteeship Council, became as of that date a Member administering a Trust Territory. In accordance, therefore, with the provisions of Article 86, paragraph 1 (c) of the Charter, which prescribes...it is necessary to elect two additional members to the Trusteeship Council."

Accordingly, on 13 November 1947 the Assembly elected Costa Rica and the Philippines to the Trusteeship Council thereby repairing the imbalance in the Council's composition at its session succeeding the event. This happened four months after the imbalance was created.

Now, as is clear from the precedent which I have brought to the Assembly's attention, in 1947 when the number of administering members of the Council exceeded that of its non-administering members by two for a period of four months.. the Assembly did not find reason for undue concern. Why is it then that, when the imbalance is likely to arise in favour of non-administering elected members, there is such a demand for giving paramount importance to the question of parity. This is something which my delegation is unable to understand. We should have thought that if parity at all was to be tolerated it ought to be tolerated in favour of the non-administering members and not in favour of the administering members. It is also to be remembered that the predominance of the non-administering members in the Council will only be theoretical. For France and Italy, after having been administering members for fourteen years, will not suddenly become non-administering in the sense that the United Arab Republic or Burma or Haiti or Paraguay

are such members. They will continue to sit in the Council qua Administering Authorities in relation to the annual reports of the Territories in their charge prior to 27 April and I July respectively.

Having said all this, I wish to make it clear that the principle of parity is important and has to be maintained along with the maintenance of the three-year period elections. I do not mean to suggest that this principle should be attached lesser importance than the other principle of the three-year period election which is consecrated in Article 86 1 (c). The mutual reconciliation of these principles, which is the real difficulty in this case, is not an easy matter and will require a great deal of mutual consultation and agreement between the members of the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly.

We feel that the best time and auspices for undertaking such consultations and agreements will occur after and not before the events which bring to attention the question of future composition have taken place.

The question that has arisen, incidentally to the election of two new members at this session, is of much greater scope than can be sized up or settled by us at such short notice, or in such little time as we have at our disposal now. We entirely agree with the delegations of the Soviet Union and Tunisia and others that full consideration should be given to the question of the future composition of the Trusteeship Council, in order to maintain the concept of parity envisaged in the Charter, not only in principle but also in effect. A fuller consideration of this matter may necessitate not only a reduction in the strength of the non-administering wing of the

473

Council but equally probably, also a reduction in the administering membership of the Trusteeship Council through voluntary retirement, or withdrawal or resignation of one or more permanent members who were formerly administering Trust Territories.

In the light of these views, my delegation is constrained to say that while the draft resolution placed before us by the delegation of Tunisia is inspired by the best of motives, it is inopportune and premature. We agree generally with the preamble of this draft resolution, except the second paragraph, thereof. We also have tome doubts about the third paragraph of the preamble. We agree with sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph I of the operative part, which states that the election of two members to the Trusteeship Council at this session should take place in the normal way for three-year terms. In fact, no other logical or juridical interpretation of the provisions of Article 86 is feasible. We also agree With the last part of this draft resolution, which purports to inscribe this question as an item on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly so that a full and careful consideration of this whole question can take place. On the other hand, for the reason I have already stated, we find ourselves unable to agree with the purpose and possible effects of sub-paragraph, (b) and (c) of paragraph I of the operative part and the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Tunisia.

As regards paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, we again find ourselves in great difficulty. It refers to the principle of equitable geographical distribution, a principle to which the Assembly as a whole has subscribed in the past. There is no objection to that principle itself, but time and again we have found the greatest difficulty in the application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. I need not go into the details of that.

As constituted, this paragraph means that, out of the remaining elected members, the two main groups would share these two seats, that is, that each would be represented. The "main groups" are not indicated. Possibly it means the Asian-African group and the Latin American group. But it seems to me that any such division has to be thought out very carefully and, speaking entirely for my delegation, we are not in favour of dividing seats on the basis of groups. I do not see why these seats should not be open to a member from the European countries or, for example, a Commonwealth country. So we find also great difficulty in accepting this paragraph which, besides being related to the other two operative paragraphs, has some inherent defects of its own. Therefore we shall also be obliged to oppose this paragraph.

Finally, I should like to assure in fellow representatives that we do not regard any decision, if such a decision is reached by this Assembly to leave over the matter to the fifteenth session of the Assembly, as in any sense a revision of the Charter or an amendment of the Charter. On that subject our views are well-known. We are for the strictest application of the Juridical procedure prescribed in Articles 108 and 109 of the Charter. Indeed, it seems to us that the draft resolution contained in document A/L. 275/Rev. 1 is the one that by its terms seeks a revision of the Charter, and it is that aspect which I have tried to bring to light. As far as we are concerned, we are not agreeable to an amendment of the Charter without careful consideration in the right way according to the provi-sions contained in the Charter itself for such revision. We should like to assure the representatives, specially the representative of the Soviet Union-who has, I know, strong views on this subject-that whatever we have said does not amount in any sense to any suggestion for any amendment of the Charter.

INDIA USA TUNISIA FRANCE ITALY POLAND TURKEY YUGOSLAVIA PHILIPPINES WESTERN SAMOA NEW ZEALAND NAURU AUSTRALIA CAMEROON MALI INDONESIA PERU COSTA!!BURMA HAITI PARAGUAY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Letter to President of the Security Council

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council on December 22, 1959. Shri Jha's letter was in reply to his Pakistani Counterpart's letter dated December 3, 1959 on recent developments in Ladakh.

The following is the full text of the letter

I have the honour to refer to the letter dated 3 December 1959 (S/4242) from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations to the President of the Security Council on recent developments in Ladakh and to state that the Government of India fail to understand why the Permanent Representative of Pakistan chose to send this misleading letter, which is full of factual inaccuracies, at this juncture. It appears to the Government of India that this letter could have been sent only with one objective, namely to put pressure on India and aggravate the situation caused by Chinese incursion into the Indian

474

Union territory of Ladakh.

The question that has been under the consideration of the Security Council since January 1948 is the resolving of the situation created by Pakistan aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir. The Council found that the Government of Pakistan, despite their earlier denials, were involved in this situation firstly because they aided and assisted the raiders from Pakistan territory and secondly because they sent their regular armed forces into the State violating Indian territory and the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January 1948 which both Pakistan and India had, accepted. It was because of this background of developments in the situation under consideration of the Council that the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan formulated the resolution of 13 August 1948 and the supplementary resolution of 5 January 1949, to resolve the situation that had developed. They, therefore, made a provision in the resolution of 13 August 1948 for the vacation of Pakistan aggression in the following clear terms:

"As the presence of troops of Pakistan in the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was represented by the Government or Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from that State.

The Government of Pakistan made this commitment to vacate their aggression eleven years ago. The Pakistan aggression, however, still continues and the representative of the aggressor now puts forward other fantastic claims.

In his attempt to mislead the Council, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has stated in his letter that the recommendations (which he refers to as "decisions") of the Security Council and of the UNCIP provide that all outside forces shall be withdrawn from Jammu and Kashmir. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the UNCIP resolution of 13 August 1948 does specifically provide for complete withdrawal of Pakistan armed forces from the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir. The same resolution, however, lays down that the Indian Government will maintain within the lines existing at the moment of cease-fire the minimum strength of its forces considered necessary for the observance of law and order. It is thus clear that the Pakistan forces have to be withdrawn in toto from Jammu and Kashmir and the Government of India are entitled to maintain their forces for the observance of law and order. The Commission had specifically assured the Indian Prime Minister that "law and order" includes adequate defence.

The Permanent Representative of Pakistan has made a further attempt in his letter to mislead the Council by making the suggestion that a sovereign authority to look after the security or Jammu and Kashmir has still to be evolved and that the responsibility for the security or the State has been assumed by the Security Council. A reference to the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948, the two UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, and the assurances given by the United Nations Commission on behalf of the Security Council to the Prime Minister of India, would show conclusively that the proposals made by the UNCIP and the Security Council to resolve the situation created by Pakistan aggression in Jammu and Kashmir were based on the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government over the entire territory of Jammu and Kashmir and on the responsibility of the Union of India for its defence including maintenance of law and order.

While doing their best to resolve, by peaceful means, the situation created by Chinese incursions into the Indian Union territory of Ladakh, the Government of India will, in pursuance of their inherent right of self-defence, take all such measures as may be necessary against any violation of their territory. The regrettable fact that the situation created by an earlier aggression on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir has still not been resolved due to the intransigence of the Government of Pakistan does not, in any way, detract from the inherent right of the Government of India to take all such measures as they consider necessary to resolve the situation created by aggression from another quarter.

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

INDIA PAKISTAN USA TOTO

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Govinda Reddy's Statement in Special Political Committee on Treatment of People of Indian Origin in South Africa

Shri Govinda Reddy, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a state. ment in the Special Political Committee on December 7, 1959 on the question of treatment

475

of the people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. He said

Mr. Chairman:

Before I begin my statement on this subject, I would like on behalf of my delegation to associate ourselves with the tributes which have been paid in various Committees to the memory of Dr. Jansen, the late Governor General of the Union of South Africa. This question which we are now considering has been on the agenda of the United Nations since 1946. It has been debated by the General Assembly in all but one (the fourth) of its fourteen sessions, and the only reason that it was not debated in the fourth session is because negotiations were in progress at the time between the Governments of India and Pakistan on the one side and the Government of the Union of South Africa on the other. The item this year is before, us as a result of the adoption by the Assembly on the 10th of December 1958 of resolution 1302 which said inter alia, that the parties concerned were to report to the General Assembly, as appropriate, jointly or separately, regarding any progress which may be made in negotiations. It is in this connection that I have the honour to make a report about the present situation, on behalf of the Government of India and I am sure that my distinguished colleague from Pakistan will also make a report on behalf of the Government of Pakistan.

In pursuance of Assembly resolution 1302 the Government of India wrote a letter to the Government of the Union of the South Africa through their Permanent Representative in New York, and the text of the letter is included in the explanatory memorandum (document A4145) on this subject. It is of importance to note that this letter, as previous letters, specifically states that any negotiations which may be entered into between the Governments of India and Pakistan on the one hand and the Government of the Union of South Africa on the other will be without prejudice to the respective juridical stand of the different parties to the dispute. In other words such negotiations would be without prejudice to the position taken by the Government of the Union of South Africa that the discussion of this item is contrary to article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. In spite of the fact that this viewpoint of the Government of the Union of South Africa is one which has been repeatedly and overwhelmingly rejected by the General Assembly, the Governments of India and Pakistan have over the last few years repeatedly expressed their willingness to enter into negotiations on this subject without insisting that the Government of the Union of South Africa accept the jurisdiction of the General Assembly on this matter. We have done this because to us what is important is that as a first step negotiations should begin. If the Government of the union were to suggest any manner or any means by which such negotiations could take place, my Government

would be happy to consider such a suggestion.

Now what is the subject on which negotiations are desired? It is simply the treatment meted out to people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. There are today about half a million people in South Africa who are of Indian origin-I am using the phrase Indian origin because they went out to South Africa from an Undivided India now India and Pakistan, and actually these people who are in the Union are some of them, coming from what is now India. and some from what is now Pakistan. It is estimated that about 80 to 90 per cent of these people were born in the Union and are nationals of the Union. These people are South Africans. Most of the people of Indian origin who are in South Africa are descendents from immigrants who went to the Union at the invitation of the Government of South Africa. They went there because the Union Government needed labour on the sugar plantations. At that time the Government of India was a responsibility, internationally, of the British Government. The Secretary of State for Colonies of the United Kingdom Government said in 1875 in connection with the arrangement to send these Indian people to South Africa that, and here I quote, "Above all things we must confidently expect, as in indispensable condition of the proposed arrangement that the colonial laws and their administration will be such that Indian settlers, who have completed the terms of services to which they have agreed, as the return for the expense of bringing them to the colonies, will be free men in all respects, with privileges no way inferior to those of any other class of Her Majesty's subjects resident in the colonies." It is important to note that this was the statement of the British Minister at the time which was made on behalf of the British Government. In other words, our contention is that as far back as 1875 there was an agreement that the people who went to the Union of South Africa from India would in no way be inferior to anyone else who lived in that territory.

As the number of permanent Indian settlers increased, there was some opposition on the part of European settlers, both to the free Indians and the Indian traders. Such agitation started in Natal towards the end of the last century. A commission was appointed to inquire into various

476

anti-Indian allegations. Not only does the report of the Commission hold that the anti-Indian allegations were unfounded, but it praised, and here I quote, "The commendable industry" of the Indians in agriculture. Giving evidence before the Commission, Sir J. C. Hulett, an ex-Prime Minister of Natal, said, and here I quote again "The free Indians at present in the Colony are an immense benefit, being largely engaged in agriculture pursuits." In 1908 as a result of anti-Indian allegations the Natal Government proposed legislation to prohibit the issue of licenses for trading to Asians after 31st December 1918. As a matter of law this legislation had to be referred to the Imperial Government of Britain. This legislation was disallowed by the Secretary of States for the Colonies Lord Salisbury, who made the following observation regarding this matter, and here I quote

"It would be a matter of the greatest difficulty to enumerate any conditions under which it would be possible to justify the interdiction of a particular class in the State from engaging in normal legitimate and necessary occupations; and it would be still harder to justify dispossessing them from their existing means of livelihood, however Liberal might be the terms of compensation. But the imposition of such disabilities on a class which owes its presence in the Colony to the Colony's own necessities and whose numbers have been augmented by the voluntary action and indeed the settled policy of successive Colonial Governments, over a period of 15 years since the advent of self-government, would appear on its merits to constitute a hardship of a especially grievous character."

Before the statement had been made by Lord Salisbury, it is important to remember that the man who subsequently became one of the most remarkable men in history and the world, Mahatma Gandhi, had already on behalf of the Indians resident in the Union of South Africa, carried on a long and non-violent campaign to achieve for the residents of the Union some of the elementary rights which they were denied. Our connection with this problem is thus not only the legal one of the flouting of repeated international arrangements but also the very important one that it was here on the South African soil that Mahatma Gandhi first kindled the fire in the furnace called Satyagraha. Our emotional connection with this problem, Mr. Chairman, can probably be easily understood and is as important as is our legal position, which is universally recognized.

After the end of the first World War, there was an Imperial Conference in which questions affecting all dominions, as well as India, were discussed. At this conference, the Government of India, that is, the British Government of India, claimed full political rights for the resident Indian community in the various self-governing dominions. And in 1921 the Imperial Conference passed a resolution recommending "that in the interest of the solidarity of the British, Commonwealth it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized." It is on the basis of this resolution of the Imperial Conference as well as all the statements by many Secretaries of State and the guarantees given by the British Government to our people before they went to South Africa that we would especially ask other Commonwealth countries and particularly the UK to consider in what manner they can help the people of Indian origin in South Africa to obtain at least the elementary human rights. We would ask them especially to let us know what they can do in this regard and to suggest any manner, any method whereby they can help. It is for this specific reason that in the resolution which was adopted last year the sponsors were good enough to include the paragraphs which stated "Invites Member States to use their good offices, as appropriate to bring about negotiations in accordance with the desire expressed by the General Assembly at previous sessions." My Government is not aware of any good offices having been used and we would particularly ask those countries which have somewhat of a moral responsibility in this matter to indicate to us how they would like to use their good offices so that we can have the benefit of their constructive advice, instead of merely being told that this matter should not be discussed in the General Assembly. We say this because we approach this problem in a completely constructive manner and would like to know what indeed we can do which will enable us to solve a problem which has occupied the attention of so many successive General Assemblies and on which so many resolutions have been adopted. We also say this because we particularly want to request those

Governments who have some reason which we have not fully understood of abstaining year after year in the resolutions which are adopted in this Assembly, to tell us in what manner, they would like to approach the problem. Let them tell us what they would like us to do rather than merely abstain on resolutions which are couched in what I may be permitted to say are immediately moderate terms.

I will now skip over a few intervening years and come to the first discussion of this problem directly between the Government of India and

477

the Government of South Africa. This was in 1927 in Cape Town, and the agreements which were arrived at as a result of those negotiations are known as the Cape Town Agreements. An announcement was made simultaneously in India and South Africa on the 21st of February 1927 of the terms of this agreement and, if I may say so, the original copy which we have of this agreement is printed by His Majesty's Stationery Office and is therefore to be considered as much an official document to which the UK is bound as any other document of the nature of an agreement published by official sources in Britain. I will quote the first two paragraphs of the agreement, of as they are particularly germane to the issue; my delegation is perfectly willing to supply copies this agreement to anyone who wishes to obtain a copy. The first two paragraphs read as follows:-

"It was announced in April 1926 that the Government of India and the Government of the Union of South Africa had agreed to hold a Round Table Conference to explore all possible methods of settling the Indian question in the Union in a manner which would safeguard the maintenance of western standards of life in South Africa by just and legitimate means. The Conference assembled at Cape Town on December 17 and its session finished on January 12th. There was, in these meetings, a full and frank exchange of views which has resulted in a truer appreciation of mutual difficulties and a united understanding to cooperate in the solution of a common problem in a spirit of friendliness and goodwill.

"Both Governments re-affirm their recognition of the right of South Africa to use all just and legitimate means for the maintenance of western standards of life.

"The Union Government recognizes that Indians domiciled in the Union who are prepared to conform to western standards of life, should be enabled to do so."

I should like delegations to note that the agreement specifically states that the Union Government recognizes that those Indians domiciled in the Union who are prepared to conform to western standards of life should be enabled to do so. I am not aware whether one of the means enabling people to conform to western standards of life lies in refusing to give them even the most elementary political, social, economic, or educational rights. Surely no one is willing to define the "enabling of people to conform to western standards of life" as that of treating them in the manner in which people or Indian origin are treated in the Union of South Africa.

Paragraph 7 of the Cape Town Agreement of 1927 reads as follows:-

"The two Governments have agreed to watch the working of the agreement now reached and to exchange views front time to time as to any changes that experience may suggest."

In accordance with this paragraph of the Agreement there was a further meeting of delegates of the Government of the Union of South Africa and the Government of India from January 12th to February 4th, 1932. At that time an agreed statement was issued by both Governments which said inter alia:--

"Both Governments consider that the Cape Town Agreement has been a powerful influence in fostering friendly relations between them and that they should continue to cooperate in the common object of harmonising their respective interests in regard to Indians resident in the Union."

It was as a result of this agreement, the negotiation of which was partly conducted by Dr. Malan of South Africa, that the Transvaal-Asiatic Tenure Amendment Bill was modified.

It is the contention of my Government that the negotiations which had been envisaged by the Cape Town Agreement of 1927 and its subsequent re--affirmation in 1932 have not taken place ; it is the contention of my Government that these negotiations have not taken place in spite of repeated requests by us for negotiations; repeated appeals of the General Assembly for negotiations, and this is to us simply a question of an international agreement which has been reaffirmed being, clearly violated.

Now in very short time I would like to give a little background of what has happened in the General Assembly over a period of years. The reason I find it necessary to do so is because this item has been on the agenda so many years that distinguished delegates sometimes tend to forget the history and the background on this subject. In the very first session of the General Assembly and even before Indian independence was formally proclaimed-that is at a time when the British Government was still formally responsible for our external affairs-the Government of India appealed to the General Assembly in this connection, and the General Assembly adopted a resolution which stated inter alia that the General Assembly "Is of the opinion that the treatment of Indians in the Union should be in conformity with the international obligations

478

under the agreements concluded between the two Governments and the relevant provisions of the Charter." This resolution was adopted by 35 to 15 with 7 abstentions and is- known as resolution 44 of the first session. Here is a clear declaration by the General Assembly in its very first session that the treatment of Indians in the Union should be in conformity with the international obligations under the agreements concluded between the Governments of India and the Union of South Africa. Since that time resolution after resolution has been adopted by the Assembly. But it is important to note that this matter is not merely a question of human rights, vital though those are for the purposes of the UN, but also a clear question of the unilateral violation of an international agreement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can tabulate dozens and dozens of actions which have been taken by the Union Government year after year which are against every fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter and every provision of international codes of conduct and international respect for human rights. If I do not do so it is merely because this Committee is already very well informed about the disabilities from which all non-whites suffer in the Union of South Africa and I do not think it would be necessary for me to categorize them once again. But I must draw the attention of the Committee to some of the extraordinary proceedings which are taking place in the Parliament of the Union of South Africa with regard to the subject of the treatment of people of Indian origion. On the 29th June 1959 discussions were taking place on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill in the House of Assembly of the Union of South Africa. Proceedings to which I am now going to refer will be found in columns 9420 and 9421 of of the Hansard which has a verbatim account of these proceedings. During the course of the debate Mr. Butcher, a member of Parliament, asked about the unemployment among the Indians and natives. I am using this word even though they appear slightly peculiar in so far as I would have thought that Mr. Butcher was himself also a native-otherwise he certainly does not appear to have any business sitting in the Parliament of a country to which he is not a native. However I presume the term natives' was used in the usual derogatory sense in which it was used in the Union to the effect that natives are those who live in the Union without the privileges of a white man as officially so defined. In reply to Mr. Butcher's question the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa said, and I quote him in full:

"I shall come to that in a moment. It is perfectly clear that if we in South Africa were to adopt all the measures which are used in a period of large scale unemployment it could be even more dangerous here than in Britain. It could lead later on to the employment of greater numbers of Bantu in skilled work. What we are going therefore is to follow the sound process of handling unemployment by creating circumstances to check unemployment but in such a way that we do not do so too fast and too far, beyond the limits of what can reasonably be expected. Hon. Members opposite have asked what about the unemployment amongst the natives and Indians? The fact of the matter is that there are various solutions as far as native labour is concerned. In particular, we are still saddled with approximately 400,000 foreign natives who

are not our concern and our responsibility. If those natives were to be pushed out of South Africa-because preference must be given to Union natives when there is unemployment then there would be no suggestion of unemployment amongst the Union natives. This presents no problem to us. The same applies to the Indians, although in my opinion the Indians are not our problem in the first place but the problem of those who are so anxious to take the care of the Indians on their shoulders. If other people are worried about the Indians, let them take the Indians back there, where they would have better opportunities of employment."

I would ask the Honourable Members to take note of the fact that the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa says officially in Parliament that the problem of the Indians who live in the Union of South Africa, and who are South African nationals, is one which does not concern the Government of the Union of South Africa. I will in this connection merely quote what was said by another member of Parliament in the same House of Assembly of the Union of South Africa the next day, that is, the 30th of June. This again will be found in columns 9599 and 9600 of Hansard. Mr. Mitchell of the United Party said, speaking in connection with the remark of the Prime Minister which I have quoted above.

"Sir, as has been said here before, this Government during the 11 years that it has been in office has had no policy whatever with regard to the Indians in South Africa and here the Prime Minister comes and extends an open invitation to the Government of India to interest itself afresh in the affairs of the Indians in South Africa. Indians who through the legislation passed at the behest of the present Minister of Finance, at that time Minister of the Interior, were made South

479

African citizens by birth. In terms of his legislation they were made South African citizens by birth and today the Prime Minister comes and says that in the first instance they are not our problem and he suggests that those people who are interesting themselves in that problem elsewhere should take the care of those Indians on their shoulders. After all the years that General Smuts and previous Prime Ministers have fought against the right of the Government of India to interfere in our affairs in South Africa is to be left now to a man who admittedly is not a South African by birth, to come here and invite the Government of India to interfere with the domestic affairs of South Africa, after all those years of efforts in which we have striven in the International Council of the world to keep India's fingers out of our particular domestic. pie in this regard and claimed that these people were our South African citizens made into first class South African citizens by Nations Party legislation ?"

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with much of what Mr. Mitchell said, as is obvious, because I do not believe that the Indians in South Africa were ever made first class citizens, but it is guite clear that the distinguished Prime Minister of South Africa considers that the Union Government has no responsibility whatever for a certain set of South African citizens-born South African citizens-because they happen to be born of people of the wrong origin. I would ask all distinguished delegates in this Committee to consider if they know of any Government in any part of the world where the Prime Minister openly states in Parliament that he takes no responsibility for more than half a million citizens in this country because they happen to be of different complexion, race, origin, colour. Many countries take poor care of their citizens, but I do not sincerely believe that there is one Prime Minister in the world who would say what Mr. Verwoerd has openly declared in Parliament regarding South African citizens of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa.

It is interesting in this connection, Mr. Chairman, to note that the Government of the Union of South Africa did at one time consider it both necessary and desirable to discuss the merits of the question regarding the treatment of Indians before the United Nations. Those who would like to consult the records will find that on the 31st October 1946 the Union Government submitted a memorandum to the United Nations on this subject. The memorandum will be found in document A/167, dated the 31st October 1946. It deals with specific and concrete topics regarding the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa and does not appear at all to take the stand that since the matter should not at all be discussed, there was no need for the Union Government to present its view on the subject. Chronologically it is interesting to observe that a request of India for inclusion of this item on the agenda was considered by the General Committee on 24th October 1946. At that time Field Marshal Smuts, who represented the Union of South Africa, moved in the General Committee that the matter should not be discussed. This was not accepted by the General Committee. Members can obtain a record of this discussion in the General Committee from Journal No. 15: Supplement B-A/Bur/35. Subsequently Journal No. 20: Supplement A-A/PV/46 records the debate at the 40th plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 31st October 1946. At that time the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Henri Spaak, said, and here I quote from the Journal, "It now appears that the two delegations most directly interested in this item, the delegation of India and the delegation of the Union of South Africa, would now agree on the second proposal, which is that the First and Sixth Committees should deal with this item jointly." This is interesting as it points out that at that time the Government of the Union of South Africa would agree to the discussion of this item before the Assembly. On the 15th November 1946 the Government of the Union of South Africa submitted a further memorandum on the subject of Indian legislation. This can be found in document A/167/Add.1.

We next come to the discussion of this matter jointly by the First and Sixth Committees on tha 21st November 1946. This will be found in Journal No. 40 and its Supplement No. I and 6. In this journal members will find that though Field Marshal Smuts still objected to the discussion of this item on the grounds of Article 2, paragraph 7, he said and here I quote from the Journal, "The Government of the Union of South Africa, however, denied that it had in any way infringed any of these elementary human rights. It had no desire to stifle any debate on the factual aspect of the Indian protest."

It is therefore the submission of my delegation that at the beginning of the discussion of this matter by the United Nations, the Union of South Africa took the position that it was willing to discuss this subject even though it felt that the Assembly should not discuss it. This point is also proved by a reference to Journal No. 44 regarding the joint meeting of the First and Sixth Committees held on 25th November, 1946. In this Members will

480

find that Mr. Nichols, representing the Government of the Union of South Africa, says and I quote the journal, "Mr. Nichols proposed to deal with the factual aspect of the Indian complaint but did not admit the right of the, United Nations under the Charter to concern itself in any way with the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could go through the records of the UN of 1946 and point out how the Government or the Union had repeatedly spoken about the substance of the matter before the UN. It is interesting to note from Journal No. 54: Supplement A/A/PV/59, which reports on the 50th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, held on 7th December 1946 that Field Marshal Smutts moved an amendment to the resolution on this subject by the General Assembly. The amendment was in the name of the South African Delegation. My delegation therefore claims that all we are requesting today is that the Government of the Union of South Africa which has in the past discussed most of this matter in the Assembly and has even moved amendments to resolutions, should re-adopt that practice. We would view any amendment they moved to any resolution on this subject with considerable sympathy as, as I have said before, our only interest is to see how we can start negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Assembly asked us last year to report to the Assembly regarding pro. gress made in negotiations. All I can say is that no negotiations have taken place, and as is usual, not even a reply has been received to our communication offering negotiations. This past year, we even took the step of writing simultaneously along with our letter to the Permanent Representative of the Union of South Africa to the United Nations an exactly similar communication from our High Commissioner in London to the High Commissioner of the Union Government of South Africa in London. This step was taken because when we had withdrawn our diplomatic representation in the Union of South Africa for reasons which are so obvious that I will not enumerate

them it has been agreed to by the two governments that the official channel of communication would be between the two High Commissions in London. It was for this reason that we wrote in London also. That too did not help. No reply of any kind has been received to our communications. All therefore we can report to the Assembly is that nothing has been done by the Government of the Union, which is not at all different to what the Government of the Union has been doing for the last few years, that is refusing to listen to all pleas, and appeals and requests either from the General Assembly or from us.

The question then arises what can be done? My Government has consistently held the view that no avenue should be left unexplored and no stone unturned to ascertain how negotiations can be brought about in this matter. We still hold this view. We appeal to all members in the Assembly to assist us, to tell us, how in what manner, can we bring about these negotiations. My Government does not wish to indulge in any recriminations. My Government would not favour any resolution which condemned any one because we believe that such resolutions do not facilitate negotiations nor do they lead to solutions. We do, however, feel that if people genuinely believe that something should be done, the Assembly should keep on saying that it should be done. No ears are so deaf that they can never listen and we feel that the greatest service that can be done to all the Governments and all the people concerned in this matter is that the Assembly should unanimously appeal once more to the Government of the Union in what I called previously, "immoderately moderate" language to enter into negotiations with us and our colleagues from Pakistan. Members of this Assembly can have no doubt about the depth and strength of our feelings in this matter; we choose to restrain ourselves very much every year when this subject is debated and I hope we shall continue to do so. But it is because we are so restrained and because we have so many reasons, so well-known to be highly agitated, concerned, worried, and even if I may say so, angry, that we particularly appeal to all those delegations which in the past have been unable to join in the unanimous appeals in this Assembly to join us this year. As I said before, my Government is perfectly open to any suggestions anyone may have, but until someone makes a constructive suggestion the least they can do is to join a

unanimous appeal. A unanimous appeal to the Government of the Union has an influence and an importance which cannot be underestimated. I referred once before rather specifically to my colleagues from the Commonwealth. I would do so again, because this is a matter in which two members of the Commonwealth are openly and repeatedly saying that they are willing to try anything which will lead to negotiations.

Let us not just be told that what you are doing is not quite right. We would say that either let everyone join in this unanimous appeal or tell us what they would like us to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is our report-a dismal one in which our only hope lies in the continuous

481

moderate but unanimous expression of opinion by this Assembly. This is what we ask of the Assembly. We feel that the Assembly can do nothing less than this, which if I may say so, as the absolute minimum of what can be done by the Assembly and every member of it.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. Venkataraman's Statement in Trusteeship Committee on Transmission of Information on Non-Self-Governing Territories

Shri R. Venkataraman, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Committee on December 2, 1959 on general questions relating to the transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories under Article 73 (e) of the U.N. Charter. The following is the full text of the state. ment:

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset my delegation desires to touch briefly on a general question that has arisen in relation to a Territory in respect of which the transmittal of information was ceased some years ago on the ground that the Territory had become self-governing. The Committee is aware that at the First Session of the General Assembly the United Kingdom declared its intention of transmitting information under Article 73 (e) of the Charter on a number of territories including Malta; and in pursuance thereof transmitted information on Malta for the year 1946. Later on the proclamation - of the new constitution for the Island in 1947, the transmission of information was ceased by the United Kingdom. I do not propose, nor is it necessary at this stage, to go into the lengthy debates that followed this unilateral action on the part of the United Kingdom Government. However, I desire to bring to the attention of the Committee the justification pleaded by the representative of United Kingdom for ceasing to transmit information on Malta. The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom stated, and I quote from paragraph 31 of the Summary Records of the 124th meeting of the Fourth Committee :

"In ceasing to transmit information about Malta the United Kingdom Government did not claim that the territory had attained a fall measure of self-government for the purpose of Chapter XI of the Charter....However, there might frequently be a stage as there was in the case of Malta when although a full measure of self-government had not yet been attained responsibility for economic, social and educational matters-no longer rested with the metropolitan government but was vested by the Constitution in the government of the territory.

Mr. Chairman, a new situation would seem to have arisen in 1959 with respect to Malta. The Constitution of the Island was revoked by an Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom-on 16 February, 1959 as a result of which the Malta Legislative Assembly, which had a measure of responsibility for economic, social and educational matters, was abolished. The Island is now ruled by the Governor assisted by an Executive Council comprising a majority of ex-officio official members and a minority of nominated non-official members. There is no local self-government. On the basis of available information it would appear that Malta has reverted to a non-self-government status. In any event, the justification pleaded by the representative of the United Kingdom for the cessation of transmission of information no longer exists. It is the earnest view of my delegation that the obligation to transmit information under article 73 (e) in respect of Malta should be resumed by the United Kingdom Administration. We are sure that the Committee will greatly welcome a statement from the United Kingdom delegation in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that last year my delegation had warmly complimented the Spanish Government for offering to place information at the disposal of the Secretary-General on the development in the overseas territories under the administration of Spain. However, no information was furnished to the Committee on Information. It would appear from the records of the proceedings of the 43rd session of the International Labour Organisation, held at Geneva in June 1959, that as late as June 1959 no legislation had been adopted on the legal status of the Spanish Overseas Provinces. For, the representative of the Government of Spain made the following statement before the Committee on the application of conventions and recommendations:

"The Spanish Cortes is at present discussing a bill on the legal status of the Spanish overseas provinces".

Even before the adoption of the law, the

482

Government of Spain appears to have decided not to transmit information on their overseas territories. We are sorry to see that in their communication dated 28 July, 1959, (Document A/C. 4/406) the Spanish Government has now indicated its unwillingness to transmit information to Secretary General. We hope that it will be possible for the Government of Spain to reoconsider their position and transmit information to the Secretary-General on the Territories under its administration.

It is often argued here by some of the Administering Members that it is for them to decide whether they have any Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration and as to whether or not they will submit information concerning those Territories under Article 73(e). I do not wish to go into these arguments at length but I would like to draw the Committees attention to a significant expression in Article 73 of the Charter. This article speaks of Members of the United Nations which have responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose peoples have not yet achieved a full measure of selfgovernment, and of members who assume such responsibilities. It is necessary, in our view, to analyse and understand carefully the full import of this expression-members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities etc. That when the Charter was drafted certain, members of this Organisation had responsibilities of administration is a matter of fact: there cannot be any dispute about that; and the obligation to transmit information under Article 73(e) flows from this fact. Assumption of new responsibilities of colonial administration after the signing of the Charter was a hypothetical matter. It would be difficult to contemplate a situation in which certain members might assume new responsibilities of this character through conquest or in any other way. The Charter cannot possibly be interpreted to have contemplated possibilities of that character. For, its purpose was to eradicate colonialism through the progressive expansion of the areas of freedom and not to encourage or perpetuate colonialism in any way whatsoever. Since Chapter XI mentions "Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities", it would be argued that a Colonial Power would be required to submit information on its colonial possessions only after it became a Member of the United Nations, but no interpretation of the phrase "who have or assume responsibilities" would enable a Colonial Power to set aside its obligations to the inhabitants of its colonies or to the world organisation or to arbitrarily constitute these colonial territories into an integral part of its metropolitan territory.

Now, Sir when some Members argue here that their overseas possessions are integral parts of their metropolitan territories and that, therefore, they have no responsibilities or obligations of the kind mentioned in Chapter XI of the Charter, it must be remembered that these territories, as any other colonial territories, came to them as the result of colonial conquests. That is true as much of British Territories as of French Territories, and of Territories under the administration of Portugal or any other Administering Member. If, therefore, the Governments of the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, or France, or Belgium come to the Assembly and say that they have certain responsibilities and obligations towards the peoples of their colonial possessions or towards the General Assembly acting under Chapter XI of the Charter, how can the Assembly accept a contrary argument from other Colonial Powers. For, that would, indeed, amount to perpetuating conquest while the whole trend of the Twentieth Century since the inception of the League has been towards the liquidation of the conquest of preceding centuries.

If the people of the Territories, which were Non-Self Governing at the time of the advent of the United Nations era, for the administration of which Members of the United Nations have responsibility-if these peoples have not attained a full measure of self-government, then certain obligations fasten themselves of such members. The cardinal test, therefore, is whether the peoples have or have not attained full measure of self-government ; and this test has to be applied in the light of the factors enumerated by the General Assembly in the annex to its Resolution 742 (VIII). This question whether these Territories form integral parts of metropolitan countries or form overseas provinces thereof would appear to be irrelevant so far as article 73 is concerned.

Furthermore, there is no justifiable ground for discriminating between the worth, aspirations and rights of one people and of another. In its aspirations for freedom and independence all humanity is one and equal. If the former colonies of the United Kingdom or the United States have become, or are in the process of becoming independent, on what ground can it be argued that Mozambique or Angola or any other dependent Territory must not aspire to the destiny of Nigeria or the former Gold Coast or the former British Indian Empire, and that they must remain content only with being integral parts of the Metropolitan country concerned ? As regards Portugal, there are several official pronouncements, which prove beyond doubt that the so-called overseas provinces are, in fact, colonies. In an 483 article in the April 1956 issue of the Foreign Affairs' written by the Prime Minister of Portugal, Dr. Salazar states and I quote :

"Apart, from 4 or 5 independent states which are to be found in Africa and apart from the Mediterranean sea-ports of that continent where there is a movement to hasten the process of evolution towards a system of autonomous government 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 civilised State."

"Notwithstanding the political experiments which Britain has recently permitted in limited areas, the major sections of Africa consist of territories which depend on Europeon 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."

It is obvious from this passage that the peoples in these territories have not yet attained a full measure of self-government. It is equally obvious that they can do so. The Prime Minister of Portugal says that these "sections of Africa consist of Africa which depend: on European States", that is to say, they are dependent Territories or in the language of the Charter they are non-self-governing Territories. Then adds the Prime Minister : "They lack the conditions necessary for existence as independent democratic nations". They may lack the conditions, but they do not, in our view, lack the potential of becoming independent democratic nations, and it is the obligation of the Administering power to activise that potential That is why we ask them to let the fresh winds of independence blow across these Territories, to throw them open to the permeating ideas of the Charter, and to let us see what the incidence of European civilisation has been on these people.

What is being said of these African Territories today was said, once upon a time, also of the colonies of this continent, which rose in revolt against colonial domination, and have held aloft for all these decades the beacon-light of freedom to the world. And there may yet be other lights ; for, there are vet dark recesses of this earth to be lit. Self-Government may be difficult to define, but it is very easy to understand, and it is easy to see where it exists. It is understood well by the suffering masses of humanity. The question whether the peoples of a Territory have attained a full measure of selfgovernment is a question of fact and not a matter for legal or juridical disguisition. It does not depend on legal subtleties though legal subtleties may be resorted to for the purpose of smoke screening the facts. In a 1959 publication entitled PORTUGUESE AFRICA, James Duffy, commenting on the legal changes in Portuguese Africa, (on page 293) says as follows

"The colonies have become provinces and the language used in the latest legislation has more than a vague similarity with that of nineteenth century decrees but it would be rash to suggest that any real change of attitude is taking place in the Overseas Ministry. It is more likely that Portuguese Government is preparing legalistic. fortress against the anti-colonial attacks it must surely face."

Mr. Chairman, it is the accepted philosophy of the twentieth century that a country belongs to those who inhabit it and not to those who conquer or exploit it. It is as simple as that, and let us make no mistake about it. If as a question of fact that the peoples of certain overseas territories do no possess a full measure of self-government, the obligations under article 73 accrue regardless of the fact whether they are described as integral parts or overseas provinces of metropolitan countries or in any other legal terminology.

It is possible to write a voluminous treaties on the legal aspects of this problem but no wisdom, no learning and no argument can convince subjugated peoples that they are free or possess selfgovernment in these territories unless there is real freedom. If we now surrender to the quibbles of law the protection given to the people of Non-Self-Government Territories under the Charter, the posterity sitting in our places will mock at us for our naive acceptance of the spacious pleas over the hard and heart-rending facts prevailing in these areas.

What we are told, and what we are expected to believe, is that there is a "State of India" that is Portugal; that there is a Guinea that is Portugal, and that the vast African Territories of Angola and Mozambique-many many times the size of Portugal-are parts of Metropolitan Portugal. The

484

distinguished representative of Guinea dwelt oft some length the other day on certain contitutional and legal provisions which are intended to constitute these Territories as integral parts of the metropolitan State, and I shall not take the Committee's time by going over those details once again. But I would like to submit to the representative of Portugal that he is unfair to himself and, what is more important, he is unfair to the peoples of these Territories when he says that these are not colonial Territories, and that therefore their peoples may not aspire to their birth-right of. independence. If the Government of Portugal were to transmit to the United Nations information as other Administering Governments do, a different story of the true status and the true aspirations of these people may come to light. We submit to the distinguished Representative of Portugal, therefore. that his country is under an obligation to submit information concerning these Territories in accordance with article 73 of the Charter, and we would appeal to him and his government with all the earnestness that we can command, to recognise the realities of the day and to join us all in our common endeavour to bring the peoples of Africa and Asia to their natural aspiration of independence.

Our approach in this matter is not arbitrary, nor one of condemnation We come here and argue our case year after year in the hope that the day is, perhaps. not far, when Portugal itself will recognise that independence cannot be denied to any people for long and that the proper function of colonial powers in this latter half of the 20th century is to recognise that fact and to work together with us, who hold a point of-view different from theirs, for the liberation of subjugated humanity. It is in this hope that my delegation, along with several others, has placed before the Committee a resolution circulated in paper A/C. 4/L. 627, which we trust will receive universal support, including that of the distinguished delegation of Portugal.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us three communications concerning the cessation of the transmission of information in respect of Non-Self-Governing Territories; two of these come from the Government of the United States of America concerning Hawaii and Alaska and the third one from the Government of France.

Thanks to the co-operation of the Gonernment of the United States, which has been voluntarily transmitting information concerning political and constitutional developments in Hawaii and Alaska, we are aware of the rapid strides that these two Territories have made in the last two years towards the achievement of a full measure of self-government. And I am glad to say that we find ourselves in agreement with the view taken by the Government of the United States that the people of Hawaii and of Alaska have attained a full measure of self-government-equal to that enjoyed by the people of all the other constituent states of the United States. We shall, therefore, be happy to support the resolution which has been tabled by the delegations of Argentina, Canada, the Federation of Malaya, Iraq, Japan, Liberia and Sweden, giving the General Assembly's approval to the communication of the United States Government concerning the cessation of information with regard to these two Territories. We would like to congratulate the Government of the United States on its successful efforts in bringing these two Territories to a full measure of self-government. We would also like to express our admiration for the achievements of the peoples of these two Territories themselves and to offer them our felicitations on their accession as constituent states of the United States of America-a status in every way equal to that of any other state of the Administering Power.

The communication of the Government of France, on the other hand, raises numerous complex issues. In its letter of 23 March 1959 the Government of France has, once again, reasserted that it is for the Administering State alone to determine which are the Territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government under the terms of the Charter. That, in our view, is tantamount to saying that the Charter is a unilateral instrument, which the Government of France or the Government of any other Administering Power has the prerogative to unilaterally interpret or apply. This view is not in consonance with the views held by other members of this Organisation, and it disregards several resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in this connection. We beg to differ from this view of the Government of France. We believe that communications from Government concerning the cessation of information should be analysed in the light of the factors listed in annex to resolution 742 (VIII), and that only the General Assembly is competent to decide whether the transmittal of information should cease.

In its resolution 334 (IV) the General Assembly declared that "it is within the responsibility of the General Assembly to express its opinion on the principles, which may in future guide the members concerned in enumerating the territories for which the obligation exists to

485

transmit information under Article 73 (e) of the Charter". Three years later the Assembly went on to define a number of factors to be used for its own purposes and by the Administering Members as a guide in determining whether any territory, due to changes in its constitutional status, remained within the scope of Chapter XI. Operative paragraph 3 of the Factors resolution states, and I quote: "A decision-and I should like to emphasise this word: decision-may be taken by the General Assembly on the continuation or cessation of the transmission of information required by Chapter XI of the Charter". We submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the position now taken by the Government of France is not in conformity with these decisions of the General Assembly.

In its letter, to which I have referred earlier, the Government of France has communicated its decision to stop transmitting information with regard to French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, the Comoro Archipelago, French Somaliland and the New Hebrides. "Under the loi-cadre of 23 June, 1956, and under the decrees issued in application thereof", the letter of the Government of France states, "a series of reforms were instituted which had the effect of granting these Territories internal autonomy." The letter goes on. "This autonomy and the liberal trend of the evolutionary processes marked by the enactment of the loi-cadre was strengthened in 1958 by the establishment of the community," The Government of France is thus basing its decision to cease the transmission of information in respect of several of the Territories under its administration on the loi-cadre of June 1956. I wish, therefore, to begin with, this law of 23 June, 1956.

It cannot be denied that the enactment of loi-cadre marks the beginning of an evolutionary process. At the same time, it cannot be maintained that the loi-cadre brought the processes of evolution to their proper culmination, namely, "a full measure of self-government", which means independence and not merely "internal autonomy".

Article I of the loi-cadre contemplates the grant to "the overseas peoples a more direct share in the management of their own interests." It purports, and I quote again, "to grant broadened deliberative powers noticeably for the organisation and management of the territorial services to the Assemblies of the Territories". The decrees to be issued in the implementation of this Law were subject to modification or rejection by the French Parliament, and they would come into force only in the form in which that Parliament Would adopt them.

So much for the contents of this law. The circumstances under which it was enacted were hardly less important, and, perhaps, may be, mentioned here. In introducing this Law in the French Parliament, the French Minister of Overseas Territories, M. Caston Defferre, stated in March 1956, and I quote:

"A deep uneasiness prevails, nevertheless among the indigenous peoples and among the Europeans. The indigenous. peoples are discontented. Plenty of promises have been made which have not been kept. The impatience of these peoples has increased since the British endowed Nigeria with a Council of Ministers and. granted internal selfgovernment to the Gold Coast. For their part, the Europeans are disturbed about their future and the maintenance of the presence.

This bill for a loi-cadre proves to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories that the Government is determined to keep its promises. To the Europeans it declares that there is no question of our leaving the Territories"-mark these words, Sir "but on the contrary a question of making warmer and deeper our understanding with the peoples in the new climate which the reform of the institution will create."

The Minister added. "The Government is not thinking at all of changing the status envisaged by the constitution"-he was referring here to the constitution of 1946--for the territories but only of modifying institutions." Mr. Chairman, the text of the loi-cadre and the statements accompanying it amply confirm the impression that the reforms did not substantially alter the status of the overseas territories. They also demonstrate that it was not intended to endow the territories with what the Charter describes as a full measure of self-government'. The Law was intended to provide for 'measures of administrative decentralization and deconcentration',--which are scarcely synonymous with "a full measure of self-government". More specifically, the loi-cadre and the decrees issued thereunder were intended mainly to establish a Government Council in each territory and to endow the existing territorial assemblies with enlarged deliberative powers, especially in respect of the organization and management of territorial

486

services, to determine the functions and powers of district and other local government bodies, to reorganize the public services, and to improve the economic and social conditions.

Decree 56-1227 offers a good illustration of, the extent of the affairs which remained in the hands of France. External Affairs, defence, the protection of public freedom-and I would like to emphasize this in particular-the protection of public freedom, monetary and financial regulations the administrative services having anything to do with external affairs, immigration, security. and customs services, the labour and welfare inspectorate, treasury, financial control, planning, higher education and broadcasting. All of then, were, and still remain, despite the installation of the community, services of the French State, proper. And this is not all. Decree 57-458 relating, to French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa mentions the very considerable authority that remains with the High Commissioner of the Republic in each of these groups of territories Decree 57-460 defines the role of the Governor, or Chief Administrator, in each individual territory, including his functions as President of the Government Council. I do not wish to go into details, but these decrees need very careful attention of the members of the Committee; as the measure of self-government on which the decision of the Government of France to cease the transmittal of information is based is greatly limited by these decrees. Financial and monetary affairs, higher education, and a great many activities in the social sphere of the territories lives still remain in the hands of the metropolitan government. The basis of a "full measure of self-government", on which the transmittal of information could be ceased, in our view, is not there as yet.

There is no reason. Mr. Chairman for us or for anyone else, to belittle the distinct advances, which these measures represent in comparison with the situation prevailing in French Territories before 1957. These are important steps in the direction of self-government. That however, is not the issue. The issue is whether these steps represent the grant of a full measure of selfgovernment and whether the immediate cessation of transmission of information is justified on that ground. It would not be inappropriate to recall that in the case of the two trust territories, the Assembly did not agree to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement on the basis of the loi-cadre when the Government of France requested it to do so. The context may be somewhat different but the considerations applying in both cases are more or less of the same nature.

Since France has not: kept the Assembly informed of the political and constitutional

growth of these Territories. A is not easily possible to assess the extent of the internal autonomy that is exercised by these territories or to examine the nature of the democratic processes at work there. Occasionally, reports have appeared in the press giving information, which, though perhaps not typical of all territories, gives reason for dismay. For example, the New York Times of 6 April, 1959, reporting the election in the French Territory of Dahomi, stated that while the Rally Party with 144,038 votes gained 37 of the 70 seats, the Democratic Rally Party with 62,132 votes gained 22 seats, the Democratic Union with a majority of votes, 172,179 wound up with only II seats in the Legislative Assembly. I am referring to this example only in order to illustrate some of the basic drawbacks in the loi-cadre and the decrees issued thereunder.

It is stated that the evolution set afoot by the loi-cadre of June 1956 has been strengthened by the establishment of the community and by the adoption of new constitution in October 1958. That perhaps, the case. But community is merely a form of relationship between France and her Non-Self-Governing Territories. Its constitution does not annul the loi-cadre or the decrees issued thereunder. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as giving the inhabitants of these. Territories a fuller measure of self-government than that accorded them by the loi-cadre. On the other hand the preamble of the new constitution, which was subject of a referendum in Non-Self-Governing Territories as in France, and should therefore, be deemed to apply to them also, solemnly proclaims attachment to the principles of national sovereignty of France and not of the community as a whole or of the members of the, community. The President of the community is not elected as such. He is elected as the President of the Republic of France, though the Non-Self-Governing Territories take part in his election in various ways. The President of France, once elected as such, automatically becomes the President of the community also. The voting in the election of the President, according to Article 7 of the new constitution "shall begin at the summons of the Government"-in which case this article would appear to constitute another limitation on the extent of self-governing powers of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Under Article 13 of the constitution "the

representatives of the government"--the Government of France--"in the Overseas Territories" are appointed by the President. Under Article 35 the French Parliament is entitled to authorize

487

the declaration of war. This, in our view, is a definite limitation on the self-determination of members constituting the community. Again, by Article 78, these States are excluded from jurisdiction over foreign policy, defence, currency common economic and financial policy, as well as-and this perhaps is the most important limitation-over policy on strategic raw materials.

The community is vested with institutional organs of its own, which are-an executive council, a senate and a court and a court of arbitration. The senate consists of 150 odd members chosen from the French Parliament and from the African Assemblies. Representation is based on population, with the French holding about 60% of the seats. French predominance in the community is apparent both in the composition of the three main institutions, and in the organization of community matters. A service of external security has been set up, and. it operates under the French Committee of Defence, called the Community Committee. The military forces to be placed at the disposal of each State will be under French command.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here we have a situation where several potential African States, with their limited autonomy are brought together into a relationship with the Administering Member which ensures the latter's predominance in the management of the affairs of the collective entity thus created.

It can be justifiably argued that the referendum of September 28, 1958 gave these territories the option either to stay in the community with their institutions based on the loi-cadre or to become independent States ; but the alternative of independence was not placed before them in its most attractive form. The alternatives were offered in strikingly different terms ; continued association with France as a guarantee of financial, economic and cultural assistance in a supposedly dangerous world, and independence in terms of abrupt cessation, as a step into the dark unknown into isolation and insecurity. President De Gaulle, at Brazaville, on August 24 said:

"A given Territory will shortly be able to take independence by voting 'No' in the referendum on 28 September ; that will mean that it does not want to form part of the proposed Community and that it is, in short seceding. That will mean that it wants to go its own way, in isolation, at its own risks and perils."

With their institutions, their economics and their social systems just what they were, could thus be regarded as a fair choice I Also, is it any wonder that the Sudan and Senegal, having first opted for the community--are now thinking in terms of full national independence. In the light of these circumstances, can it be said, Mr. Chairman, that France has fulfilled its obligation "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions according to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and that she should no more transmit information on these Territories to the United Nations. In what way are the circumstances of the Ivory Coast with a population of 2 12 million, of Dahomey with a population of nearly 2 million, of Upper Volta, Madagascar, Niger and Chad different from those of the Former British Togoland or the Trust Territory of French Togoland or of any of the other newly independent states?

Now let us view this situation in the light of the Factor's Resolution. It does not meet any of the factors indicative of the attainment of independence dealt with in the first part of the annex : namely, international responsibility ; eligibility for Membership in the United Nations ; power to enter into direct relations of every kind with other governments ; sovereign rights to provide for national defence ; the freedom of the people to choose the form of government which they desire and freedom in respect of internal matters such as judiciary and economic affairs, etc.

Of the second and third part the important factors relating to geographic considerations and ethnic and cultural considerations are also not satisfied. Geographically and ethnically, these territories form part of Africa and not of France. In the light of all these considerations, it would be our humble submission that the Government of France, as the Administering Member concerned should, for the time being, continue to transmit information concerning these Territories under Article 73 (e) of the Charter.

INDIA USA MALTA SPAIN SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PORTUGAL BELGIUM FRANCE ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE NIGER NIGERIA GUINEA ARGENTINA CANADA IRAQ JAPAN LIBERIA SWEDEN MADAGASCAR MALI PERU SENEGAL SUDAN CHAD

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. Venkataraman's Statement in Political Committee on Algeria.

Shri R. Venkataraman, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee on December 4, 1959 on the question of

488 Algeria.

Mr. Chairman,

Though the General Assembly has been discussing the question of Algeria since 1955, we are approaching this problem this year with greater faith and hope for finding a just solution. Our faith arises out of the recent pronouncements made by the Government of France and the Provisional Government of Algeria in regard to the application of the basic principle of selfdetermination to Algeria. The Committee will recall that this question was also considered at the Bandung Conference of Asian-African countries in April 1955 and the Conference. declared its unanimous support of the right of the Algerian people to self-determination in the following terms

"In view of the unsettled situation in

North Africa and of the persistent denial to the peoples of North-Africa of their right to self-determination, the Asian-African Conference declare its support of the rights of the people of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia to self-determination and urge the French Government to bring about a peaceful settlement of the issue without delay."

The unanimous conclusion of the twenty-nine countries that met in Bandung and which represented more than half of the peoples of the world, was clear evidence of the deep and widely felt concern of the international community in finding a just and satisfactory solution to the Algerian problem.

The question has been discussed at successive sessions of the General Assembly since 1955 and although the discussions in the United Nations did not result in any solution of the problem, it would be incorrect to state as the distinguished Foreign Minister of France said on September 30 1959, in the course of his intervention during the general debate, that he was convinced that the intervention of the United Nations in the past did not contribute to facilitate the solution of the Algerian problem but that effect was quite the contrary. My delegation does not agree with this and we are convinced that the discussions here during the past few years have helped in bringing this unfortunate issue before the eyes of the world.

It is unnecessary for me to recount the several efforts made in the United Nations and outside for the solution of the problem. My delegation would, in particular, like to express our appreciation. to His Majesty the King of Morocco and His Excellency the President of the Republic of Tunisia who had offered their good offices to help in finding a solution of the problem of Algeria. At the eleventh session and again mat the twelfth session, resolutions were passed by the Assembly, without dissent on both occasions, but with little result. I should like to refer in particular to the resolution adopted by the Assembly at the eleventh session, Resolution No. 1012 (XI), by which the General Assembly expressed the hope that in a spirit of cooperation, "a peaceful, democratic and just solution" would be found. Today we ask for the same thing, that is, for a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the

problem of Algeria.

It is the duty of my delegation to express briefly the views of the Government and the people of India on the problem of Algeria. We have repeatedly stated in the United Nations and elsewhere that in Algeria, there is a national movement in which there is a great mass upsurge and in which great passions, hopes and aspirations are involved. We have always stressed the need to recognise this tide of nationalism and the feelings of the Algerian people, feelings which cannot be suppressed by force of arms. We have repeated that no country, no Member State of the United Nations could afford to ignore the lessons of history and disregard the experiences particularly during the last quarter century during which time many countries have become independent and taken their rightful place in the international community. We have always felt and we continue to feel that the liberation of nations and the establishment of national liberty is not merely a national concern but also the concern of all the people of the world. Early this year, Prime Minister Nehru expressed the hope that France, under the distinguished Presidentship of General De Gaulle, would acknowledge and accept the demand of the Algerian people for their freedom and put an end to the war in Algeria. Reiterating India's sympathy with the Algerian people, Prime Minister Nehru said, "India's policy towards colonial domination and racial discrimination and sup. pression remain what it was during her fight for her own freedom and India would hold to that policy. We are friendly with France. We will continue to be friendly. But in this particular matter our sympathies are with Algeria. We want that Algeria should be independent and that its personality should be recognised".

Though the French delegation participated in the discussions on Algeria during the eleventh and twelfth sessions they withdrew last year from the discussions on this item at the

489

thirteenth session. This year again they have chosen to absent themselves from the debate. I feel certain and I speak for almost every member present here when I say, that the absence of the French delegation is a matter of great regret to us. It is a matter of regret because a Member State that can help in finding a solution to the problem is not among us here when the Assembly is discussing ibis vital issue. More so because France is one of the five Permanent Members of the Security Council, which is charged with the responsibility for security and the maintenance of international peace. We believe that in the light of the recent developments which give some reason for hope, the presence of France among us today would have provided the confidence and moral strength which are needed more than ever at present. We do not say this by way of reproach but more by way of expressing our disappointment that France felt compelled to keep away from the discussions on the Algerian question. It is not perhaps too late for France to reconsider her decision but in any case we hope that the views expressed in this Assembly, views which represent good part of world opinion on this question will be given the consideration they deserve by the Government and people of France.

Many distinguished delegates have spoken on the developments since the 16th September when General De Gaulle, speaking in the name of France, solemnly recognised the rights of Algerians to self-determination, This was indeed the most hopeful and promising event during all these years. Speaking at a press conference on October 8, 1959, Prime Minister Nehru said "President De Gaulle's latest offer was certainly a marked advance on previous suggestions coming from the French Government, and (they) acknowledge the right of self-determination, which was the basic thing."

The delegation of India would like to place on record its appreciation of the Government of France for its acceptance of the principle of selfdetermination as a basis for the solution of the Algerian problem. This, in the present circumstances does France great credit and, as has been stated by several speakers, we believe that General De Gaulle has by his courageous and far-sighted action done a great service to France.

Though the French proposals mark an important step forward towards the solution of the problem, there are many questions for further clarification and examination. There are aspects of the proposals which are in bare outline and even vague. For instance, the French scheme confines their offer only to twelve Algerian depart. ments and leaves out the two departments of Sahara; the period of four years suggested for the referendum after the actual restoration of peace appears to be too long ; the procedure for ratification or confirmation of the choice of the Algerian people by the French contained in De Gaulle's proposals may cause doubts and anxieties.

We do not think that the General Assembly should at all go into the details of this scheme. It is really a matter for negotiations between the parties concerned. Once the parties sit together they would be able to hammer out an acceptable solution by negotiations and discussions. If we have referred to a few points in the French proposals, it is only to emphasise the need for further discussions and negotiations between the Government of France and the the Algerian Representatives.

We were happy to note the conciliatory nature of the reply of the Algerian Provisional Government to the proposals made by General De Gaulle on September 16 and in particular the statement that the Provisional Government was ready to enter into pourparlers with the Government of France to discuss the political and military conditions of the cease-fire and the conditions and guarantees for the applications of self-determination. We believe that what is clearly indicated at the present time is the getting together of the two parties because we have a great deal of trust in the wisdom of France and also in the good sense of the Algerian people and we believe that a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the Algerian problem will be found before long.

We have been told that there is some unwillingness on the part of the Government of France to agree to negotiate with Algerian representatives who are at present in detention in France. The persons named by Algerian Provisional Government are well-known leaders of the liberation movement who possess the confidence of the people when they would represent. It would seem to us somewhat surprising that the Government of France should hesitate to negotiate with these persons merely because they happen to be in detention in France and not fighting in Algeria. I should like to draw the attention of this Committee to the fact that in my own country similar situations had arisen during our own fight for independence. When the British administration desired to negotiate with the leaders of the Civil Disobedience Movement in the nineteen-thirties,

the Viceroy of India released Mahatma Gandhi and the members of the Congress Working Committee. He said "My Government will impose no conditions on these releases for we feel that the best way for the restoration of peaceful conditions

490

lies in the discussions being conducted by those concerned under the terms of unconditional liberty I am content to trust those who will be affected by our decision to act in the same spirit as inspires it." Not only were the British prepared to negotiate with the leaders who were then in jail but they were also prepared to release them without conditions to enable them to conduct the discussions in liberty. The spirit which animated this grand gesture found ready response, amongst the nationalist leaders. There were several such occasions in our history and on each occasion the British accepted the claim of the people of India that our leaders who were in detention should be the ones with whom the British authorities could negotiate. International press reactions also favour discussions with the Algerian leaders in prison. The Daily Telegraph of London dated November 21 states as follows : "As we all know, Mr. Nehru who negotiated India's independence and Dr. Nkrumah, who became the Prime Minister of independent Ghana, were at some - time detained in English prisons. Thus we may well ask why France should put-forth such useless objections regarding Benbella. It is very possible, in consequence that world opinion which have backed France during the recent weeks will find in the latest offer of the F.L.N. and in the refusal opposed it by France a good reason to again change its sympathies." In any case, Mr. Chairman, it would seem somewhat unrealistic to have one party to a negotiation choosing the representatives for the other side. As the Chairman of the Indian delegation said during the discussion of the same question at the thirteenth session.- If you pick and choose the people you are talking to in a sense you are talking to yourself." However, we would like to hope that this matter would be settled satisfactorily.

Much avoidable hardship and misery is allowed to continue in Algeria causing distress to the people. When the parties are agreed on the right of the Algerian people to determine freely its own destiny there appears to be no justification for further human sacrifice. The urgency for the need to negotiate is, therefore, all the greater.

In connection with the war in Algeria my delegation would like to reiterate the views expressed by us at the thirteenth session in connection with the application of the Geneva conventions in respect of treatment of the prisoners. We believe that these persons are entitled to be treated as belligerents in strict conformity with the Geneva conventions, providing for their housing, for their rights of internment, medical attention and so on.

The committee has before it a draft resolution which we have sponsored along with several other African delegations. We believe that the draft resolution in its present form reflects the general view of the members of the Assembly.

Doubts have been raised in this Committee about the wisdom of the Assembly adopting a resolution on the question of Algeria. it has been suggested that a resolution-any resolution for that matter-at this juncture would not help but on the other hand might have the opposite effect in that it may adversely affect the encouraging and hopeful trends arising out of the acceptance by the parties concerned of the principle-of self-determination as the basis for a solution of the Algerian problem. Mr. Chairman, I am sure everyone will agree that nothing should be done here that would in any way endanger the chances of the parties concerned getting together as early as possible and discussing the conditions necessary for arriving at peaceful solution of the Algerian problems. My delegation is one of those which would not do anything either in the United Nations or outside which would in any way hamper the peaceful solution of problems. After a close examination of the resolution contained in Document A/C. I/L.246, we feel convinced that this resolution contains nothing to which either the French or the Algerians could take any exception. On the other hand, the preambular paragraph, and I quote "Noting with satisfaction that the two parties concerned have accepted the right of self-determination as the basis for solution of the Algerian problem" contains a tacit tribute to the generosity and farsightedness of the Government of France and the sense of responsibility and realism displayed by the Provisional Government of Algeria. The operative paragraph

gives expression to the view held universally that talks and discussions should begin as early as possible. In effect, this resolution offers the good wishes of the eighty-two nations and the peoples of the world to the parties in their endeavour to find a peaceful solution to this unfortunate chapter in our history. Many of the preambular paragraphs are more statements of fact or are those which have been adopted without opposition in the previous years. My delegation finds it difficult to read anything in the resolution which could or would in any way discourage either party to proceed with the talks and discussions. That is why no mention is made in the resolution of the details of the offer made by the Government of France or the views held by several delegations in respect of the terms and conditions or any other matter touching the substance of the matter to be discussed. To say that no resolution should be adopted at all or

491

that even good wishes and sympathy and support of the United Nations should not be expressed is to accept the argument that the subject matter is beyond the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

France has a glorious chapter of helping dependent peoples to grow into freedom and independence and we are sure that the same spirit will animate their dealings with Algeria. My delegation sincerely trusts that the Government of France will accept the objectives underlying the resolution in the same spirit in which we the authors of the resolution have offered them viz the desire to achieve a peaceful, democratic and just solution of the problem of Algeria.

INDIA ALGERIA USA FRANCE INDONESIA MOROCCO TUNISIA UNITED KINGDOM GHANA SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

In reply to a question by an Hon. Member of the Rajya Sabha on December 1, 1959 Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said that in his report the Secretary-General expressed the fear that in the absence of proper contribution from the member countries for the U.N. Emergency Force, a financial crisis might arise.

Replying to another question, she said

At present Brazil, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada and Yugoslavia have forces serving UNEF, in addition to India whose present contingent consists of II 74 officers and other ranks. Such countries while liable to contribute to the expenses of the Force as members of the U. N. are also entitled to claim from the U. N. expenditure which they would not have incurred if they had not sent contingents. They continue to bear the cost of the normal pay and allowances of their forces; all other extra and extraordinary expenditure including the entire cost of maintaining a Territorial Army unit as a replacement for the forces sent to UNEF is recoverable from the UN. The general principle is that participation in the Force should not involve any financial loss to the countries concerned "

She said : India's share of the total UNEF expenditure uptil the end of 1959 has been assessed at Rs. 73,03,867, but our own claim against the U. N. for the same period is likely to exceed this amount and therefore no payment by India can be made.

"Upto the end of August 1959, Rs. 1,09,56,000 have been debited by us on account of the operation most of which is recoverable from the U.N. A partial claim for Rs. 58,33,813.45 for the period upto June 1959 has been lodged by us and other claims are being prepared."

INDIA BRAZIL DENMARK NORWAY CANADA SWEDEN YUGOSLAVIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

India's acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction

Replying to a question in Rajya Sabha on December 1, 1959, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said:

"India deposited on the 14th September, 1959 with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a fresh declaration, in accordance with Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court, accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

She laid on the Table of the House a copy of this Declaration, which includes six conditions.

The following is the full text of the Declaration :

Excellency,

I have the honour, by direction of the President of India, to declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of India that they accept, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate such acceptance, as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, and on the basis and condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice over all disputes arising after the 26th January, 1950 with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date, other than :-

(1) disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have resources to some other method or methods of settlement ; (2) disputes with the Government of any State which, on the daft of this Declaration. Is a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations;

(3) disputes in regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the Republic of India;

(4) disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of India have accepted obligations;

(5) disputes in respect of which, any other party to a dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice exclusively for or in relation to the purposes of such dispute ; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of a party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court:

(6) disputes with the Goveranment of any State with which, on the date of an application to bring a dispute before the Court, the Government of India has no diplomatic relations.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Agreement on Gandak Project

India and Nepal have signed an agreement on the Gandak irrigation and power project, which will confer benefits on the peoples of both countries on an equitable basis.

This agreement symbolises the close partnership and cooperation between two sovereign countries-India and Nepal-in utilising the waters of the Gandak-a river flowing through their territories.

The origin of the project can be traced to a proposal made immediately after independence by the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the then Minister for Food and Agriculture in the Government of India. He, at that time, had suggested to the Bihar Government to investigate the, possibilities of taking out canals from the river Gandak for meeting the chronic food shortages in the scarcity areas of the State.

Between 1948-54, investigations were carried out and the first project report prepared. Since this project was to be a joint Indo-Nepal venture, discussions with His Majesty's Government in Nepal were initiated by the Indian Ambassador at Kathmandu in 1955. These discussions were held with two successive Nepalese Ministries, headed by Dr. K.I Singh and, subsequently, by Gen. Subarna, while meetings were arranged between Indian and Nepal engineers at official levels.

After two years of negotiations, conducted in a friendly and cordial spirit, a settlement satisfactory to both India and Nepal has ban reached on the project.

The project envisages construction of barrage at Bhaisalotan with one end in Nepa and the other in India. The two main canal on the western and eastern banks also take off within Nepalese and Indian territories respectively.

The total area irrigated by the Project it Nepal and India will be 37 lakh acres.

There will be two power houses-one on the Nepalese and the other on the Indian side, each with a firm capacity of up to 10,000 kw.

The project will further provide additional employment opportunities and better trade facilities for the peoples of Nepal and India.

The total cost of the entire project, to be wholly borne by India, is estimated at Rs. 50. crores-the tentative apportionment being Rs 39. crores to Bihar and Rs. 11 crores to Uttar Pradesh.

It is hoped to complete the project in 10 years.

Under the agreement, compensation will be paid by India and Nepal for the land acquired for the project. Similarly, India has agreed to

493

pay royalty for quarrying materials taken from Nepal.

The sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction of His Majesty's Government in Nepal also remain supreme in the agreement.

Nepal will have the right to withdraw for irrigation or any other purpose supplies of water from the river Gandak or its tributaries so long as the water requirements of India and Nepal for purposes of irrigation or power generation on the Gandak-project are not prejudicially affected by such withdrawals.

In the event of supplies in the river being short of the total requirements, it has been agreed that the shortages will be shared between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government on a pro-rata basis.

All other rights of both countries have also been adequately safeguarded.

On completion of the project, Nepal will get, free of cost, flow irrigation for about 1.5 lakh acres, which fall within the command area. Further, water supplies for an additional area of 2 lakh acres in the Rapti Doon or elsewhere in Nepal in the upper reaches of the Gandak and its tributaries have been reserved for future use of Nepal.

The Government of India have agreed to construct, at their cost, all the canal and distri-

butary systems up to a discharge capacity of 20 cusecs for providing irrigation in Nepal.

Moreover, India will contribute up to Rs. 15 lakhs for the construction of water courses below the capacity of 20 cusecs. The Government of India will spend about Rs. 230 lakhs over the irrigation facilities for Nepal.

The power house in Nepal, together with transmission lines from it to the Bihar border at Bhaisalotan and, thence, to Raxaul via Sagauli, will be constructed by the Government of India, at a cost of Rs. 451 lakhs, of which about Rs. 350 lakhs are for works benefiting Nepal.

From this grid, Nepal would be assured supply of firm power at actual cost of production and transmission.

The agreement also provides for transfer of the Canal System together with service roads and allied works to His Majesty's Government in Nepal. It is also open to His Majesty's Government in Nepal to take over the Western power house, free of cost, after the full load of 10,000 kw has been developed in Nepal.

Other indirect advantages to Nepal from the Project will be improved communications as a result of construction of a bridge over the barrage, Service roads, and telephone, telegraph and radio links.

The foremost benefit to India from this project will be insurance against famines in Saran, Champaran, Muzzaffarpur and Dharbhanga districts of North Bihar and Deoria and Gorakhpur districts in Uttar Pradesh.

This area is densely populated and suffers from chronic food shortage, and the rainfall in it is undependable.

The additional area assured of irrigation facilities in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh from this project will be roughly 33 lakh acres-27 lakh acres in Bihar and 6 lakh acres in Uttar Pradesh.

The power supply from the power house on the eastern canal will be available for India. Further, firm power not utilised by Nepal and all secondary power from the power house on the western canal, will also be available for use in Bihar.

NEPAL INDIA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Passport Restricitions on Minority Community in East Pakistan

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on December 15, 1959 in reply to a "calling attention" notice on the restrictions imposed on members of the minority community in East Pakistan in respect of issue and renewal of their passports:

Government of India have, during the last few months, seen reports in the Press that no fresh passports were being issued to the minority community in East Pakistan, that the passports

494

presented for renewal were being seized and that the applicants for India-Pakistan Passports were being asked to pay a security deposit of Rs. 100/-.

From enquiries, it has been ascertained that the Government of East Pakistan have:

(i) undertaken a rigorous check of the antecedents of passport holders, particularly: those belonging to the minority community, as a, part of the drive against smuggling and large numbers of passports are held up with the district authorities pending the conclusion of necessary enquiries;

(ii) directed that those applying for new India-Pakistan passports should deposit Rs.. 100/before issue of the passports and those who already hold a passport should deposit Rs.100/-

before undertaking travel to India; and

(iii) issued instructions that the members of the minority community should be asked to give detailed information about their income, taxes paid, the members of their family living outside Pakistan, remittances made etc.

These measures taken by the Government of East Pakistan and the consequent delays in the renewal of old passports and the issue of new, passports have been causing serious hardship to the members of the minority community in East Pakistan. This, in some measure, explains the monthly average figures of migration which have gone up from 411 in 1958 to 609 during the first ten months of 1959.

Our representatives at Dacca and Karachi had taken up this matter with the Pakistan authorities concerned. The Government of East. Pakistan have told our representative that the scrutiny of antecedents of passport holders has been undertaken with a view to check smuggling and to detect forged passports, large numbers of which have been in circulation. As regards the deposit, the Pakistan authorities have stated that deposits have been asked for to enable the East Pakistan Government, in case of need, to arrange for repatriation of their nationals who have travelled to India, and that larger deposits have been asked for from those applying for passport facilities to travel to countries other than India. As regards the detailed information about income, taxes paid etc., the East Pakistan authorities have stated that these enquiries are being made with a view to check illicit transfer of funds in violation of the foreign exchange regulations. The Pakistan authorities also informed our High Commissioner in Karachi that the measures taken by them apply to all Pakistan nationals and that there is no basis for the allegation that there is any discrimination against members of the minority community in East Pakistan.

When this matter was raised informally at the last meeting of the Chief Secretaries of the Eastern Zone held in Calcutta in August, 1959, the East Pakistan authorities promised to issue instructions to expedite the enquiries and relieve the hardship caused by the delay in the renewal or issue of passports. Our representatives at Dacca and Karachi are following up this matter with the authorities concerned in pursuance of this assurance given at the conference of Chief Secretaries.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Interrogation of Minorities in East Pakistan

In reply to a question whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news item published in the Tribune of December 5, 1959, to the effect that the persons belonging to the minority community in East Pakistan are being interrogated in respect of their income and bank accounts etc. and that a large number of passports sent for renewal are not being returned to them for months together, and if so, whether Government have made any enquiry about the reasons for such interrogation and what its effect is on the minorities there, the Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said in the Rajya Sabha on December 17, 1959 : "According to reports received from the Indian High Commission and the Deputy High Commission, Dacca, from time to time, passports belonging to the minority community in East Pakistan were being held up and not returned to the holders. The Indian High Commission in Karachi and the Deputy High Commission in Dacca were accordingly instructed to take up this matter with appropriate authorities in Pakistan. This matter was also raised informally at the last meeting of the Chief Secretaries of the Eastern Zone-held in Calcutta in August, 1959. The representative of the Government of East Pakistan then explained that they had detected a large number of forged passports in circulation and that they were, therefore, obliged to exercise a check on all passports in

order to ensure that these were genuine. They however, promised to issue instructions to the authorities concerned to expedite the checking. A Note by the Pakistan Foreign Office to the

495

Indian High Commission also denied the allegtion regarding the stopping of issue and renewal of passports of members of the minority community and added that no discrimination was made in this regard.

"No authentic information is available regarding the number of passports withheld by Pakistan authorities, particularly as this is a matter affecting Pakistan nationals who do not approach the Indian Missions. It is estimated, however, that nearly 70,000 passports belonging to members of the minority community are still held up in East Pakistan. The matter is being pursued with the authorities of East Pakistan in pursuance of the assurances given by them at the last Chief Secretaries' Conference.

"It is also understood that the authorities of East Pakistan are making enquiries from a large number of members of the minority community regarding their income, taxes, accounts, members of family outside Pakistan, remittances, etc. It is understood that these enquiries are being made in order to tighten up the operation of foreign exchange restrictions and to ensure that Hindu residents do not send currency abroad through illegal means."

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru,

made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on December 21, 1959.

Three days ago, on the 18th December, I received through our Ambassador in Peking, Premier Chou En-lai's reply to my letter of the 16th November. This letter has already appeared in the Press and so I need not give any details about its contents.

I read this letter with regret. It does not accept the reasonable and practical proposals which I had made to Premier Chou En-lai in order to secure an immediate lessening of tension along the Sino-Indian border and thus to create the necessary atmosphere for a peaceful settlement of the border problem. It is merely a reiteration of claims to extensive areas in our territory which by history, by custom or by agreement have long been integral parts of India. It does not contain any reply to the detailed letter which I had sent to him on September 26 and the note of November 4 in which some salient facts bearing on the situation had been mentioned. Premier Chou En-lai has stated in his letter that he would send a reply to this previous letter and note of mine in the near future.

I have today sent a reply to Premier Chou En-lai referring to the above facts and stating that I am sorry to find that he had based his claim on recent intrusions by Chinese personnel into parts of Indian territory. It is, in fact, these intrusions which had brought about the present situation and created apprehensions. I have further stated that I cannot accept the allegation that Indian forces had occupied any part of Chinese territory, or committed aggression at Kongka Pass or at Longju, where our established check-post was attacked by Chinese troops.

Premier Chou En-lai in his letter has spoken of the "friendly manner" in which Indian personnel who were captured in the Chenmo Valley were treated. I have referred him again to the statement of Shri Karam Singh about the treatment that he and his colleagues received while they were prisoners in the custody of the Chinese border forces. This statement clearly indicates the deplorable treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected.

Premier Chou En-lai had suggested that he

and I should meet on December 26 so as to reach an agreement on the principles which are presumably to guide the officials on both sides in the discussion of details. I have repeated, what I have said previously, that I am always ready to meet and discuss with him the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. I have, however, pointed out that I do not see how we can reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts. I would prefer to wait for his promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4 before we discuss what should be the next step. I have added that it is quite impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days.

In my reply I have expressed my agreement with him to the sentiments which he had

496

expressed in the last paragraph of his letter, to the effect that the principal concern of out two countries should be "with the programme of long term peaceful construction to lift ourselves from our present state of backwardness, and that we should not be parties to the increasing of tension between our two countries or in the world." India has welcomed the fact that there is some lowering of world tensions and that "the world situation is developing in a direction favourable to peace". It is for this reason, even apart from the imperative need to improve the relations between our two countries, that in spite of recent events, I have continually stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of our problems.

An Hon. Member has said that it is not good to negotiate and that is a trick for time to pass on the part of the Chinese Government. Well, I do not know what the Hon. Member has in mind. But so far as I am concerned and so far as this Government is concerned, we will negotiate and negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end. I absolutely reject the approach of stopping negotiations at any stage. That, I think, is not only a fundamentally wrong approach, but, if I may say so, with all respect to the Hon. Member opposite, it is a fundamentally anti-Gandhian approach. That does not mean that any action which is necessitated should not be taken. That is an entirely different matter. But negotiations will go on so long as this Government functions, to the end.

That does not mean, as I said, any action that we intend should not be taken. If the Hon. Member means a declaration of war, well, the Hon. Member, if I may suggest to him, might consider the question a little more carefully as to what war involves and how we attain our object by a declaration of war.

Therefore, Sir, I am in your hands. I merely state that I think a further discussion at this stage, when we are obviously in the middle of this correspondence-the correspondence may not be to the liking of the Hon. Member or to my liking, the letters that we receive, but that is the way how countries function short of war. There is no other way. The other way is war, and that way is to be avoided as far as one can avoid it. That has been our policy and that is the policy, at any rate the declared policy of every civilised nation. For us to jump into something without exhausting all possibilities, something which will be disastrous not only for the countries jumping into it but for the whole world, is not a matter lightly to be undertaken, and we know this Government will not undertake it in that way. But there are many other things which this country has to do in the way of preparation, in the way of strengthening our defences, etc., and those things certainly should be expedited, undertaken to the best of our ability and as speedily as possible.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Discussion on India-China Relations

Replying to a discussion on India-China

relations in the Lok Sabha on December 22, 1959 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not exactly remember the date of our last debate in this House. I think it was in November, towards the end of November. A little before that, a few days before that, I had sent a letter to Premier Chou En-Jai which the House knows. In that letter we had made certain proposals and we had a full and instructive debate in this House. The House had that letter before it and the whole situation, and the House was pleased to give its support, and if I may say with respect, its enthusiastic support, to the action we had taken in that matter.

Since then we have had a reply from Premier Chou En-Jai, and I have sent a brief reply to him to his letter. In effect, the new points for consideration are Premier Chou En-lai's letter and my reply. On the whole, however, the debate has proceeded more or less on the same lines as previously, though references have, no doubt, been made to Premier Chou En-lai's letter.

Hon. Member Acharya Kripalani complained or remarked that I was allergic to suggestions being made to me or criticism being made. I hope I am not, and that I am always very willing to listen to any suggestions or criticisms. Naturally, when a criticism means a reversal of a policy which I believe in, then, I find it somewhat difficult to accept it, unless I am prepared to accept the reversal of that policy; it is not a question of minor changes or anything, but a basic reversal of the policy, and, therein, naturally, I have some difficulty.

Now, I have listened, as I should, with very considerable attention to the various speeches made, and made rather long notes about what has been said. I shall not say much in regard to the many this said, because much of that was said, though no doubt justified from some point of view was not particularly helpful in understanding the

497

situation or what should be done. There were naturally exhibitions of resentment and anger at what the Chinese had done. One can understand that, but they are not helpful by themselves in finding any particular way out of the difficulty. May I say that I entirely agree with Shri Jaipal Singh when he said that this matter should not be treated as a party issue? Of course not; it is not a party issue. Many things have been said by Hon. Members opposite with which I am in hearty agreement; some things have been said by Members sitting with me on this side, with which I am in hearty disagreement, so that it is not a party issue- at all; it is a national issue, and indeed, it is something more even than a national issue, because it impinges on all kinds of international issues, but certainly, so far as we are concerned, it is a national issue.

Now, let us be clear about certain basic factors, so that they need not be thought to be in doubt. We are committed from every point of view, to defend our country, to preserve its integrity, to preserve its honour and self-respect. That is not a matter for argument, I thought. Opinions may differ as to how to do it. That is a different matter. But the basic thing is clear, and in doing that, in the ultimate analysis almost any price has to be paid. One cannot proceed on the basis of barter, haggling and the tactics of the market place, where a nation's honour and self-respect are concerned. That is clear. But when you come to the next step about what one should do, much has been argued about negotiation or war or something in between. I said the other day that if you really stop negotiations, the alternative is something which is either war or leading up to war, or of course, it may be just sitting tight and doing nothing, which seems to me a very feeble way of meeting the situation.

Shri Jaipal Singh referred to what he considered the many intermediate or middle stages, such as, he said, South Africa or Portugal. Well I would hardly have thought those instances helped this argument in spite of all that has happened in South Africa, every year, we have put forward the proposal to negotiate with them in the United Nations, and it has been passed there by a considerable majority. It is South Africa that has refused to negotiate, the word may not be right, anyhow, to talk about these matters. which have created so much trouble there.

In regard to Portugal, we have always been willing to talk to Portugal; naturally, the talk has to be about the basic matters, not about some superficial matters. So these examples are not very helpful.

Then, Acharya Kripalani mentioned economic sanctions. Another Hon. Member talked about a punitive police action. Now, with all respect to them, I do not see how economic sanctions have the slightest effect on anybody in the present situation. We have very very little trade with-China. We had some trade with Tibet which has dwindled chiefly because of Chinese activities on the other side. We may consider further as to whether we should continue it or stop it or take another step in the economic sphere. That is a matter for consideration. One may do that, but it has no real effect on the situation. It is obvious.

As for the idea of a police action, I am rather surprised that the Hon. Member who., he himself has reminded us, has been a gallant soldier, should put forward this idea of a police action. What exactly it means in this context is not clear tome. You can have a police action against some very very weak adversary where the police the whole meaning is that the police can function there and get results-can get results. Whether the police is represented by some little army or not, essentially it is a police action against a small adversary. We do not take police action against a larger force of police, if you like to call it, or whatever it is. It is a misnomer. Let us not confuse ourselves.

Then I found in the speeches of many Members a desire to make it clear that they do not want war, but they suggested various other things. I have mentioned some. Acharya Kripalani asked: Why do you always talk about a world war? It may be a local war.' Yes, it may be, of course. But anyone studying the question in the context of wars today-possibility of wars-knows very well that local wars do not take place, are not likely to take place, between two great countries without developing into big wars and the big wars without developing possibly-not certainly-into a world war. I am merely trying to clarify these, matters so that we may indulge in clear thinking. Merely, in our resentment saving, as an Hon. Member just said a little before me, that we must do this here, we must take Tibet or Tibet must be thisall that may be a pleasant thought, but it has no relation to reality.

Here are two countries, both strong in their respective ways, both huge, both-I say-incapable of being defeated by the other. It is quite absurd to imagine for anyone in China or elsewhere that China, however powerful she may be is going to ultimately defeat India in case of war.

498

I do not accept that, and I think China! knows that too. It is equally absurd to imagine that India is going to defeat China in a great war.

First of all, for some things a country paysit does not count the cost. If its honour, selfrespect and freedom are involved, no cost is too great. It is better to perish in the attempt than to submit or surrender. That is the basis of our thinking, and I hope, of this House and our people.

Having said that, it does not mean that we should give up thinking in regard to the steps that we take in order to justify whatever our position may be. If we have to think of problems of war we have very much to think of what the views of experts may be. I do not mean to say that experts are only people wearing the military uniform. Civilians like Acharya Kripalani may become experts in military matters: for ought I know he may be able to give an opinion about what should be done.

Normally, when one talks about war or even police action one does so after logically thinking as to what those steps should be one after the other. What is more important and what every General has to think is this. A General has to forget himself for a while and think that he is the enemy's General and what he will do. Then he should devise his policy. That is the way: to think. One cannot imagine any General who has any experience at all imagining that he has a clear field and the other fellow is a fool and he will run away before him. That does not happen in war or in any circumstances like this. Everyone thinks about these matters in the strictest practical way. In addition to that he may think in an idealistic way. I hope we think in both ways, idealistic and practical. But if you give up one of them it will be unfortunate. But if you give up both idealism and practicality then where are we? There is no anchorage to hold on to.

As I said, apart from strong expression of opinion etc., broadly speaking, I believe that there is a very large unanimity of opinion in this House on this issue. It may be expressed differently with greater emphasis or less emphasis. There is a large unanimity of opinion about this matter, even though some people may differ here and there about the steps to be taken, the timing of it.

Much has been said about timing. Acharya Kripalani is apprehensive that time may run against us and the Chinese authorities may Consolidate their position in these areas. In fact, he used the word 'colonise them'. I do not know what the Chinese mayor may not do. But as Raja Mahendra Pratap managed to say before he sat down--and he speaks with experience having, I believe, wandered about some of these territories it is not a particularly easy matter to colonise, or, if I may say so with all respect to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, to industrialise these territories. I do not know what modem science may not do in future. I cannot say. I am merely referring to the present, that for the last 2000 or 3000 years nobody has succeeded in that in Ladakh. I am talking about Ladakh for the moment because there are different areas. At the present moment, in all this wide area, I think, possibly one or two tiny villages or a few huts are there. Otherwise, there is no inhabitant

In summer some shepherds come to graze their sheep and they walk away in winter. We are now--I need not remind Hon. Members-in winter. It is exceedingly difficult except for some daring explorers or that type of persons to function with ease in those territories. Nobody lives there. I do not deny the possibility of, with great effort, creating conditions for people to live there. They live there not by producing anything there because the territory is not that way-for thousands of years it has been like that. If it is going to be changed by scientific effort, that will take a very considerable time. It does not change suddenly like this.

I was talking about the colonisation of these territories. I am merely pointing this out as Raja Mahendra Pratap wanted to do. This may be done, I do not know, with the resources of people but it is not a practical proportion. I am talking about the time element. The Hon. Member has rightly pointed out that a road has been built. Mr. Chou En-lai has in his letter referred to this road being built with 3,000 civilian personnel and all that from 1955-57. That is perfectly true. The House knows that-the road that was built, I am not talking about the subsequent developments. Mr. Chou En-lai's statement presumably refers to this road through Aksai Chin area; that is perfectly true. In that corner of Ladakh that road was built and for two years or so, we knew nothing about it. It is perfectly true; it may be our fault. We knew nothing about it. Whatever has happened in Ladakh, so far as we know, apart from the Aksai Chin area, the wide area that they have transgressed has been done mostly in the last summer--this last summer--as part of the continuation of their efforts to suppress the Tibetan revolt. I cannot say of any corner but broadly, this, I think, is true.

499

Replying to an Hon. Member, Shri Nehru said : "I do not know what in this age of atomic energy can be done or what might not be done. But take the NEFA area, I think that we have done a rather good piece of work in the NEFA area, an area in which the British failed to do anything at all for decades and decades. They just failed completely. We have done a good piece of work not only in spreading our administration there but in communications, in schools, hospitals, agriculture, etc. among the people who are my difficult to handle. That was done and that no doubt will continue.

We want those areas to develop and naturally we cannot expect them to develop in the real industrial sense. It is far better to develop industries where they can easily develop than across mountains and other; places where it is a much harder task but those areas should develop in that sense and may be, where we find good minerals, etc. they will certainly have to be developed and exploited. But the main thing is this. If you do not go back to the past which we had discussed so often, what is to be done in the present ?

Now, I repeat that whether we talk about negotiation or whatever we talk about, it is clear, and, I thought there would be no doubt in any Hon. Member's mind, that any kind of further step that the Chinese may take will obviously be resisted wherever it may be-that is obviousto the best of our ability.

Shri Nehru said : Because an Hon. Member put me a straight question I am giving him this answer that, as a matter of fact, that has been our policy-whether it was fully and properly implemented or not is a different matter. That policy has not changed. And, as a matter of fact, in NEFA, of course, apart from that very tiny enclave of about three or four miles, Longju it is because of our strength there and our determination to resist that we have prevented their entry to NEFA except, as I said, in Longju. In all these areas, whether it is the border, Uttar Pradesh or Himachal Pradesh or Punjab, we have prevented their entry and we will prevent it.

Now the real question is that difficulties have arisen in regard to this fairly large area in eastern Ladakh which, as I said, a part from the Aksai Chin area, which they have entered mostly during the last summer. It may be said, rightly, that we should have been in a position to prevent that. It is a difficult task, but it may be that if we had directed all our attention to it previously it might have been done. I do not wish: to argue that-point. Anyhow, here is this present position and this present position can be resolved basically in two ways: one is by an attempt at negotiation vielding some kind of fruitful results, a peaceful settlement, land the other is by compulsion and coercion which may be less than war or war itself. Any attempt at compulsion or coercion is really-in these circumstances economic sanctions do not count-if not war call it police action if you like, that is, the use of armed people. Now, when Hon. Members refer to this, no doubt they have to bear in mind that there are armed people on the other side too, it is not a one-way traffic. Therefore, if one has to take that, principles apart, one has to do so-in favourable circumstances when one thinks - that it is likely to yield substantial results. One does not do this merely in a huff or because one is angry. That may lead to something the opposite of what one desires.

Therefore, while one tries to settle it always by negotiation one, at the same time, strengthens oneself to deal with any situation that might arise or has arisen. These are normal platitudes-the House will forgive me for repeating them, but I want a little clear thinking on this issue. We follow both these policies. We tried to negotiate because that is not only right but inevitable and I would submit that no country in the wide world would not negotiate, does not matter how much they are opposed to each other. If they are dead opposed to each other, even then they talk. We have had in recent months or may be in the last year very serious incidents between powerful countries like the Soviet Union and the United States of America-shooting down bombers, aircrafts, etc. Well, they have talked about it. They have not declared war. They have talked about it; settled it and sometimes not settled it; it is still there unsettled. Sometimes they have given compensation, or whatever it is. But countries, whatever the situation may be, always negotiate. It is an inevitable thing in international affairs. Otherwise, there will be a complete law of the jungle. You may say that one party is functioning as if it was the law of the jungle. It may be. It is deplorable and one should naturally do what one can to stop that. But one negotiates even then. Negotiation always carries weight if there is strength behind it. A weak country or a weak person cannot negotiate at all. Therefore, strength is an essential factor. The building up of strength, the addition to your strength, is obvious. It has to be done.

Then, Hon. Members might ask, "What will you do if your negotiation does not yield results?" I cannot, and it would not be right for me now, to lay down what one does; but, as I said, in any

500

event, we have to build up strength to meet such contingencies at a suitable moment. For us to say, as some Hon. Members hinted at, that "Do not talk to them; do not negotiate" is a thing which, I would venture to say, will not be under. stood by any country in the wide world. The Hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani, seems to think that this is the fault of our publicity. Countries gather information, and their foreign offices, even if we are at fault, do keep themselves informed about these matters. They are interested in a matter of this kind. It has excited world-wide interest naturally because of the possibilities in it; because of the potentialities of big scale trouble in it. Every country has watched it, studied it; we have helped them to study it and all that. If those countries do not immediately accept, let us say, Acharya Kripalani's view-point on it, it is not necessarily true that we are at fault. It may be that Acharya Kiripalani's viewpoint may be at fault.

The Prime Minister said: One seems, to imagine that if we shout loudly enough about what we feel the other party or other country will agree to it. Publicity goes a very small way in these matters. It really consists, as far as possible in placing the material. In judging of any matter outside India-many matters come up-do we decide, because somebody's publicity hits us on the head, in his favour? We judge these things from our own sources and our own information as to what has happened in Europe or South America or Africa or Asia or South-East Asia. The countries have their ambassadors, ministers, agents of publicity, and what not, to get information. They judge from them. We may fail completely in some small matter; this may happen if there is a not somewhere here; but in big matters concerning two countries, other countries are deeply interested and are very well informed. They have to be. They cannot afford to be not fully informed about matters like this between two great countries like India and China. They may be right or wrong. That is a different matter. But they attempt to keep themselves informed and, we attempt to keep themselves informed too. I have no doubt the other: country also keeps them informed. There it is.

To imagine that what we think is inevitably a hundred per cent, right is not necessarily correct. Sometimes we may be a little wrong too. We are human beings subject to error, just like others are. I think it comes in the way of clear thinking. If we decide and if we have come to the conclusion, that we are a hundred per cent in the right, no further thinking is required. Only some kind of strong action is necessary. Action, or rather the capacity for action, is always necessary, because without that, words do not count. But that action must think of the consequences and every action that is indulged in surely is indulged in with a view to achieve results. To indulge in action not to achieve results obviously has no good result itself. So, these factors have to be considered.

When you discuss the border of any country, wherever it may be, which has historical backgrounds, all kinds of past incidents are brought up, which are discussed. I think the Chinese case is a very weak one. They go back, which is very wrong, I think, to past periods of history. That is a different matter. But whatever it is, you have to deal with it, you have to answer it. My point is, I cannot deal with them by saying, All that you say does not require an answer". We are right, but that is not the way. We may be right 100 percent or 99 per cent, but I have to answer their case, as I insist that they should answer mine. Otherwise, there can be no dealings at all. Otherwise, you decide in an, armed way or coercive way-they or we-and whichever has the longer lathi possibly produces a greater effect. The whole thing cannot be dealt with in this easy-going way, as if it does not require any argument. It does require argument to convince them to convince the other countries and all that.

There is so much said about the McMahon line and we have strongly stressed our case. I have not a shadow of doubt in my mind that not only the McMahon line is right from our point of view, but I would go further and say that before the McMahon line was made, the McMahon line itself was the laying down of something that existed before it; that is justification of the traditional border there. It is not the McMahon line that created the border. It is only after a conflict it was laid down. That is so. Take Ladakh. The history of Ladakh, the present history of Ladakh goes back to 1842 when after war between the ruler of Ladakh, Maharajah Gulab Singh, and the ruler of Tibet both being feudatories of others-the ruler of Tibet being the feudatory of the Emperor of China and the ruler of Ladakh being the feudatory of the ruler of Punjab at that time-the war between them ended ultimately in the victory of Gulab Singh's forces, and that resulted in a treaty acknowledging that Ladakh was part of Kashmir State territory. Later this area, this boundary, was not demarcated on the ground, but laid down in maps by some English surveyors.

Now I can understand some dispute being raised about some country here and there. of course, it is not marked, and its territory is not inhabited. There is no administration, no pay-

501

ment of tax, no proofs-the only proof is travellers' accounts-the normal thing that has been understood by people who pass that way, and maps; these are the two or three ways of proving these things. So that, the question may arise about minor points here and there, but the major point is the basic boundary of Ladakh which was laid down 112 years ago, not today. It is not marked there; it is marked in maps.

Now some maps differ. There is doubt about it. Maps differ, travellers' accounts differ and travellers' books differ, and all these matters can be argued about. One cannot say that we will not talk about these matters. But the basic thing is not about these border troubles, but this rather massive infiltration into Ladakh which has chiefly taken place, to the best of my knowledge, during the last summer, apart from the Aksai Chin area.

The argument-if it is raised-that "we are here and we have taken possession of this territory; therefore, it is ours" of course, is an utterly wrong argument. The sovereignty of a country does not change because somebody comes and sits in a corner of it. It is obvious it cannot. No country has an army spread out all along its borders to protect it from people coming in. Anybody can come in, but the sovereignty of that country remains over that territory, even though some people may sit on a little part of it.

Therefore, if I may say so the basic point today is not, I submit, that we should not negotiate; let us consider that, because one has always to negotiate, and to say that negotiations will not bear fruit, if I may say so, has no relevance in this matter. Even if it did not bear fruit, even then you will have to negotiate, because that is a way of procedure. The moment you refuse to do so, you are wrong before the world, and the world will think you are afraid of negotiation; you are afraid of that. They will not accept your word for it-you are afraid of talking to the other parties; that is the impression created. But the negotiation has some value only if it is backed by strength.

In the final analysis, it comes to this that we must build up our strength and, as I have said previously-I think on the last occasion-this is not a matter which we can dispose of by a discussion. It may take a few months or a year or more. Whatever the issue of this is, the issue of this matter may come or may not come in a few months or so, I do not know, but what I am saying is that the situation that has arisen on our borders is of such historical significance from a long-term point of view. India and China, these two great countries, for the first time face each other on a long border which is a live border, and even if we are friends, even then, we have a live and dangerous border; if we are not friends then it is worse. Therefore, this tremendous historical development is taking place in Asia affecting not only India and China, but all the countries of Asia, necessitating, quite apart from other developments, the building up of our strength. Then we can consider using it whenever it is necessary.

Building up of our strength means certainly defence forces and the defence apparatus, but remember that defence means today industrial strength; it is industry that gives real strength. So, while we keep our Army etc., as strong as- we can make it and as well-equipped as possible, the real basis, the real strength, will come from rapid industrialisation.

We come back really not only to industrialisation; it means better agriculture, better industry, in order to meet these crises, because it is only then that countries become strong. That is how other counties are strong today. The so-called Great Powers or the middling Powers are strong because they have become a modernised State, because they take advantage of the modern methods which increase their production, give them strength, all kind of things. Therefore, the basic thing is that we become a modern State, not remain in a backward condition economically and socially.

These are the basic things that we have to face, and this is a challenge to the country, not a challenge in the present of course which we have to meet, but much more so a challenge for the future, because ultimately unless proper balances are created in Asia, all our wishes may not lead us to what we want to have.

Therefore, I would beg this House to look at this matter from this wider point of view as well as from the immediate danger point of view, and to consider it not a party matter, but a national issue of far-reaching consequences.

502

CHINA INDIA USA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Discussion on India-China Relations

Replying to a discussion on India-Chin relations in the Rajya Sabha on December 22, 195 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said :

Mr. Chairman, I have always welcomed discussions on foreign affairs in this House and profited by them. On this occasion I was somewhat reluctant for a discussion, though I bowed to the wishes of the House and your wishes, Sir, because I felt that having regard to the present situation, nothing new, so far as discussion is concerned, had really emerged and it would be rather an odd course of events or precedent to establish that whenever I send a letter there is to be a discussion and whenever I receive a letter there is to be a discussion. As a matter of fact, such letters are, normally not published. But owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case here, we have decided, and I think rightly, to place all correspondence that takes place before parliament and the public. And yet it is obvious that diplomatic correspondence can hardly go very far if this took place and if it is continually discussed in public. Some new methods of diplomacy will have to be evolved. That was my difficulty, not of keeping back any facts from this House or the country, because when we place all our cards on the table and all our letters, then there is nothing hidden, and if we are to proceed through diplomatic means, they have to be somewhat different from the procedure often adopted in a debate. The

facts may be the same, the course of events may be the same. As Mr. Davabhai Patel said, and no doubt, others have said or realised, the issues before us are of the highest moment and importance and require not only great effort of the mind, but, if I may say so, other efforts too. It is a situation which, as was pointed out in the last debate here, is a new situation in India's history of two thousand years. It is not some mere border incident that has happened, although border incidents have happened. It is not something which can be brushed away by a little strong language as our friend from Ladakh just used. It is a conflict between two of the biggest nations of Asia coming up face to face on a long border after thousands of years of history. Therefore, we have always to keep in mind where we are and what we can do and what we will have to do. At the same time, keeping in mind all this does not mean that we would approach this question with an apprehension of not being able to do much or with weakness. I do not believe in that. But weakness or strength comes from many things and in many ways. It is not merely a question of strong resolutions that we may pass. There is the military test of weakness or strength, and there is the industrial test of weakness or strength, and there is the test of the morale, of the people, the discipline of the people. All these are tests and we are going to be tested in every way. And whatever may be the outcome in the next few weeks or few months or whatever the period might be of these border troubles, this testing will continue for years to come. I should like this House to realise this. Now, I do not understand when Hon. Members ask, "How long are we going to put up with this kind of thing?" What exactly does this kind of thing mean ? I do not understand it. I say, as long as the circumstances require it. It may be a week, a year, ten years or a hundred years, because you cannot change all these factors that go to make world changes. I use the words "hundred years" in a metapherical sense. It may happen. But the point is, the whole outlook has to be fitted into the enormous changes that are taking place in the world.

Here are two mighty nations of the Western world, the United States of America and the Soviet Union opposed to each other in many ways, fearful of each other, arming against each other and yet holding their hands realising the consequences of not holding their hands, realising the consequences that once they let lose the dogs of war, nobody can stop them. In strength or military might, neither India nor China can come up anywhere near those tremendously powerful nations but we are big nations, strong nations, determined nations and each nation is having its own strong sense of self-respect and honour. If we honour, as we do, our own self respect and are going to stand by it whatever happens, let us remember that China is not a small or a mean country. It has also a strong idea of its self-respect and honour and let us not throw words which without doing us any good do a lot of harm by attacking the self-respect of a country. This is quite apart from what they may have done or we may do. Of course, we have to talk warily as we have to act warily but with strength. Here this position has arisen due undoubtedly to certain activities, advances, and I think, aggression by the Chinese authorities in Ladakh chiefly and a little bit in NEFA. Now, there is a history behind it which can be traced to some extent from the White Paper that had been circulated, the correspondence. etc., and we can try to understand and find out what has happened more or less and what might take place but again, I would say, behind all this are bigger and more historical changes that are taking place in the face of history. Two revolutions come into contact, the Chinese revolution and the Indian revolution. They are of

503

different types but nevertheless revolutions which have changed the face of these countries and which go on changing them, may be in somewhat different ways and it is a major fact of history not only of India and China but of Asia and the world that these two revolutions come across each other on a wide field. That is the problem before us which cannot be dealt with by merely getting angry or petulant about it. Let us be Angry by all means but let us think as to how we can deal with this matter. We cannot, of course lay down every step because each step has to be conditioned by events, each step has to be conditioned by new circumstances, but broadly speaking one can lay down and one can prepare for it so far as one can because whatever step we may take can only be successful in so far as it is backed by strength and a people's will and determination to shoulder the burdens of that step. Each step involves burdens and each step involves grave difficulties for the country. When there is a conflict between

two countries, big or small, there are, broadly speaking, two ways of dealing with it. The normal way which every country follows till something else happens is the diplomatic way, by diplomacy of correspondence; diplomacy of personal meetings and discussion. The moment any country renounces the diplomatic way, there is no other way except war. There may be perhaps a middle way of nothing happening, just sitting at home and being angered with each other but the moment you say that you will not have the diplomatic way, it means that you close the door of meetings, of talking and of correspondence. There it is and then the other forces come into play. It may be a way or it may be, for the moment, not doing anything if you like,- but a situation which drifts towards war. I should like to know what other third way there is. That is one point to be realised when people talk about, "How long are we to wait ?" I say, you will have to wait as long as you have to wait. I cannot measure that time and I cannot limit it. Do we deal with a situation like this, or does China deal with a situation like this by issuing an ultimatum to India, "Do this" or "Do that"? Is India going to deal with a situation like this by issuing an ultimatum to China? Think of the meaning of these words and the consequences that lie behind those words. It means shutting the door with no other way open except the way or war. Now, all of us want to avoid war, I presume all of us, may be not some but let us realise that this imagining that one can have a little scrap here and a little scrap there and then adjust with the other party is rather infantile thinking. Two great nations do not have little scraps and then frighten each other by scraps. Scraps grow. In fact, the chief difficulty at the present moment which the House faces and the country is angered at is, as every one knows, because scraps have occurred. It is not our fault, may be, but it does not matter but the point is it is the scraps that rouse passions and if there are a few more scraps, the period of small scraps will end and the period of big scraps and other things will come in. One thing leads to another. One has to look into this not only from the context of our border and of two mighty countries coming into conflict but its consequences elsewhere, what will happen. I am being perfectly frank with this House which normally a person in my position should not be, but I think that we should be frank with each other and not lose ourselves in fine phrases. Any kind of warlike

development between India and China will be an indefinite war because we will never give in and they will never give in. Realise that. It is not like what the Hon. Member from Kashmir said, "Go and teach them a lesson. They will then behave". It is amazing, and this kind of approach, I am sorry to use the word, is rather infantile. It means that throughout our life we will be warring and warring because India will not give in. Are we going to allow China to conquer India. or will they allow themselves to be conquered ? All these facts come up. Have you thought of them? Of course, if they try to push into India, naturally we have to fight and fight regardless of the time taken, it may be a few years or a hundred years, That is a different matter and we have to fight because there is no choice left. From our side or from their side, in bringing this decision about one thinks not once but many times before doing it. When there is no escape from it, well, there is no escape from it. Therefore, one tries naturally the way of peaceful settlement. We have been talking about these things not only in our case but in the case of every quarrel in the wide world. We have talked about this in regard to big international issues and we still go on talking about it. Was that meant for others only, this talk that we indulged in, and was not to be applied to our own case when it came? That would be a strange commentary on what we say and what we do when faced with a difficult situation.

Therefore it is inevitable that we shouldcall it what you like-negotiate, deal with this question diplomatically, deal with it by correspondence, by meeting when necessary, because in such a matter it is far more important to get results if results are obtainable than to allow some kind of false prestige to come in and refuse to talk. That is not becoming when major issues are at stake involving the future destiny of a country, of hundreds of millions of people, and I should say quite frankly that in this letter which

504

we have been discussing-the letter of Premier Chou En-lai-there is, so far as facts are concerned no giving in. It is a reiteration, repetition and re-affirmation of their claims and yet there is one thing in it which I welcome, whatever the reason for it may be, and that is, as I see it, certainly a strong desire to meet and discuss. There is that and I welcome it, although I must say I do not understand how Premier Chou En-lai expected me within four or five days or a week to be able to meet him in a third country. It seems rather odd to me but the fact remains that there is that and whatever the reason behind that may be-some people may say there is a special motive behind that ; it does not matter. May be, but the point is that throughout that letter this point is brought out-so far as I am concerned whenever the time comes, whenever it is suitable, I shall avail myself of that opportunity because the issues are too serious for any other course to be adopted. That is the broad approach to this question.

We have sent a reply to Premier Chou En-lai which has not been published but in fact I had given the substance to this House yesterday, because I wanted it to reach Premier Chou En-lai before it is published. It will be published in a day or two, perhaps two or three days.

Now I think in the last two or three letters that we have sent we have stated our case, I won't say in all its details but broadly they have been stated and this House should realise that merely repetition or strong repetition of certain phrases does not make a case when you are dealing with international matters, just as the Chinese Government should realise that their mere repetition of strong phrases does not make a case for them. A case is something different whether it is looked at from constitutional, legal, historical, geographical, or other points of view, uses etc. We have broadly stated our case ; it is a good case and I think the facts and the history behind it and all that are very much in our favour. But it has to be dealt with in that level. If I or the Chinese Government merely deal with it at a level of hurling strong speeches at each other or ultimatums, well, then there is no discretion. Then we enter into a field of conflict which from a merely verbal conflict may go on to physical conflict and from a small physical conflict to a big physical conflict and so on and so forth. All these step-by-step consequences come.

So I have ventured to place these various considerations before the House. I am grateful to the House for their kind expressions of confidence in the policy we are pursuing and their assurance to support this policy to the hilt. Of course without that faith and confidence and assurance, I could do little ; nobody could do anything. In such a grave matter we require the full direction and confidence of Parliament and of the people and we have to tread the straight and narrow path of building up strength as soon as and as rapidly as we can in all ways, always also restraining ourselves from doing the wrong thing which will bring about wrong and evil results which may become irretrievable. It is a difficult position for anyone or for any country just as the world in the last few years has livednot under a balance of strength or balance of power but it has lived-under a balance of terror. That has been the state of the world. These great mighty countries, mightier than any country the world has ever seen, have lived in a state of terror of each other-the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb and all that-and in spite of their anger and passion and disgust of each other, they have restrained themselves because they know the consequences of not restraining themselves. And here now we see this great attempt being made by two of the most powerful nations in the world somehow or other to find a way out of life under this terror, a way of peace which won't come quickly. It will take time. It is not a question of a meeting, call it summit meeting or whatever you like. Even now they envisage a succession of summit meetings but it is by far the most hopeful sign the world has seen in the last ten years, this meeting of people who have been rivals and who have been opponents trying and coming together to find a way out and that way out is not merely something that will apply to them or something that will apply only to Europe. Obviously in the circumstances as they exist, it will apply to the wide world directly in some places, indirectly to others if tension goes down. Now, even in an extreme case like that the House will see how countries have functioned even when they are full of passion and anger and strength and all that ; yet they have restrained themselves realising the consequences. Are we not to show even that much restraint here and not think of the consequences of this or that action and to become impatient and say, 'we cannot wait' ? Well, if we cannot wait, what do we do ? I do not know. anyone has in mind when he says, I cannot wait ; something must be done'. And I should like that aspect to be developed as to what should be done. Mere anger I can understand and I should like that anger to be translated into strength-giving elements in the country.

That I can understand. Of course we have to build up strength-that is the basis of it-in every way; as I said not only in the military way but even more so in the industrial way, and this strength has to do far more than the sword

505

or the small gun. It is the industrial machine behind it that counts and above all it is the strength of the morale of the nation which counts, a nation which will not surrender to evil, surrender to invasion, surrender to any threat and stand up with head high whatever happens. That is the thing we build up meanwhile always trying to find a way out of the deadlock, to find a solution consonant with the integrity and self-respect of the country-because anything which goes against self-respect should be ruled out of course-at the same time remembering not to say or do things which make it difficult for the door to remain open. which put the other side-not a weak side but a powerful side-concerned also angry and thinking-wrongly you may think but rightly according to their thinking-that they are being insulted and all that. It is a very dangerous thing when the iron enters the soul of a nation. In war time it enters it and they, go ahead simply motivated by hatred and anger and a desire to destroy. It is a dangerous thing and till it works itself out in terrible destruction ; well, the war proceeds-somebody is defeated or nobody is defeated-whatever may happen.

Now I should like some difference, some distinction to be made in India between what I would call a grim determination to preserve our freedom, our integrity, our honour and selfrespect because there can be-I entirely agree with one Hon. Member-no bargaining about these things, it is true, and at the same time avoiding that iron entering into our souls and our saying something or doing something which makes the iron enter into the other party's soul. Then a situation is created out of which there is no way out, except dreadful conflict, indefinite conflict, uncertain conflict, spreading possibly to other countries, spreading possibly all over the world. These are serious possibilities which may come about by some action of ours or China's or somebody else's. We feel wronged by China. I feel that the way they have acted has been wrong and unfair to us. I am not for the moment going-it is up to the House and Hon. Members

into the question of how far we have been at fault, our Government here in the past. But we cannot go on repeatedly discussing the past. We have to discuss the present and the future. And in the future the only two courses open to us are to strengthen ourselves in all these ways that I have mentioned and at the same time to try our best by friendly approaches dignified and friendly approaches, to find a way by settlement.

Now, sometimes Mr. Dahyabhai Patel sometimes others talk about the "Bhai-bhai" approach. I really do not understand what this criticism means. I hope that our approach to every country will be a "Bhai-bhai" approach. I am very glad that in regard to China it was a "Bhai-bhai" approach. What does it mean? I fear the significance of the words is not realised. It is a very common thing in India, a friendly way of approach. Each country has its own way of approach. It is not a bad approach. There is nothing derogatory about it. And this "Bhaibhai" has been used for almost every country from which people have come here. We may have used it more for some countries, because they took it more, and for some less, and it is quite a right approach. That does not mean of course, that our eyes are closed, that we surrender anything that we value. That, of course, is wrong. More especially while Governments deal with each other, the people's approach towards another people should always be friendly and they should not consider the people of the other country enemies, even though we are in conflict with the Government. Surely even in the days of our national struggle, the lesson we learnt was to fight against imperialism, British imperialism, and not against the Britisher. I am merely mentioning this in passing, because I am anxious that the resentment that there is in India and which has been caused rightfully and justly should be directed into right channels of strength to build up, because it is a matter of our survival not of phrase and of not being able to wait or not wait. It is a matter of India's survival. That is the question we have to face. It is a big question. It is not a border issue. Of course, there is the border issue. We shall deal with it to the best of our ability, but behind that border issue stretches out this future which might be and ought to be a good future for us and which might also be a dreadful future by countries fighting for survival. So, it is in this context

that I would beg of this House to consider these matters and deal with them and even advise us.

Now, I am not dealing with Premier Chou En-lai's letter. But there is one particular matter which I should like to correct. First of all, may I point out-I think it was Diwan Chaman Lall who said something about it-that the Chinese have agreed to withdraw from Longju. Yes, but they have made conditions. There are conditions attached to that. You withdraw from somewhere else. So, it is not simply a case of agreeing to withdraw. You withdraw from places in the U. P. border, Himachal Pradesh and several other things. It is not such a simple thing. Now, they have caught us in a small matter in regard to a name. They have pulled us up. They have caught us in an error. In Ladakh, in the papers you might have seen, there is this

506

question of a place called Pulingsumdo. Now, we have got mixed up. It was an error in one of our letters between two places-Pulingsumdo and Pulamsumda. And they have caught us in that mistake in this last letter. No doubt you did not know anything about it and Hon. Members could not judge. They have said with great force that this place you have mentioned is in our territory, Well, it is undoubtedly. It was a misprint or error. It is a place twenty miles away. This Pulamsumda is in our territory. So, that is true.

May I express my gratitude, again to Hon. Members for the confidence they have reposed in the policy we are pursuing.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Opening Speech in Rajya Sabha Debate on India-China Relations

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement opening the debate in Rajya Sabha on India-China relations on December 8, 1959 : I beg to move, Sir:-

That White Paper No. II and subsequent correspondence between the Governments of India and China, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 23rd November, 1959, be taken into consideration.

Almost exactly three months ago, Sir, there was a debate in this House on the difficulties and conflicts that had arisen on our border, the border between India and China. Since that debate, there has been a serious incident in Ladakh about which the House knows fully. After that there has been some correspondence between the Chinese Prime Minister and the Government of China. All this has been placed on the Table of the House. The Chinese Premier, Mr. Chou En-lai, made certain suggestions to our Government in a letter dated the 7th November. On the 16th of November, I sent him a reply putting forward certain proposals-interim proposals. The whole object was that before any further step could be taken to find a way out, there should be some interim arrangements to prevent any conflicts on the border. Now, that letter of mine was sent on the 16th November, and we have received no answer to that yet. In fact, therefore, there has been no major development since this exchange of correspondence. Our Government have received a letter from the Chinese authorities in answer to a previous letter. This relates to the treatment of prisoners after the Lakakh incident. We had complained of the ill-treatment of these prisoners, and in their reply, they broadly said that this was not true and that they were treated as well as could be expected in the circumstances, there. That is how the matter stands so far as the correspondence, etc. is concerned.

Now, Sir, after the last debate that we had here, chiefly because of the Ladakh incident and partly because of other developments, there has been a worsening of the situation, and I might say, both actually and in the public mind, and it is natural that there should be this strong public feeling when such things happen on our border and a neighbouring country intrudes and pushes into our areas that have been in our possession for a long time. The questions that arise today for the consideration of this House are broadly two-of course, there are off-shoots of these questions. One is, this House might again consider and give its opinion and advice as to the broad policies that we should follow and secondly, what steps should be taken in the implementation of these policies. On the last occasion, much was said by other members and by me about these broad policies. Now, it is important, first of all, that this House should give its clear directions about these policies, because after all the steps that we take or follow are the results of these policies If the policies are not agreed to, then naturally the steps may also not fit in. It is important. therefore, that there should be this clarity of thinking. The situation that has arisen is one of great difficulty and complexity and a situation in which passions-public passion-are roused, quite naturally, and it becomes all the more necessary, when such strong feelings are roused, that there should be calm and clear thinking as to the broad policies and in regard to their implementation. The implementation indeed has many aspects. One is the purely military aspect, others connected with it and yet another aspect and a very important aspect is ultimately how we build up the country's strength for the purposes of defence. Now, in regard to the broad policies, Sir, we have followed, as the House well knows, a policy in foreign affairs of what is called non-alignment or to put it in another way, of not tying ourselves with any military arrangement or bloc, and trying to be friendly with all nations with whose policies we may or may not agree. We follow that and we have raised our voice whenever we could in the councils of the nations in favour of the policy of peace and against the continuation of the cold war mentality which automatically leads to a worsening of the situation everywhere. It is a curious paradox that today when

507

we are facing certain grave dangers on our own borders, that the very policy for which we have stood for so long is meeting with a large measure of success in the important centres of the world and that apart from perhaps a few lone voices, broadly speaking, the world is moving towards an attempt to put an end to this cold-war and, possibly, even to these military blocs ultimately.

I do submit, Sir, that the broad policy we have Pursued in the past has been a correct policy and is a correct policy today. A policy of nonalignment or a policy of peaceful co-existence, or Panch Sheel, call it what you like, is not a policy which is followed regardless of changing circumstances; the policy remains but! it is adapted to changing circumstances. I say this, I repeat this and I have said it previously too, because some Hon. Members on the last occasion had stated that this policy of non-alignment or peaceful co-existence, had collapsed, had failed. I think that while it is true that in so far as our relations with China are concerned, that policy has not suceeded, that is, in the sense that our relations with China are not the embodiment of peace at the present moment so far as our thinking and our actions are concerned. What are the reasons, we may seek for them, and according to our thinking, the fault lies with many things that the Chinese Government have done, with a certain expansive, aggressive attitude that they have adopted and that actual fact that they have intruded on our territory. Therefore, that policy has to be met, that action has to be met. But that has little relation to the basic policies that we pursue. I say this because, presumably, some people imagine that this has been the result of that policy. That of course, is, I would submit, completely wrong. In fact, the big fact of the modern world today is the success, the world-wide success, of the policy that this country has ventured to put forward and tried to pursue. I world repeat this because I should like clear thinking on this issue and clear directions because, after all, we in the Government necessarily have to fellow policies which are laid down or approved of by Parliament. The ultimate judge is Parliament, if I may say so, the ultimate judge is the people of India represented in Parliament, and we have to take our directions from Parliament and what Parliament decides, that the Government will follow, will pursue, if it finds itself capable of doing so. If not, some other Government makes charge and follows that policy. It is impornot therefore, that there should be clear thinking and clear directions on these issues, these broad issues, so also, to some extent, in regard to the implementation thereof, although, obviously, implementation of a policy like this, especially in the military sphere, can hardly be discussed in Parliament Now, Sir, when we consider the implementation of these policies, there is a purely military aspect of it and there is an aspect of it, which has always to be borne in mind. We me Great Powers today, and unfortunately the greatness of a nation today and, perhaps, previously too, is counted in terms of the armed might of that nation. Other factors come in no doubt but a great power is a power which has a big army, navy, air force, etc. That army, navy, air force, etc. today have been built up because that country has a big industrial apparatus, because it is what is called a technologically advanced country. In fact, defence today depends tremendously upon the industrial and technological background of a country. All the world knows it. Therefore, in order to strengthen a country for its defence, the major effort is not in merely enrolling people for the army which, of course, is done in a measure but in building up that technological and industrial background in the country. Otherwise, that country is weak from the military or defence point of view.

Now, not today, but ever since we came into existence as an independent nation twelve years ago, this factor has been before us. If any Hon. Member thinks that we had forgotten the question of defence or ignored it in our enthusiasm for Panch Sheel, then I would submit that he is mistaken. We may have made many mistakes but the fact of strengthening the country from the defence point of view was always before us. We did not know, and I confess today that I did not expect that there would be an aggression on the part of China. Anyway, it has taken place. But the circumstances being what they were no Government could ignore the aspect of Defence and we came to the conclusion then, as now that the basic factor in defence is the industrial growth of the country, and all the armies in the world without an industrial background could not function adequately in the matter of modern defence. To some extent our Five Year Plans and the like were based on that, not directly on defence but on building up this industrial background. As the House well knows in the last few years, more especially since the Second Five Year Plan came into being, greater stress has been laid on the foundations of industry, that is, basic industries, heavy industries, in the country. It is on them alone that defence can ultimately rest, apart from petty methods of

defence. There are other things, of coursecommunications, roads and other things which are important, but all this follows really the development of heavy industries in a country which not only provide the wherewithal for

508

defence but which are supposed to raise the economy of a country to higher levels, thereby making the country and the people strong, putting them in a stronger position, for any emergencies that they might have to face.

I am stating these rather simple facts because I want this whole question to be considered in that context. A country does not normally go about talking about the steps it takes for defence, partly because one does not want to Jay stress on it before the world at large and partly because our stress, our public stress, has always been on peace and will continue to be on peace, but Oat stress does not mean, cannot mean and should not mean, any kind of forgetfulness of the country's basic requirements in regard to defence. Always the question comes up before countries who are in danger or who may want to endanger others. The question has now been put as to whether they should have guns or butter. Well, we have very little butter in this country. As it is, it is difficult enough to resist the temptation to give more butter, of course meaning not butter only but the necessities of life of our country, the necessary amenities of life. But when this test comes, this problem arises-guns or butter. Where a country is industrially advanced, it has got a broad apparatus either to manufacture the good things of life, or guns and warlike equipment. That choice has to be made as it had been more or less made, let us say, in Hitler's Germany, and he decided in favour of guns and he got them and fought a great war. In our case that question, guns or butter, arises, not in that same way, because, as it happens, and perhaps fortunately for us the same thing, the same basis has to be laid, the same foundation has to be laid, whether it is for guns or for butter. The choice really comes after the foundation is laid, as to how to use that foundation for the future, whether to produce consumer goods, let us say, or the amenities of life for our people, or warlike material. Therefore whichever way we proceed in our thinking, we come to the conclusion that both for guns and butter we have to lay, as rapidly and as firmly as we can, these industrial foundations and that is ultimately

heavy industries. Of course that does not mean that other things do not count. Obviously, whether it is for war or for peace, one wants adequate food It is obvious one cannot fight with an empty stomach or one cannot work hard even for peaceful purposes with an empty stomach. So what I venture to point out to this House is that that particular choice in that way does not come to us at the present moment even though we are threatened on our borders. The choice as to whether we can give up all progress, that we are envisaging, in favour of guns and guns alone that would come to us if we decided to give up that, building-up process and to rely on guns, which we buy or import from abroad within our resources. Of course we can go and buy to meet a temporary emergency-war like material and equipment, but thereby we cut short all our planning and the other schemes that we have in view. I hope it will never come to that. In a very small measure, of course, it may come but not in a big measure, because that itself then would be wrong thinking or rather a very short-term thinking.

But the kind of crisis that we have to face today is not a short-term crisis-let us realise that. It cannot be, in the nature of things a short-term crisis, whatever the next developments might be, it is a long-term affair. And whatever way we may think, we cannot ignore certain facts of geography. If we are concerned today with China, and China is concerned about us, well, whatever our feelings may be, India and China are neighbouring countries bordering on each other for thousands of miles. That border is going to continue and the two countries are going to be next to each other not only now but in future ages; neither country is going to run away from that geographical position. Therefore we have to think in long-distance terms also apart from the short-term objectives that we have. The short-term oppresses us, because we have to meet the questions of today and we have to find answers to these questions. Nevertheless I would beg of Hon. Members to remember that the short-term leads on to the long-term, and if in approaching the short-term we weaken ourselves in the long-term, that is not a wise policy. There is a tendency sometimes in the public mind, naturally, to think in terms of the short-term, because of powerful reactions, because of anger and the desire to do something quickly and effectively. Well, naturally one has to give adequate importance to this short-term business and take adequate steps. Nevertheless, whether it is in war or in peaceful development, it is the long-term that counts, and not the short-term as a reaction of strong feelings or anger. Therefore we have to consider this question. In so far as the shortterm is concerned certainly we must, and that becomes largely question of military strategy, tactics, call it what you will. But the moment we get back to the long-term, which is so important, we have to consider two aspects of it, our broader policies, broader policies in regard to other nations, other nations meaning all nations, and how to strengthen the country basically to face those long-term developments, whatever they might be.

Now in that long-term process one has to

509

realise. I repeat what I have said-that the strength of a nation comes from the technological developments of that nation; everything else is not real strength; it is some kind of a temporary or limited strength. Of course I need not say about the other factors that are well-known-strength comes from. discipline and unity, and all that, of course. That is so essential. But apart from these basic qualities that a nation should possess. it comes from the technological progress of a nation, and all the courage in the world does not ultimately take the place of technological progress in the modern world. That fact I should like the House to remember, because we have to make vital choices, basic choices. We cannot merely react to circumstances without thinking of the future results of our reactions. I said also that our future policy includes not merely this business of building up the nation, technologically, industrially and otherwise, but in our relationships with other countries and our policy has largely been directed towards building up good relationships in the last many years, and I believe it has borne very good fruit so far as we are concerned, good fruit not only in the sphere of friendship, etc., but in more practical domains also. And if it is said, as it is said, sometimes, in criticism or disdain, that we talked about Hindi-Chini-Bhai-Bhai and went on talking about it and ignored the realities of the situation, well, I do not know who exactly started this Hindi-Chini-Bhai-Bhai, but however did it a good thing, because that should be our attitude to every

country. If the House will remember, that the same Bhai-Bhai business is repeated whoever comes here from any country often enough. of course it may be over-done; it may be done at the wrong time and the wrong place, which is irritating..... But my point is that the friendly approach is always the right approach. whatever happens. I make no exceptions. To the friendly approach must necessary be allied the watchful approach, the vigilant approach and a preparations' approach. But the moment you lose that approach or desire for friendly settlement, you loss yourself in a forest, in a most dangerous forest, where anything my happen, and which is had both from the national point of view and the international point of view.

Today, of course, there is this development of mighty weapons which we have not got, bet which the Western world and Russia have got. We have moved into a new phase of history. We have wars, cold wars, and cold wars have become abnominations, which everybody wants to avoid. Therefore, only tomorrow we are going to welcome the great leader of a nation. Why do we welcome him? For many reasons. Not because he is a great leader of a great nation, but fundamentally because he is a messenger of peace today in the world, and the heart of our country, which is so devoted to peace, goes out to him because he comes here with this message on his lips and in his heart. We have welcomed others too in that spirit. It may be that our ideas or views were not reciprocated from the other side, about peace or about friendship. Would this House advise, therefore, to function in a bellicose manner, aggressively, to show that we are strong and we can talk loudly? That surely is not the sign of strength. Strength comes in other ways.

Now, sir, this is the background. I want to make it clear-let there be no mistake in the minds of Hon. Members here-as to what the motive forces of our action and our basic policies are, because we believe firmly that peace is better than war, that war is unutterably bad. Nevertheless, if a country's freedom or its integrity, or its honour is attacked, we have to defend it with war, if necessary, and we have to defend it with all our might and have to prepare for that. In the ultimate analysis we came to the same conclusion either way. But it does make a difference whether the particular mental and other approach is for peace or for war. How that is from a larger point of view.

If you look at it from the strictly narrowest point of view of practical affairs, you arrive at the same conclusion. There are certain facts of the modern world which we cannot ignore, and one cannot, therefore, behave in a rather immature and juvenile way of shaking one's lists at everybody and threatening everybody even though that threat may be justified or the fist may be justified. That is one side of the question.

The other and the more practical side, as things are, is our preparation for meeting this contingency, this crisis in an adequate way with all the strength so that we can gather and increase that strength. That, as I said, is a military problem to some extent to make the most of our strength today and tomorrow, but it means ultimately-and let this be fully realised that it is not a purely military problem-it becomes a problem of utilising every ounce of energy in the nation. It means putting an end to every species of indiscipline that weakens the nation. It means-I use the phrase which I used in other place-a nation in arms, not in arms going about with a gun in hand of mental and physical arms for the affray, whatever happens. It means many great things that people have not thought of or talked of. It means our fashioning, whatever it is, our Five Year Plans, our budgets, our everything, in a different

510

way. It means austerity and hard living and hardship. I shall not quote the words of a famous Englishman about blood and sweat and tears, but it does mean that blood and sweat and tears to everyone of us if we have to face this contingency. Therefore, let us not do so light-heartedly, but with clarity of thought and firmness of decision and realising that at this moment these petty quarrels and criticisms are singularly out of place even though they might have their place at other times, because I find that curious contradiction in all the people so often, in what they are doing.

I find a contradiction in all our young men who sent me letters written in drops of blood to offer their lives for the defence of our country, and these young men behaving in a manner which would ruin any country if that behaviour went on for some time. It is utter indiscipline. It does not fit in with a crisis. It does not fit in with anything, crisis or not, but certainly at a time of crisis, it shows utter ignorance of or understanding of what is Happening. So, let us realise what we are in for. We shall work for peace. We shall work for settlements. We are not, I hope, going by a spurt of anger to be compelled to take wrong steps, but we shall work with all our might also for the strengthening of the country, and for the defence of the country.

If there appears to be in the minds of some Hon. Members some conflict between the two approaches, I do not agree with them. I do not think there is any real conflict. Both are essential approaches.- And if this House or Parliament thinks that these basic approaches are not correct, that some other approach has to be followed, then obviously the will of Parliament must prevail. But Parliament should then find means of enforcing that will or implementing that will. That is broadly the question.

Now, some little time back I mentioned what our responsibilities were, apart from the obvious responsibilities of defending India and Indian territory, I mentioned some names of some neighbouring countries. It is undoubtedly true that our responsibilities extend to these neighbouring countries, and it is not in a light-hearted manner that I mentioned them which add to the burdens that we carry, heavy as they are, but because these responsibilities were undertaken by us many years ago. We have to stand by them whatever the consequences-our neighbouring countries-Sikkim, Bhutan and Nepal. Now, each one of them stands on a separate footing and let us not mix them up. Nepal, of course, is an independent country just like India is independent and whatever it chooses to do in the exercise of that independence, we cannot come in the way. But, if I mentioned Nepal on the last occasion, it was because nearly nine years ago, there was a clear understanding between the Governments of Nepal and India on this point

There was no military alliance. It was a clear understanding which has been advantageous to both and in order to remove any doubts from Hon. membars' minds, I shall readout the words of that understanding. This treaty between India and Nepal, a treaty of peace and friendship, was signed on the 31st July 1950. I shall read the

first two articles. Article I states

"That the two Governments agree to acknowledge and respect the complete sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of each other."

Article 2 says

"That the two Governments hereby undertake to inform each other of any serious friction or misunderstanding with any neighbouring State likely to cause any breach in the friendly relations existing between the two Governments."

Now, apart from this treaty-but it is an essential operative part of that-there was an exchange of letters between the two Governments in identical language, as was the custom. In these letters there is this sentence:

"Neither Government shall tolerate any threat to the security of the other by a foreign aggressor. To deal with any such threat, the two Governments shall consult with each other and devise effective counter-measures."

This was the clear understanding arrived at and therefore I thought it desirable to state that. In fact I was a little surprised that people did not know this. The words may not have been known but the position itself was pretty well known and I want to make it perfectly clear that this understanding has nothing to do with any kind of unilateral action on our part. We cannot do it, we will not do it. We are going to take no step in regard to Nepal or in Nepal. That is for the Government of Nepal to decide but it is in mutual interest-it is stated in these letters and the treaty -for us to associate ourselves, first of all in knowledge as to what is happening, and secondly. in the counter-measures that might have to be taken. The Prime Minister of Nepal, the other day, said something on this subject and may I say

511

that I entirely agree with his interpretation of this position ?

Now for the last many years, we have laboured through Five Year Plans and the like, to build up the prosperity of this country as well as its strength because the two are allied. You cannot separate them, though of course you can Jay far greater stress on one aspect than on, the other but the base is the same, more or less. One may lay greater stress on arms production and less on such measures as may bring some relief to our people but the foundation is the same. We have arrived at a stage now when some kind of words, which have lately come into common use are often applied to India. That is, we are approaching what is called the 'take-off' stage, 'take-off' into a more or less modernist economy. Out of traditional economies, we march through various stages into an industrial and technological stage of production, etc. It is a very basic stage and a stage which, by the very virtue of the fact of our advance, brings all kinds of new problems. The problems that we face in our economic world are evidence of the progress we have made and are making and you will find that type of problem in every country which reaches that stage. When you cross a river, your hardest effort is when you are in the middle of the river facing heavy current, not when you are near one of the banks. That is where we are, and it is recognized, I think, in the greater part of the world that the progress we have made has been rather remarkable. We are not comparing with other countries like China. It may be, it probably is, that the progress China has made industrially. I mean the rate, is faster and the results are greater. I do not exactly know and I am not prepared to accept that as a fact but we have also, tied up with our industrial and economic progress, certain other conceptions of human dignity, individual freedom and all that and I take it that we are not prepared to give up those conceptions which we value. It is not for me to say what China or some other country might do but it is for us to lay down our own basic conceptions. Now one has to pay a certain price for these conceptions of human dignity and freedom. In fact those conceptions can only flourish, broadly speaking, in peace time. One of the first things that a war brings is the suppression of much that an individual stands for. and the progressive degradation of the human spirit. That is the result of a war, not only among those who fight but among others because nowadays wars are total wars, affecting every human being. In peace time one may argue about controls and all that. In war time they inevitably clamp down on everything because it is

a matter of life and death for the nation. No individual counts, no individual's freedom even counts except within limitations. It is not a good state of affairs. Let us realize that. The two great wars, the World Wars, have undoubtedly brought in a good deal of degradation in human relations, towards violence and hatred and all that. So we have to try to hold to our anchorage and to the ideals we hold and yet make good. That is the basic problem before us and that problem comes up before us at a time when there are new horizons all over the world. We live in an extraordinary and in a most exciting time when these new horizons are opening out, scientifically and otherwise. Old conceptions even, whatever they were-whether they were conceptions of military or other conceptions-are out of date with modern weapons. Economic conceptions are out of date in the modern world with new forces coming into play. Whether they are conceptions of the capitalist world or communist world, both to-day are out of date in this new horizon that is opening out and the new horizon that is coming into play.

I am mentioning all this because you have to consider every problem and more especially a grave problem like this, in this wider context of a changing world. We are changing in our own country. We are perhaps not so conscious of that change because we are in the middle of the change. Others see it better but we ought to be able to see the changing world at least and not be led away by old slogans and older concepts because people are in the habit, nations are in the habit, of repeating certain concepts and slogans to which they are used. They go on using the old rhetoric when the reason for that rhetoric is past. So you find in the world to-day a great ideological conflict that was taking place between the so-called communist world and the non-communist world still being referred to in brave phrases and words and yet progressively losing its edge. Countries adapting themselves to the new world when it is growing, go on using the old rhetoric sometimes, if I may respectfully say so, as men of religion sometimes go on using their old rhetoric, whether it is to the point or not. Although they adapt themselves to the new conditions, the words remain the same. So we find it here. Now in this state of affairs, when the world is in a fluid state. changing and new ideas and horizons are opening out, it is a peculiar misfortune that me should be

confronted with a situation which threatens military conflict and war. It is not our seeking, as the world knows. But whether it is of our seeking or not, we have to face it and we have to prepare ourselves for it with all our strength, all the time trying to find peaceful methods of solving all these problems. If those are denied and if those

512

are denied and if those are not available, then there is no choice left and we shall face that. But we shall face that. I hope, even then keeping the ultimate objective in view and not entirely letting go the old anchorage which has held us together. Great wars take place, bloody wars, but after the war comes peace. Nations come together to find some kind of peace, for they can not fight for ever. I remember a phrase which Mr. De Valera long years ago said in my presence. He said it was very odd how after each war people came together for peace. Why don't they come together before the war and settle it? It seems a simple way out, but it is a very wise thing. You first go through blood and disaster and then you come together and talk of peace. Anyhow, in the world as it is developing to-day, it would be a great misfortune if there was a world war. And that is why the major countries of the world and particularly the leaders among those countries, seeking peace to-day are the United States and the Soviet Union, and I believe the United Kingdom. These countries, all powerful countries, all highly developed countries, have come to this conclusion that the way of war is not a good way, and I believe that all three of these are determined to find a way out. We welcome that, and I would not like to do anything which comes in the way of that. It may be that some other countries are not so keen on these settlements. They live in some kind of fever or excitement. They have developed a kind of neurosis because of the fever, may be. But I do not want my country to develop any neurosis of that kind because it is not only bad in itself, but it is really discarding everything that we have stood for, and if we discard that, then we become without roots, national or anything. So I hope that however we may face this contingency and these dangers, we shall remember that basis, that root of ours which has helped us so much in the past.

CHINA INDIA USA RUSSIA GERMANY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BHUTAN NEPAL **Date** : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on India-China Relations

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on December 9, 1959 while replying to the debate on India-China relations :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to Hon. Members for all that they said in the course of this discussion even though some of it was in criticism of our policies and what I may have done. I am glad of their criticism. because it enables me to deal with certain aspects of this matter and to remove, possibly, some doubts that may remain in Members' minds. Naturally it is rather embarrassing for me to discuss personal matters, whether the personal matters refer to me or to a colleague of mine.

Now the Hon. Member opposite, Mr. Ganga Sharan, after paying me some compliments, mostly undeserved, said that-well-I was suffering from a certain rust, mental or otherwise, or bodily. Well, I am no judge of my mental or other condition, and if I have, in this opinion, lost the lustre that I once possessed, that is my misfortune. But Mr. Ganga Sharan perhaps wrongly thought that I was endowed with certain qualities or misjudged me in the past. I cannot function today as I functioned forty or fifty years ago. That is a natural result of the lapse of time. But so far as the policies are concerned, which I seek to pursue hard, I believe that they are in line with all that I have said and done in the last forty years, whether it was in the course of our struggle for our independence or later. I am too much rooted in those thirty years of our struggle to start on a new line in the later years of my life. Nevertheless, whether it was twenty or thirty or forty years ago, I was always trying to look to the future, trying to look to the future for which we were attempting to prepare India. That question always loomed before me-what of India's future, what do you want India to be, what do we want the world to be, although I was involved very deeply in the then din. Nevertheless, the future occupied at least half of my mind. I wonder how far that is the case with Mr. Ganga Sharan or Dr. Kunzru.

Mr. Shiva Rao gave a very relevant quotation from a speech by Sir Winston Churchill, the first speech he delivered when he became the war premier because of the last great war, when he said: "If the present sits in judgment on the past, it may lose the future". It is a wise saying from a man of great experience of war and peace, both. It does seem to me that the Hon. Dr. Kunzru is always so wrapped up in the past that he hardly has any idea of the future. Now it has been my misfortune not to have been able to agree with Dr. Kunzru in the course of the last forty years. I am not talking about minor agreements or disagreements; they may occur anywhere-but of a rather basic approach to life and its problems, a basic approach to India and its problems, a basic approach to national and international problems; for forty years we have differed, and forty years ago the Hon. Member differing from these new policies left the great organisation to which I had the honour to belong and have belonged all this

513

time. He did not agree, he had every right not to agree of course, as everybody has the right. But he cut himself away from the national current of the day because he did not look at the future; he did not look at the currents of life that were convulsing Indian humanity.

He judged me, Mr. Ganga Sharan, and tells me about public opinion. I should bow to public opinion, of course. What am I here except as a representative of public opinion, and the moment I do not represent them, I shall bow my way out and seek some other occupation-that is obvious. Of course opinions may differ as to what public opinion is. Naturally; and there is no single public opinion; it varies and agrees very seldom. There are varieties of public opinion as there are varieties of groups and classes and occupations and all that in a great country. Undoubtedly Shri Ganga Sharan represents a body of public opinion. Undoubtedly Dr. Kunzru represents a body of public opinion. Whether that body is small or big is another matter. The question therefore iswhen we talk about public opinion-to what public we refer to. Is the opinion of the masses or the city folk? Is it the opinion of a number of intellectuals ? Is it the opinion of a small group or a big group ? All these things arise. Is it the opinion of a few news. papers ? All that arises. I venture to think that I have, among my many failings, one quality, and that is judging public opinion having my hand or my mind on the pulse of public opinion, affecting and changing public opinion. Of course, it is wrong to be swept away by public opinion. If you consider it wrong, you have to resist it. But broadly speaking I try to keep in touch with public opinion and the public have been generous to me in this matter, not only in their affection but also in accepting often the advice I gave them. Therefore, I would submit let us not discuss here in balance what public opinion is. What I am afraid in the present instance, and I shall be quite frank with this House, is that here we are facing the gravest problems that a country can face. There was a brief but very important reference to this in Mr. Panikkar's short speech yesterday. We are facing one of the major historical changes of the world, of Asia, and of India. That is what we are facing, It is not a minor matter. Some people argue, some people say that it is a minor matter, a border raid, some killing. It is something very big, not in terms of that invasion or aggression or border raid. I am not going now into semantics and legal, wordy quibbling, as Dr. Kunzru was pleased to do vesterday as to whether any violation of the frontier is more or less not expansionism. Is that the way we deal with major problems of the day when the whole picture of the world is changing so far as India is concerned and India's borders are concerned ? That is a major issue that we have to face, to which reference was made by Mr. Panikkar. Here is a historical change of the greatest magnitude. For the first time two major powers of Asia face each other on an armed border. For the first time a world power or would-be world power sits near our borders and frontiers. It is quite immaterial whether we are friendly or not. Even if we are hundred per cent friendly with them, the fact remains that here is a mighty power sitting on our borders. That itself changes the whole context, the whole picture. That we have to observe and

see. And we are not a mean country or a weak country. So, we face each other there and we face each other in anger at the present moment, and we are going to face each other, not today or tomorrow but for hundreds and hundreds of years. Neither China nor India is going to walk out of Asia. That is the question of the present and that is the broad aspect. And I am glad that Mr. Panikkar, with his great experience of both these countries, drew attention to this major historical fact; that is, we are sitting or we are looking at these problems at a turn of history's wheel, a major turn which has never taken place in the past. Look at it from this point of viewnot this petty, quibbling point of vew of a little area being here or there, of what some body has said and somebody has not said.

Behind this, look at this other picture-both China and India trying with more or less success to move out of a traditional form of society with traditional structures as they used to be, into something new, because all over the world for the last hundred years, 150 years if you like or more, there has been this change from traditional forms to what might be called modern forms-I am using the word 'modern' rather technologically modern, scientifically modern-which has changed the face of the world, which has made the great powers as you see them today because of the technological advance. Now, I am not going into another and a deeper question as to whether technological advance, scientific advance, is enough for a country I should say not. The other forms, call them what you like, ethical, moral, spiritual, are necessary to give a country any sound foundation. And surely in the case of India, a country which has believed in that kind of thing, it is important. But I am going to discuss that. The major fact that I am pointing out is that here is this mighty change which has come over the world, over the Western world to begin with and now spreading over the Asian world--the advance of science and technology changing the ways of living, the methods of life and bringing the problems of higher standards, more food, more clothing, more of everything

514

that a man needs. And in the course of all this not only a nation's prosperity increases, but its armed power increases. Armed power to-day is above all based on technological advance. It does not matter how brave the people are in a country. If they are technologically backward, they are supposed to be weak and they are weak in that sense. Now, we see those changes coming over Asia, tremendous, mighty waves of change coming over every part of Asia in various degrees. You see in China a revolution one of the most basic and fundamental in history, taking place, something convulsing 600 millions of people. We see mighty changes in India, In the 400 millions, not in that violent way, not with those abrupt and violent methods, which we have seen in China, but nevertheless big changes, tremendous and revolutionary changes taking place in the whole structure of life here. And I doubt if even we who are to-day sitting in Parliament fully realise how the base of life in India is changing by a variety of things, by the spread of education by the spread of industry and all that. Now, in this background each of these countries is groping forward and when a country like India or a country like China gropes forward, it makes a change-too big not to affect the world-where these two mighty countries come against each other and face each other in an armed way, in anger. That is a major event of the world,

What is happening to-day perhaps in the world is that the centre of gravity of conflict is shifting from Europe to Asia. All these are major historical things and cannot be disposed of by petty arguments, petty criticisms and this or that. Here is the future unveiling itself, unravelling and bringing tremendous new problems which cannot be answered by any traditional way of thinking, whether in war or peace. Therefore, I would beg of Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha to keep this in mind because I have great respect for Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha. But do think that he is too rooted in traditional ways of thinking to realise the present or think of the future. And as for Dr. Kunzru, whom I have respected always and respect now, I have always somehow felt this difficulty that he loses himself in innumerable details and the big thing passes by unnoticed. So this is my difficulty. I shall deal with some of the points that Dr. Kunzru raised in so far as I can. But I do wish this House and this country to realize what. has happened and what is happening-I dislike it, this House dislikes it. I appreciate and I welcome the surge of emotion that has passed through this country because of these border troubles. A healthy community ought to react in this way, and having reacted in this way we should turn this

energy, this enthusiasm in the right, constructive direction, to build up and strengthen the country to face any peril or adventure that might come our way. But what troubles me is this turning of this enthusiasm into wrong channels, into effervescent channels which do not last, and sometimes cries are raised which I have fought against all my life when they were raised in other countries. And I am not going to accept those cries being raised in India because I am an Indian. I dislike jingoism, whether it is in England or America or Russia or China or India. I am not a jingoist; I do not want my country to be jingoist, and especially when the jingoism has not even any basis of that great strength to enforce it, it becomes ridiculous to talk in that way. We are not weak. I do not accept it when anybody says we are weak. We are strong enough to face any contingency partly because we have developed industrially and otherwise; we are stronger than we were some years before, much stronger, and may I say that the principal strength to which I attach importance has come to us, to our war machine, during the last two or three years.

Our war machine, as all war machines, depends on an industrial apparatus behind it. I am not talking about the general industrial apparatus of the country, but of the specialised, broad industrial apparatus. That has progressed more in the last two or three years than at any previous time, because more attention, organised attention, has been given to it. That is a thing which comes from a new approach. In this country in whatever line we move we are restricted, limited, con. strained, cabined by our old habits of government and everything. Whether it is the army, whether it is the civil structure-we have the advantage of carrying on with every kind of structure but-there is a very grave disadvantage of being cabined and confined by all this structure. It takes up all the time and we have to consider this matter today, more especially when we talk about policies and other things. But the real difficulty that comes in our way is the delay in the implementation of any policy, whether in the States or the government here because of procedures, all kinds of procedures. It has to go through so many grades of officials and others to get through, noting and all that. We all complain against it and yet, we find it exceedingly difficult to get out of it. This kind of thing does not apply, of course, to the Chinese Government. There is no Parliament to discuss

anything there. They decide and they order and it is done. And I am not talking that Parliament should not discuss it-of course not-and I was really talking about the difference in the whole approach there, how things can be done rapidly, whether rightly or wrongly. Our procedures have been inherited from the old British times. The

515

delay is there. Good procedures are there, good in the sense that theoretically they are good, good in the sense that they aim at perfection, perfection of the official procedure, checks and counterchecks, this must not go wrong, that must not go wrong. But they result in great delay and that is a very vital matter when we have to do things quickly whether in a peace situation or in a war situation. In a war situation, of course, all that has to go in a chain. So we are tied up. In the same manner, I submit, we are tied up in our mental processes, most people are. It is difficult to adopt ourselves to a world which is rapidly changing, and we are tied up in our mental processes also, because we represent, by and large, as we should, not only the urban people, the technical people in India, the new type of human being that has risen in this technological world in India, but we represent above all the rural masses of India. They require representation, of course. That is the principal problem. But we bring with that also the traditional mind. We see that great forces are at work which are changing India, changing China, changing Asia, changing the world. Therefore, we have to look at these problems in this wide perspective and realise that we have to prepare not for some trouble on the border to-day. But of course, we have to, to the best of our ability, protect our integrity, but this is the major problem of the future, of two nations armed facing each other. People say, why don't vou drive them out ? "Why don't you ?", as if it is some kind of a children's game and not realising what this means. If we can drive them out, they can drive us out of some place and we enter into theirs. So, I do beg of this House to get this broad picture of the vast historical change that has come in and that has to be faced.

We have got here to face a situation which can only be faced by strength. If that is so, we have to build up that strength as rapidly as possible, and we have to find out how to build up that strength. That strength can be built up in many ways-armies, etc.-but basically again, it has to be built up by the industrial background that you have. And remember always, that is not a question of today or six months or a year; years ahead we shall have to face this problem, peace or war. Apart from peace or war, whatever it may be, the facts are that two great nations face each other across a tremendous frontier and they are both pretty strong, stronger than in the past. Then bow are we to live ? Are we to live in permanent hostility or are we to find some way of existence as friends, if not as friends, as people who tolerate each other ? Now, look at this picture even in the wider context of the world. What is happening? All the world is talking about President Eisenhower's visit here. The visit of President Eisenhower would have been important at any time because he represents a great nation. He is a great man. But particular importance attaches to his visit today here, not because of our trouble on the border, but because he is moving about all over, at great trouble and inconvenience, is visiting a number of countries in Europe and Asia, because we feel that he is pursuing an ideology of peace. And that is why wherever he goes, he finds a tremendous welcome, not only from governments, but from the people, and that is why I have no doubt that this afternoon or tomorrow or the day after the people of Delhi will welcome him in their vast numbers, but not a formal welcome, but a welcome from the heart, because we welcome the messengers of peace, the builders of peace, and we feel that he is trying his utmost to achieve peace in spite of great difficulties. Why is all this turn taking place in the Western world? Why suddenly-not suddenly; but nevertheless, very rapidly-has the cold-war mentality gradually changed ? It has not gone, of course-of course, not-but the change has been remarkable in these last year or so. And everybody is hoping that as months pass, more progress will be made on the question of disarmament, on the question of stoppage of nuclear tests which is so vital, and in putting an end to this cold war. All over the world the masses of people hope that this will happen. They have had that hope, of course, for a long time past. But today a change is taking place with even governments; stolid as they are, they have been moved somewhat by popular emotion and by the facts of life facing them, and so, governments are also moving in that direction. Now. they are doing so, I take it, not because of, shall I say, humanitarian reasons or just love of everybody, and I hope this element of humanitarian reasons enter into them. But really governments function, shall I say, not for humanitarian reasons. That is supposed to be rather tough-the government way of dealing with a national question.

A minister may not be tough but Governments are tough and I suppose they have to be tough but Governments have come to the conclusion that this toughness in the present day does not pay. Toughness leads to consequences not on the other party but on themselves. Toughness might lead to utter destruction of themselves and their countries. Here is a great power, England, a nuclear power. What is the fate of England in a nuclear war ? Every Englishman knows that. They are brave people, they do not shout and complain. In a major nuclear war, England is destroyed just like any other country-of course not only England, I am merely mentioning England.

516

Here is one of the greatest countries in the world, a most advanced country, one of the most prosperous countries and even a member of the socalled nuclear club. Even that country cannot protect itself if there is a war. They can destroy others but they cannot protect themselves. A curious situation has arisen in this world. Therefore, these statesmen of the world of many countries are trying their hardest to get rid of these fears and suspicions and find some way of living with the people across their borders, some way of co-existence. There is no other way. And let us hope that they will succeed. Now I refer to this matter because you have to consider even your problems from the context of these larger developments because these larger developments will affect us, will affect China. It is not a question of, as some people. say, 'How can you put your trust in China'? It is not a question of trust at all. Frankly, first of all no country finally puts its trust in any other country. They may be more favourably inclined or less but in the ultimate analysis, they have always to keep a loophole in their minds that the other party will not play up or that other things may happen or national interests may come into play. The safer thing is for the national interests to be more or less in line with international interests. Where they conflict, you do not quite know what will happen. So it is not a question of my trusting China or not

trusting it but it is a question, nevertheless, of my realising that China and India, two great countries, are going through enormous changes which are strengthening them, making them powerful, modern power-States and they will be and they are next to each other and have to remain for millennia to come, for geological ages, next to each other. All these questions come up. This does not mean, of course, that we should think of what will happen hundred years hence and forget what is happening today. In the context of today, you have to take every possible step to protect your integrity, your freedom and your self-respect. That of course is so. That is common ground. I need not argue that. You may go into details as to how you do it but it is common ground that we should face this position and protect our country's territories, to the best of our ability and in that comes again a certain morale of the nation, a certain discipline, a certain unity and not constantly nibbing at each other and nagging at each other and blaming each other, because that is just the thing which undermines that very basis when you have to face a national crisis. Then you prepare for tomorrow also by our developing industrial growth and the rest. That is admitted. I do not refer to it because it is no good going on repeating the same phrases, but the basic thing remains. What is your picture of today, and what will be the picture tomorrow and the day after and you have to prepare for it because basically and fundamentally I know that we must work for peace in the world, we must work for peace on our borders and we must work but at the same time not talk about peace-if I may be forgiven for saying soin an Utopian way, just reciting a Mantra of peace and doing nothing. I do not believe that the weak can do anything worthwhile. A weak nation cannot do and even the cry of peace from a weak nation or individual has no influence on others. It is only when there is strength behind it, the strength of will and the spirit of the nationand organized strength of the nation, that its voice counts.

It has been an amazing thing and a surprising thing that India's voice has counted for so much in the councils of the world in the last several years since independence. Progressively it has counted for more and more without the material background of strength behind that voice. It has been a surprising thing how that has happened. We may have been taken in by it that we are getting bigger and bigger. We may have become conceited about it-there was some room for conceit, I admit-but the fact is that a country like India which in the modern world is in terms of physical might not to be compared with the great powers or with many of the armed nations, which cannot be even called great powers, a country which is poor and which is struggling hard to get rid of its poverty, how has this country's voice, with no great military might, with no financial or other resources, counted for so much in the world for the last few years. Whether it is in the United Nations or whether it is elsewhere, we are respected all over the world, let us remember that. Now there must be some reason for it. May be, you may say-well, I am not saying it but somebody may say that-that it, is clever diplomacy, it is cleverly putting ourselves across to others. May be, there is something in it not wholly. It may be due to the remembrance in the world of a mighty personality like Gandhiji and we shine by it or we have got something of the radiance that he possessed. It may be that we have spoken with conviction and earnestness and sincerity about peace and our desire for peace and our desire for tolerance and when we have talked about coexistence and all that, it was not a phrase in our mouths and lips. It was a deep feeling from inside our hearts and it was a deep understanding of the world as it is today because there can be nothing else but co-existence in the world. I do say it-because the emphasis is deeper-that there can be nothing else but Panch Sheel in this world. I say it with all the emphasis at my command. It may be broken by individuals or

517

nations. They will suffer if they break. The world will suffer. It is a different matter. So we have followed a policy not of the day, not of the moment, but a policy which looked into the future and millions and millions of people in other countries were affected by that. That looked up to India in a sense-they could get nothing out of us, not money, not arms-they looked up to us because they feel that India did have the courage to stand for something even though it was a poor country and a lightly armed country. There was something in that. It was the policy we pursued, the policy of non-alignment, the policy of coexistence, the policy of Panch Sheel, call it what you will, basically. It was-I will not say immaterial-largely immaterial all the same what

China did or some other country did about it. In so far as China is concerned, if China breaks that policy, that type of contact with us breaks-between China and India, but the policy is not wrong. We attained a measure of stature among nations So which normally nations do not attain unless they have financial power, industrial power or military power. We had none of these three, to any large extent. We attained that because of the policies we have pursued. Now so far as the world is concerned, the world judges of that policy not by some Sastric document preserved in our ancient archives. The world has heard of this policy from what the Prime Minister has said about it and the world has reacted to it from learning of it from my lips, from my writing and from statements made by me. Therefore the world has fallen out of step with Dr. Kunzru. That is my humble submission.

Now, Sir, I would beg this House to keep these broad pictures in mind. I shall briefly repeat them. There is the broad picture of the world undergoing a tremendous change. As I said yesterday, new horizons, new visions, come up, something almost going outside the scope of physical existence, when you talk of going to the moon and of scientific developments today. They almost take you to something which I do not know how to describe. I may call it the fourth dimension. We live in a three dimensional world and now we might almost be on the verge of the fourth dimension for aught I know. Anyhow there are two types of existence, two types of the experience which are beyond the normal experience of humanity, individuals apart. That is happening in the world today. Science says matter and energy are one and the same thing almost. We do repeat these phrases, not understanding them. So there is this change. Then there is this big change in the world, the change away from the cold war, in which the lead has been taken by these two great, the two biggest and strongest nations of the world-America and the Soviet Union. That is one aspect of it. The other aspect is this particular problem that is raised when China and India, if I may say so, come to grips with the problem of historical significance. That is represented today by the aggression or invasion of our territory, or call it what you like, by the violation of our territtory and all that. But behind that question-that is important enough and we have to face it but actually behind that stretches this vista of the future which I see all the time and I try to evolve

or meet this equation or see how to solve this problem. But I want this House and not only this House but millions of our people must have some glimpse of this, for otherwise they will decide wrongly. Otherwise they will lose all the enthusiasm and energy that they possess by taking shelter in jingoistic and chauvinistic cries. That would be a tragedy, a very grave tragedy, because we shall become a nation not of depth but of effervescence. We shall become a nation which has lost its anchorage. I am afraid of that kind of thing and that is why I talk about this sometimes in public and elsewhere. People think I am afraid of China or I am afraid of this or that, because I do that. I am elsewhere. People think I am afraid of China or of this or that, because I do that. I am not afraid of anything of that type, I am only afraid of our nation losing grip of the fundamentals in which it has believed. That is the only thing I am afraid of.

Now, may I refer briefly to some of the points raised. Dr. Kunzru referred to a certain Border Committee that was appointed. I shall tell the House about this committee. But I suppose enough facts have come out in the papers, in the White Papers and in the speeches here and in the other House to indicate that right from 1950, or at any rate from 1951, when the Chinese forces came into Tibet, we have had this problem before us. It has not suddenly come up before us this year or last year We have had this problem before us and this developing picture which I have put before you, of two power States emerging, two power States coming face to face with each other on a tremendous border. Ever since 1950, this has been the picture before us. We may have differed as to the timing in our minds, as to when this will happen, whether in 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years, it was difficult to say. But we had that picture. And looking through my old papers when this occurred, I was surprised myself to see how we had referred to these contingencies, 8-or 9 years ago, in our papers and how we had written to our Ambassadors in Peking and others, especially at Peking and asked for his reactions. In those early years of this present-day Republic, the Chinese Republic, Mr. Panikkar was our Ambassador there and I read

518

through his notes on the subject and our notes to him and our decisions. From the very first

day and all the time this problem came before us, about our: frontier. It is not a new problem. The question was whether we should raise it in an acute form at that stage. We decided whether it was right or wrong you can judge now, it is easy to be wise after the event, for hind sight is always easy to take. We decided not to, and still we do not see how we could have decided: otherwise. We might have done so, of course, but I do not see any reason yet. But with all the material that was before us at the time, we decided that we must make clear in every possible way that our frontier was in our opinion,: clear in our maps, clear in our statements, clear to the world and clear to China and clear to our own people, of course, and hold by it. stick by it. Why should we go about asking China to raise this question when we felt sure about it? Why invite discussion about a thing on which we had no doubt? But as I said, we might, with hind sight say that that was not a very wise policy, that is a different matter. The point is, this was discussed repeatedly in our notes, in our papers, and dispatches, I believe, if I may say so, Mr. Panikkar himself advised us at that time, "Yes, you need not raise it; but declare it openly." . We declared it in Parliament. We declared it before the Chinese Government and all that. And during all this period, remember, the only way this question came up before us was because of the Chinese maps. When we saw the Chinese maps, we protested and the answer always was "These are old maps which require revision and we shall, when we have leisure, revise them." But at no time during this entire period did they challenge our maps. They did not accept it in so many words but they never challenged it. And they never raised this question themselves and all that they said about their own maps was that these had to be revised. Now, I wish to admit that a lingering doubt. remained in my mind and in my Ministry's mind as to what might happen in the future. But we did not see how we were going to decide this question by hurling it in that form at the Chinese at the moment. We felt that we should hold by our position and that the lapse of time and events will confirm it, and by the time perhaps, when the challenge to it came, we would be in a much stronger position to face it. I may be perfectly frank to the House. It is not as if it was ignored or that it was not thought about. After the longest and clearest thinking and consultations with those who were concerned, between our

Ambassador and others, our Foreign Affairs Committee and others, we came to this decision. This was discussed again and again, after two or three years, whenever a new contingency arose.

Then came the period of the Tibetan Treaty or the Tibetan Agreement of 1954. Again we considered it at length. Should we bring this question positively into the front-the recognition of the McMahon Line? An Hon. Member I forget who, asked, "Why did you not ask them to recognise it?"

Well, what exactly was the quid pro quo? They were sitting in Tibet. Our telling them that we did not recognise it-would mean nothing. What were we supposed to say? It is not clear to me. Was it a question of non-recognition of the Chinese Government? Were we going that far ? "All right, we do not recognise you. We break off relations with you because you do not recognise the MacMahon Line" or, as some people going on saying, we do not recognise the Chinese sovereignty or suzerainty over Tibet. They were sitting there and our saying anything to them would make no difference. It is rather infantile to think that they would have been frightened by our saying something. The result would have been that they would have achieved their dominance over Tibet completely and the only thing is that we would have quarrelled with them and we would have come near breaking point with them. The trouble on the frontier would have come immediately, not now but years back we would have had to face it. So, this business of saying that we should have insisted on this and insisted on that, we should have asked them to guarantee this and guarantee that we should have made them commit themselves to this or that envisages all. kinds of ultimatum and the like being issued by us and their being compelled to accept that ultimatum. It does not fit in with the facts of life, with the facts as they are in Asia, in India, in China and in Tibet. I can imagine some argument being based on some high moral principles, regardless of what happens to India or Tibet or to anybody. That, of course, may be advanced but such an argument usually by itself does not influence Foreign Offices.

Now, Sir, some Hon. Members seemed to have an idea that there has been negligence and said that past negligence should not be repeated I really am not ashamed to confess errors; maybe we had been negligent here and there in various places but in our broad policy in regard to our frontiers, I do claim that we have not been negligent keeping this broad picture in view because any other step of a major character would have created a crisis earlier than we would have been prepared for it. You may say, and you would be right in saying, that we could have pushed ahead with more of road building or building lines of communications, etc. I think

519

we have been going on fast there.

But then, you should remember another aspect. It always becomes a question of balancing things. Here we are struggling with our Five Year Plans and the like. We have to balance and to see whether we should spend so much more on the development of a frontier area or in some other area which will bring in quicker results, say a steel plant of a fertiliser plant. One has to balance all these things. Maybe the balancing is wrong. One makes a guess; one has to judge. There is the danger of slow progress in one direction and the dangers in the frontier. All these things have to be done and one makes a guess About the future and goes ahead.

Now, Dr. Kunzru referred to the Border Committee Report. There was another Committee also. Last evening I got the report and looked through it again. The North and the North Eastern Border Committee was appointed in 1951. This committee made a large number of recommendations and these recommendations were examined by an ad hoc committee of Secretarics and finally by the Defence Committee of the Cabinet. An overwhelming number of recommendations made were accepted and implemented. Among the major recommendations were the re-organisation and expansion of the Assam Rifles, the extension of administration in the NEFA area, development of intelligence network along the border, development of the border areas, development of civil armed police, development of communications and check posts. Our position in regard to Nepal was considered separately. All these recommendations, barring a few, were accepted and they have been implemented some time ago. So far as the development of the border areas was concerned, the Ministry of Home Affairs took up this question with the State Governments concerned and provision was made for these in the Five Year Plans, the Centre giving substantial help. This development included road communications, schools, hospitals, tribal welfare, animal husbandry, etc. The construction of a number of roads was entrusted to army engineers, especially in NEFA. The Ministry of Transport was also entrusted with making a number of roads. Some of these roads have been completed, some are being constructed and a few were not accepted or not proceeded with, either for tactical reasons or because expenditure on the construction of such roads was colossal and out of proportion to the good that they may do. So, Sir, broadly speaking, it may be said that nearly all the recommendations made by the Committee were accepted and implemented.

Dr. Kunzru referred to what our representative said in the United Nations in regard to Tibet. He was surprised at it. First of all, I am afraid, our representative did not say the words which were quoted by Dr. Kunzru. That is neither here nor there but our policy in regard to Tibet was laid after full discussion in Parliament long before the question came up in the United Nations. I stated it-I am not quite sure if I stated it here or in the Lok Sabha-in answer to questions. We have discussed this clearly and we have laid it down also. We declared it publicly, in Parliament, in Press Conferences and the like and that is exactly what was repeated there. You might disagree with that policy; that is a different matter. I think that was a right policy and the only policy to be pursued but to state that this is something new evolved there is not correct. There is, Sir, an intimate relation between the domestic policies of a country and the foreign policies of a country. Sometimes they diverge a little but broadly speaking-presumably because there is the same mind behind both--they act and interact against each other and I have a feeling that the difficulty that some Hon. Members may have in appreciating my argument for the foreign policy we pursue really relates back to their difference in view about the domestic policies we pursue. I have no doubt about it in my mind. Not always, but in varying degrees it is there and you will find that even today, while I have ventured in all

humility to say that the foreign policy that we pursue is supported by the widest measure of public opinion that you can have in India-it has been supported and it is supported-there are minor criticisms.

The critics of that foreign policy, you will find-the major critics-are critics of our domestic policy also. They are tied up-the two things and I can understand that. That happens; some people think differently; it is not necessary for everyone to think alike in the country. There are parties that think differently, honestly, sincerely. But we must realise the urges behind it, the roots of the thoughts which govern their domestic outlook as well as their international outlook. And if they are different, they can convert me; I shall be happy. I try to convert them, sometimes with success, sometimes I fail.

Now, Sir, I have ventured to take up nearly an hour of this House and for the rest all I wish to say is that so far as the present situation is concerned, obviously we have to prepare for it to the best of our ability. On the one hand I have

520

referred so much to our industrial development even from the defence point of view. Now I want to expedite it, to hurry it up; I want Govern. ment procedures to become quicker in doing these things. I try to do it but it is a very difficult thing in a machine, in a huge machine, that has grown up from generations to-change it quickly. We have been changing it; we have changed it partly; we will change it more, I hope, and make it a swift-moving machine. We have to think again of the future, the next few years, how we are to face that future. We cannot deal with the issue today; we have to deal with it in the military sense today and we propose to give opportunities to our young men to be trained in the N. C. C., the Territorial Army or the Special Force that we may raise.

Sir, there is one fact which might be remembered when- people think so much sometimes of obtaining outside aid. Maybe they imagine that in my conceit I say that I will not take outside aid. Well, it is not for me to judge myself but I certainly have a little conceit about India's standing on its own legs. Of course I cannot say what in an eventuality we may do; that is a different matter but I do not want this idea to go out to our people that others will preserve our freedom, that others will help us, I do not want India to go on crutches. We have faced grave difficulties, grave crises, and survived them and I have no doubt at all in my mind that we shall survive not only because of the development we have got now and the way we are developing but more so be. cause I have got a fundamental faith in the Indian people. Therefore I am not worried; certainly I have to think and I have to take counsel in Parliament and we have to devise general ways of meeting such tests. So what I was saying was, it is an odd thing you talk of aid. The type of warfare we are dealing with is warfare which requires stout men, not machines very much. Certainly, some machines you want, not big machines. The type of aid that one gets from abroad are machines and in these mountain areas those machines do not reach. It they are big machines there is little good. We want stout and trained men, not only stout and trained men, but men of the mountains who are used to high altitudes, who are used to terribly cold climates, who are used to hardship. We want young men who physically are in A-1 condition. From the physical point of view our conditions are not generally A-1 or A-2 even. So this is the type of thing we want and we have got enough of them, I am sure, and I hope that we shall build up for the present our defence as much as possible in this way and build up our industrial apparatus for the future and while doing all that always aiming at a peaceful settlement, always aiming at peace, and not losing ourselves in some kind of vague chauvinistic or jingoistic ideas which will do enormous injury to our country and to the larger causes that we have supported.

CHINA INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEPAL PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Maltreatment to Karam Singh by Chinese

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on December 11, 1959 while speaking on an adjournment motion on the bad treatment given to Karam Singh by the Chinese :

This is a matter on which I can very well understand the desire and anxiety of the House to know what exactly the facts were. The first information that reached us, that is, 2 or 3 weeks ago when Shri Karam Singh reached Leh, I think, or Srinagar, was to the effect that he had been badly treated. It was a relatively brief report of what he said : not one sentence, it was longer than that-It was not a very full report. Immediately we sent that report to the Chinese Government and protested against this treatment. This House will remember, in the course of the debate, reference was made to the treatment of prisoners, Geneva Convention, etc.

Then, the reply to that was received a few days back, as I informed the House, I think, in which they said, no, we treated him well and generously, which of course, was directly contrary to the report we had received from Shri Karam Singh.

As the original report of Shri Karam Singh was relatively a brief one, without details we wanted to have an amplified and full report from him. We did not wish to trouble him too much immediately, because, the poor man was suffering in hospital. But, in the course of the last few days, some further particulars have been obtained from him. In fact, they have just reached us-I received the report just ten minutes ago. I have not been able to read it even. There is no doubt the first general impression is that the treatment accorded to Shri Karam Singh and others was bad : in fact, very bad. It seems rather a grim story of bad treatment. I should like, naturally, to consider his report which I have not read yet-I just got it 10 minutes ago-fully and to take such other steps in regard to it so far as the Chinese Government is concerned. It would be right and obviously desirable that I should take the House into our confidence in this matter. But, at the

521

present moment, I have not yet even read that

report, and it is rather difficult for me. I would suggest, if you will permit me to make a statement about this a few days later.

CHINA USA SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Treatment to Indian Police Party by Chinese Troops--Papers Laid in Lok Sabha by Prime Minister

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, presented to the Lok Sabha on December 15, 1959 the following papers relating to the treatment of the Indian police patrol party captured by the Chinese troops at Chang Chenmo Valley on October 21, 1959 :

- (1) Unofficial memorandum of the Chinese Government on 14 November, 1959.
- (2) Note of the Indian Government on 24 November, 1959.
- (3) Note of the Chinese Government on 28 November, 1959.
- (4) Note of the Indian Government on 13 December, 1959 along with statement of Shri Karam Singh.

The following is the text of the unofficial memorandum presented by Vice-Minister Chang Hanfu to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on the 14th November, 1959.

The following are the main facts about the border incident of October 20th and 21st in the area south of Kongka pass as admitted by the Deputy Commander of the Indian forces Karam Singh and the other eight Indian soldiers, Mohd. Khalil, Sonam Dorje, Rulia Ram, Tsring Nalbu, Gur Bahadur, Abdul Majid, Rudar Man, Shiv Dayal who were detained or captured in the incident. These main points fully confirm the account of this border incident given by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its memorandum of 22nd October, its note of 24th October and its statement of 26th October.

The Indian Military personnel involved belonged to the Indian Tibetan Boundary Force under the Indian Ministry of Home Affairs. They were led by Commander S.P. Tyagi and Deputy Commander Karam Singh. They started from Leh towards the end of September for Tsogstsalu, Kiam and Shamal Lungpe and the North East of Kongka pass to set up check-posts there and arrived at Kiam on 19th October. They had never been to the place before where the present clash occurred at south of Kongka pass.

On 20th October Mohd. Khalil, Sonam Dorje and a guide called Chadan were sent from Kiam to the area south of Kongka pass. Khalil and Dorje were each issued a rifle, ten round and a field glass. They admitted that they were sent for the purpose of reconnoitring the conditions of Chinese troops within Chinese territory. At 1300 hours that afternoon they were discovered by three patrolling Chinese Frontier Guards. The Chinese Frontier Guards shouted to them and waved to them to go away. The Indians failed to do so and were then detained.

On 21st October Tyagi and Karam Singh took more than 60 Indian troops to the area south of Kongka pass to search for the three missing armed Indian personnel. Before starting Tyagi expressed he had a mind to fight against Chinese troops. The Indian Military personnel carried with them four bren guns and about 50 rifles as well as two or three sten guns and 25 hand grenades.

When the Indian Military personnel approached a hill in the area south of Kongka pass they discovered six Chinese soldiers on the hill. Tyagi ordered Karam Singh to take 30 men to surround and capture the Chinese soldiers. They saw one or two Chinese soldiers waving their hands for them to go away. Instead of going away they pressed forward.

Then Indian soldier Ali Raza fired first. Another Indian soldier Manohar Lal caught a horse of the Chinese Frontier Guards. Thereafter fire was exchanged.

Chinese soldiers were equipped with no mortar and other artillery. They were armed with rifles, tommy guns, light machine guns and hand grenades.

The 9 Indian Military personnel were killed while they were attacking up hill target but the detained and captured Indian military personnel admitted that they had been given good treatment by the Chinese officers and soldiers during their detention.

The following is the Text of the Note handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India on 24th November, 1959 :

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and

522

have the honour to refer to the note which the Ministry handed to the Embassy on November 4, 1959, in regard to the incident, in the Chang Chenmo Valley. A first-hand account of the incident, received from the second-in-command of the Indian Police patrol party, was attached to that note. The Government of India have since received further accounts of the incident from the Indian personnel who had been captured by the Chinese forces on October 20 and 21 and released after several reminders on November 14. These accounts corroborate the earlier reports which had been given by the members of the Indian police patrol party who had retured to the base after the clash.

The Government of India would also like to refer to a Constable named Makhan Lal who remains still unaccounted for, According to the statement of Shri Karam Singh, he and Constable Rudra Man were made by the Chinese forces after the clash on October 21 to carry Makhan Lal who had sustained injuries for a distance of two miles. They were then made to leave behind Makhan Lal on a river bank. What happened subsequently to him is not known to any of the released personnel. The Government of India would like to have any further information which the Chinese authorities might have about Makhan Lal.

The Government of India are surprised and shocked to bear of the treatment to which the Indian prisoners were subjected by their captors. The prisoners were kept in torn tents in bitterly cold weather and without any bedding for four days. As a result of this, the leader of the party, Shri Karam Singh, and three Constables were severely frost-bitten. One of the prisoners, Constable Abdul Majid, who had a bullet wound on his back, received no medical attention until the fourth day. Besides, the prisoners were subjected to continuous interrogation from the time of their arrest till the time of their release. They were asked under threats and pressure to make statements to the effect that the Indian party had gone forward knowingly into Chinese territory and that they had sent two Constables and a Porter the previous day to carry out espionage there. The Government of India have no knowledge of the statements which the prisoners are supposed to have made to the Chinese authorities, but, obviously, statements made under such circumstances cannot be regarded as voluntary.

The Government of India protest strongly against the deplorable treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in Chinese custody. Under article 17 of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, a prisoner of war is only bound to give his surname, first names and rank, date of birth and army regimental, personal or serial number, or failing this, equivalent information. No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind. Whether or not the Geneva Convention applies to the Indian personnel taken prisoners by the Chinese forces on October 21, it is obvious that they should not have been subjected to treatment worse than that to which prisoners of war are entitled. It is most regrettable that the Chinese authorities should have subjected the Indian prisoners to interrogation, threats and harsh treatment in order to compel them to make statements desired by their captors.

The Ministry of External Affairs take this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

CHINA INDIA CHAD CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA SWITZERLAND

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The following is the text of the Note handed over to the Embassy of India in Peking on 28th November 1959

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China presents its compliments to the Indian Embassy in China and, with reference to the note delivered on November 24, 1959 to the Chinese Embassy in India by the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, has the honour to reply as follows:

In its memorandum of October 22, its note of October 24 and its statement of October 26, the Chinese Government gave detailed and incontestably correct accounts of the border incident which occurred at the Kongka Pass on October 20 and 21, 1959. The facts admitted by the captured Indian military personnel are in agreement with the accounts given by the Chinese Government. On November 14, the Chinese Government handed over to the Indian Embassy in China a written material setting out the facts admitted by the captured Indian military personnel and drew the attention of the Indian Government to it. It is proved by the material that the report of the second-in command of the Indian police patrol party attached to the Indian Government's note

523

of November 4 is completely inconsistent with the facts.

Out of traditional Sino-Indian friendship and humanitarian considerations, the Chinese Government on the third day after the Kongka pass incident already took the initiative in notifying the Indian Government that it was prepared to let the Indian side take back the captured Indian military personnel and the bodies of the Indian soldiers. The Chinese Government is gratified that they were handed over to the Indian side smoothly on November 14. However, the Chinese Government cannot but be surprised that, at a time when the Kongka pass incident is drawing to a close and the two Governments are actively exploring avenues to eliminate border clashes, the Indian Government should create a side issue by levelling a groundless charge and even lodging a strong protest against the Chinese Government on the pretext of so-called "deplorable treatment" of the captured Indian personnel. The Chinese Government categorically rejects this protest of the Indian Government.

Throughout the period of their custody, the Indian military personnel were given friendly and generous treatment by the Chinese frontier guards. The Kongka pass area was difficult of access and hard to get supplies, yet the Chinese frontier guards did their utmost to look after them in various ways. A few of the captured Indian personnel got frost-bitten. That was because their own outfits were very thin. As soon as the Chinese frontier guards obtained supplies, they issued to them cotton-padded suits, felt boots, beddings and articles of daily use, and gave them necessary medical treatment. In respect of board and lodging, they were treated in no way inferior to the Chinese frontier guards themselves. They were quartered in warm underground rooms or in complete new tents. The assertion that they were kept in torn tents is a pure fabrication. The Indian Government's statement in its note that Abdul Majid had a bullet wound on his back and went without medical attention for four days is also inconsistent with the facts. Majid never indicated that he was wounded or ill. As a matter of fact, his movements showed that he was whole and sound. The captured Indian military personnel all expressed more than once during the period of their custody that they were well treated. When they were handed over to the Indian side to be taken back, they all expressed warm thanks.

It is normal that the Chinese frontier guards conducted necessary interrogation of the captured Indian personnel to make clear the facts about the armed Indian personnel's trespass and provocation, as this was their duty. The captured Indian personnel were finally interrogated once again; this was only because there were important discrepancies between the report attached to the Indian Government's note of November 4 received by the Chinese Government and the facts as told by the captured personnel, and it was necessary to check it up with them. It is also merely for this reason that their handing back was postponed several days. The interrogations of them by the Chinese frontier guards were always made in a free and unrestrained atmosphere; so-called pressure or threats was completely out of the question. The Indian Government's allegation in its note that the Chinese frontier guards subjected the captured personnel to threats and pressure in the interrogations and gave them harsh treatment is an utterly unwarranted charge.

The Indian Government in its note expressed the hope of receiving any information which the Chinese side might have about an Indian military personnel who was unaccounted for. On November 13 when the representatives of the frontier guards of the two sides discussed on the border at the Kongka pass the concrete steps of handing over the captured Indian military personnel and the bodies, the Indian representative also made the request that the Chinese frontier guards search for the body of that Indian military personnel for the Indian side. The Chinese representative agreed then to make a further search. The Chinese frontier guards made an active search at and about the spot of the incident but still found nothing. It could be affirmed that this Indian military personnel was not on Chinese territory. The following day the Chinese representative informed the Indian representative of the result of the search, and expressed the hope that the Indian side might search on its own territory. The Indian representative agreed to this.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Indian Embassy the assurances of its highest consideration.

CHINA INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The following is the text of the Note handed over to the Chinese Embassy in India on December 13, 1959

The Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to refer to the note of the

524

28th November presented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Ambassador of India in Peking. The Government of India have now received full details from the released Indian police personnel as to the incident at Kongka pass and the subsequent treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in Chinese custody. These details confirm the account of the incident contained in the earlier notes. The statements of the released prisoners entirely contradict the assertion in the Chinese note that the Indian personnel were given friendly and generous treatment by the Chinese frontier guards. On the contrary the treatment which the Indian prisoners received was most harsh and inhuman and opposed to all canons of civilised behaviour. A text of the statement made by Shri Karam Singh, who was the leader of the Indian police party, is attached to this note. This statement is corroborated in substance by other members of the Indian party.

It will be seen from Shri Karam Singh's statement that the Indian prisoners were denied adequate food and shelter. It also appears that Shri Karam Singh was subjected to interrogation on 12 days for a total period of nearly 70 hours. Under threats and prolonged interrogation, he was made to subscribe to certain statements which his captors wanted him to make. He was further made to repeat similar statements on subsequent occasions so that these statements could be taperecorded. Attempts were made by the Chinese frontier guards to re-enact the incident at Kongka pass with the forced participation of the Indian prisoners with a view to taking photographs which could be used presumably as evidence in support of the Chinese version of the incident. Similarly, photographs of the prisoners arranged in various poses were taken presumably to show that the prisoners enjoyed certain facilities and amenities while in Chinese custody. The Government of India must state that no credence whatsoever can be given to any statement made by Shri Karam Singh or any other Indian prisoners in these circumstances. The certificates of good treatment which the prisoners might have given their captors at the time of release are equally valueless.

The Government of India are also surprised at the statement in the Chinese Government's note that Constable Abdul Majid was "whole and sound and never indicated that he was ill". In fact, Constable Abdul Majid received a bullet injury in the encounter and even now he has a splinter in his back. No medical attention was given to him for the first few days, and terrified at the treatment to which the arrested personnel were being subjected, he did not ask for medical care.

The note of the Chinese Government suggests that they are unaware of the whereabouts of Constable Makhan Lal who still remains unaccounted for. It will be seen from the statement of Shri Karam Singh that Constable Makhan Lal had received abdominal injury and was helped by him and Constable Rudar Man to walk a distance of nearly two miles. He was then left by the Chang Chenmo river in the custody of two Chinese soldiers as ordered by the Chinese escort. It is extraordinary that the Chinese authorities should now profess ignorance as to the whereabouts of Constable Makhan Lal. The Government of India would request that enquiry be made of the Chinese frontier guards once again as to the circumstances in which Constable Makhan Lal was left behind on the Chang Chenmo River on the 21st October and what happened to him subsequently.

The Government of India once again record their emphatic protest against the deplorable treatment to which the Indian personnel were subjected while in the custody of the Chinese soldiers. This treatment which the Indian personnel received was much worse than that to which even prisoners of war are entitled under the Geneva Convention of 12th August, 1949. It is obvious that the reports which the Chinese Government have received from their frontier guards, both about the incident and about the subsequent treatment of the Indian presonnel, are entirely unrelated to facts. The Government of India would urge that adequate action be taken against the persons responsible for subjecting the helpless Indian prisoners to such inhuman treatment.

The Ministry of External Affairs take the opportunity of extending to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The following is the full text of the Statement made by Shri Karam Singh

I reached Hot Springs on the 19th October, 1959. On the 20th morning, two parties of two Constables each and the third of two constables and a Porter were sent out to reconnoitre the area. Two parties returned but the third one, consisting of Constables Khalil and Sonam Dorje

525

and Porter Chettan failed to do so. The same evening search parties were sent out to look for them but they returned without any success.

Next morning (21-10-59), I decided to go out and search for the men myself. Shri Tyagi also accompanied me. We left with a party of about 20 men, including a section and some personnel of the ITB Force. We left instructions for the main party to follow on foot.

After I had gone about five miles to the east of Hot Springs, I noticed hoof marks which appeared to be those of the Chinese horses. We followed these hoof prints for a few hundred vards. We also observed the area through binoculars but we noticed nothing of special interest. After the main party had joined us, we advanced further into the plain which was overlooked by a hill. The hoof prints appeared to be running along the right of this hill. I, therefore, decided that I would, with about 20 men, follow them to find out whether there were any Chinese intruders in the vicinity. I told Tyagi to wait with the main party until I returned and to keep a look out for any signs of the Chinese; if he saw any, he was to demand the return of our missing members and to ask them to leave Indian territory.

I along with Jemadar Rulia Ram, Head Constable Man Singh, Head Constable Babu Wadkar and Constables Abdul Majid, Gur Bahadur, etc., followed the hoof prints which went along a track skirting the hill on our left. As we did not apprehend any danger, we were not marching in any order but were moving in twos and threes. I was not even carrying a weapon. When I had covered about six to seven hundred yards, and had almost passed the hill on the left, one of my constables noticed some movement in front along a nullah and shouted "Chini, Chini". I looked at all sides but before I could spot anything in front, I noticed on my left a Chinese soldier on the hill shouting something and waving his hands upwards as if he was asking us to raise our hands and surrender. I shouted back at the top of my voice that it was our area. Instead of receiving any answer, we were fired upon both from the front as well as from the hill top. We were taken by complete surprise and so all the members of the party made for such cover as was available and returned the fire. Some retreated towards the hill on the right. Jemadar Rulia Ram, Constables Abdul Majid, Ali Raza, Gur Bahadur Beg Raj and Norbu Lama ran with me and we took shelter behind a mound. Some of the others ran towards the hill on the left but were struck down with bullets and hand-grenades. Our firing was ineffective as we had inadequate cover and the Chinese were in a favourable position. After some time I ordered those who were near me to discontinue firing as their firing was having no effect and the ammunition was being wasted.

The Chinese continued to fire on us almost incessantly. We could also hear firing on the other side of the hill. Constable Ali Raza made a bid to get away in the afternoon and although he was fired upon, was able to escape. The Chinese used LMGs, rifles, tommy guns and hand-grenades. At about 5 P.M., firing from the front increased in intensity and a few bren-gun bursts were fired at us from our right and Constables Beg Raj and Norbu Lama were killed., Realising the overwhelming superiority in numbers of the Chinese soldiers and their fire power, I thought that it was futile to resist any further and, therefore, decided to surrender. We raised a white handkerchief after which the Chinese stopped firing and asked us to drop our: weapons and advance towards them with our hands raised. I, accompanied by Jemadar Rulia Ram, Constables Abdul Majid and Gur Bahadur surrendered to the Chinese. Later, Constables Shiv Dayal, Rudra Man and Tering Norbu, who were apparently lying concealed elssewhere, also surrendered and we were all herded together.

When we were being searched etc., I looked around And I thought there were about 30 Chinese soldiers in position on the hill. The soldiers that were on the side of the nullah were no longer visible to me. After our search, we were sent to Kongka Pass with an escort of 11 Chinese soldiers.

From the place of the encounter, five of us were made to carry the dead-body of a Chinese soldier who had been killed. Constable Rudra Man and I were asked to help Constable Makhan Lal, who had been injured seriously in the abdomen. His condition was really very bad. We carried him for two miles, where the Chinese soldiers ordered us to leave him on the bank of the Chang Chenmo river. Two of the Chinese soldiers stayed back near Makhan Lal and nine escorted us to our destination. From this place, I and constable Rudra Man were made to carry heavy loads. We were completely exhausted and were finding it extremely difficult to walk with this heavy load but we were repeatedly prodded by rifle butts to move on. We reached the Chinese Kongka La Post (above 16,000 ft.) at about 2 A.M. on the 22nd of October, 1959. We were all put together in a pit, 6 feet deep, 7 feet wide and 15 feet long, normally used for storing vegetables. It was covered with a tarpaulin which left several openings through which ice-cold breeze penetrated. We had to spend the night on the frozen

526

ground without any covering. No water for drinking was provided nor were we permitted to ease ourselves during the night and the following day. The sentries adopted a menacing attitude.

On the morning of October 23rd, all of us were taken out of the pit for the first time and taken to a place about two miles towards Lanak La. We remained there the whole day and returned to the pit at night. We do not know why we were kept away from the camp that day. During the day, I was merely asked through an interpreter to write out the names of the captured persons but I expressed my inability to do so for want of spectacles. I told the Chinese officer to take down the names, which he did.

On the evening of 24th, I was again taken out in a truck to a distance of about one mile, where the dead bodies had been laid out and I was asked to indentify them. As I could not identify all of them, I suggested that some constables may be called to help me in identification. They brought me to the camp and asked me to select a couple of constables. We went back along with two constables. Shiv Dayal and Gur Bahadur and identified the bodies. After this, we rejoined the others in the pit.

For the first 3/4 days, we were given only dry bread to cat. The intensity of the cold and our conditions of living were more than sufficient torture to demoralise us. By then I and 3 constables were suffering from frost bite and our repeated requests for medical attention and hot water were disregarded.

At about 4 A.M. on the 25th of October, 1959, I was called by two Chinese officers and taken for interrogation. I was removed to a tent about 50 yards away, where 5 Chinese officers, including an interpreter, interrogated me. One of them, at the very outset, threatened that I was P.O.W. and that I could be shot dead any moment. He also warned me that they did not want any arguments or discussions. They asked me to write out my statement, to which I pleaded my inability as I did not have my spectacles with me. At first, they asked me to narrate entire incident. As soon as I came to the point that firing was opened by the Chinese, their senior officer present became wild and shouted back that it was incorrect, and that I must confess that the Indians fired first. I refused to accept this despite repeated and constant threats that I would be shot dead. Ultimately, they made me to say that I could not judge at that time as to who fired first.

They asked me to admit that Indian soldiers seized Chinese horses, which were standing near the foot of the hill towards Chang Chenmo river. As I was on the other side of the hill, I told them that I had not seen anybody taking away the horses. Despite this, it was recorded that my men had disclosed to me that some Indian constables had taken away the Chinese horses.

Utmost pressure was used to extort from me that Tyagi and I knew beforehand that the place where the incident took place, was within Chinese territory. I told them that I could not make that statement because that place was miles within Indian territory but they continued to assert that it was Chinese territory and was in Chinese occupation. In this connection, it was finally recorded that "I have now come to know that the area, where the encounter had taken place, is under Chinese occupation".

The Chinese wanted me to acknowledge that no member of the ITB force had ever visited that particular area. I told them that only in June this year, an ITB patrol had gone upto Kongka Pass and stayed there for a day or so. They wanted to know if I myself had ever visited Kongka La and when I said that I had not, after a considerable discussion, they recorded-----"I and my men (who were prisoners with me), had never visited this area." I insisted that they should also write that I camped several times at Hot Springs and had toured the adjoining areas, but they did not agree to include this.

As regards the objective of our patrol, they wanted me to admit that we intruded into their territory to attack and capture the Chinese as well as to establish a checkpost. I stated that we had no such intention. In any case, it was our territory and the question of intrusion into the Chinese territory did not arise. On this assertion, they threatened me, but I stuck to the position that we were in Indian territory and were out looking out for the missing men. They then said that when fire was opened on us Tyagi and the main party were on the left of the hill and were advancing further in order to surround it. I told them that I could not see anything on the other side of the hill, and, therefore, there was hardly any point in obtaining a statement to this effect from me. As far as I remember, they finally recorded that though Tyagi did not tell me anything, it might be that it was his intention to send us from the right side and himself proceed on the left side in order to surround the hill and capture the Chinese.

The Chinese were emphatic that I should admit that they had gesticulated to us from the

527

hill to go back. I told the senior Chinese Officer, through the interpreter, that my party was advancing in small groups following the hoof marks and that the forward group with me had noticed some Chinese in front. Whereas it was quite correct that for a moment I noticed some gesticulations from a Chinese on the hill to my left, no time was given by the Chinese soldiers, to understand and to respond to the gesticulations. In fact, I had, at the top of my voice, shouted that it was our area. The answer to this was firing from in front and the hill to the left and rear. The Chinese officer lost his temper on this and said I was a cunning liar and threatened to take out his pistol and shoot me. I tried to argue that if their intention was to ask us to go back then they should also have allowed the patrol party to return and not have captured them. I told them that, in fact, the Chinese soldier was gesturing to us to raise up our hands and surrender and that is why I had shouted back that it was our area to which the reply was a hail of bullets. In the statement, however, the Chinese recorded that one of the Chinese soldiers on the hillock had waved his hand indicating that we should go back and not adopt a hostile attitude.

I was asked to admit that our action was against the spirit of 'Panch Sheel'. I told them that it was they who had opened fire on us ; it was they who had violated the principles. Ultimately they recorded that "the incident was against the spirit of "Panch Sheel'."

When they asked me my rank, I told them

that I was a Deputy Superintendent of Police and was the Second-in-Command of the I.T.B. Force. Shri Tyagi was the Commander of the ITB Force. I had already decided to conceal the fact that I was the leader of the party to avoid interrogation about the Police and Army dispositions 'and I had warned those captured with me to refer to me as the Deputy Commander. The total number of men in the party that had left Hot Springs in the morning was about 60 and this was recorded.

This interrogation lasted from 4 A.M. to about 4 P.M. with short breaks for meals, etc. By this time, I was almost frozen and mentally and physically exhausted because of cold, persistent interrogation, intimidation, threats and angry shoutings, and the lack of sleep. In this condition I was compelled to sign the statement recorded by the Chinese. At the end of this interrogation, the Chinese then brought all the other captured personnel before me and read out the statement, sentence by sentence. I was asked to translate each sentence in Hindustani. All the captured Personnel were Asked to append their signatures on the back of the statement and several photographs were taken.

After this interrogation, I was separated and put in a tent where insufficient bedding was provided. The tent had a big opening at the top round the central pole to act as a chimney but as there was no fire in my tent, this hole made the tent unbearably cold.

My interrogation was continued in my tent on the 26th from 0730 hours to 1700 hours. I was also told that my interrogation would continue the next day and until it was concluded, I would not be provided with a proper bedding.

On this day I was made to sign the following statement, as far as I can remember :-

Tyagi returned after having a meeting with Mr. Sharma in Now Delhi on the 22nd September, 1959. I returned from Srinagar on the 24th September, 1959 Tyagi informed me that a decision had been taken to establish check-posts at Tsogstsalu, Kayam (Hot Springs) and Shamul Lungpa. We left Leh for patrolling the border area and for establishing check-posts at these places. Tyagi left Leh on 27th September, 1959 while I started on the 29th September, 1959. Tyagi had about 40 men with him. Three constables accompanied me. I reached Phobrang on the 4th October. Tyagi arrived on the 5th of October, 1959. Tvagi started from Phobrang for Tsogstsalu on the 7th October. I left Phobrang on the 14th October and arrived at Tsogstsalu on the 16th October, 1959. A check-post was established at Tsogstsalu and we left for Kayam. We established a check-post at Kayam and we had to establish one at Shamul Lungpa. On 20th October, 1959, our two men missed. On the morning of 21st October, 1959, Tyagi took 60 men and reached the hill (battle field). When we were at a distance of about 400 yards from the hill, some Chinese were seen. Tyagi ordered me to take some men on the back side of the hill and to surround the Chinese and himself went in front. There were some 30 men with me and about the same number with Tyagi. We surrounded the hill. A Chinese was seen waving his hand so as to say "go away and do not adopt hostile attitude." I have heard from my men that the Indian soldiers fired first.

528

Some Indian soldiers took away the horses of the Chinese."

I protested that as regard firing, none of my men had told me that Indians fired first but they rejected the plea and said that they had obtained confessions to that effect from other-captured personnel. When requested to confront them with me, I was told that as I was a prisoner I had no such right. Similarly, I pointed out that the story of surrounding the hill etc. was also not correct but to no avail.

My interrogation started next day (27-10-59) at about 0800 hrs. and it lasted for about three hours. The entire period was devoted. to ascertaining from me the details of the ITB organisation.

My interrogation was resumed at 0800 hrs. on the 28th October, 1959, in my tent by three Chinese, two of them were officers and the third an interpreter. The interrogation lasted 5 hours and was confined to ascertaining the details of the check-posts.

Information was also obtained from me in regard to the strength of the checkpost, arms and their functions and was only noted down in their own language.

The same afternoon, all of us were take not the Chang Chenmo river where the dead bodies had been laid out. We were asked to remove their uniforms and wrap a muslin cloth in accordance with Indian custom. At our request hot water was supplied to give a bath to the dead bodies. A number of photographs were taken while we were busy in this operation.

In the evening, they issued as the following

Item of clothing :

- (i) Cotton-padded coat.
- (ii) Cotton-padded pant.
- (iii) Cotton-padded caps.
- (iv) Namda Gum boots.

I did not take these because items offered to me did not fit. Either on this day or the next a doctor examined my feet which had swollen up and administered an injection. Photographs were taken.

On the 29th Morning at About 0900 hrs. the interpreter came to my tent and delivered some sweets as a gesture of goodwill. After some time, a new face together with the previous officers and the interpreter came to me. This lime, two Stenographers had also been brought to take down my statement. This officer introduced himself as Commander of the Tibetan area. His questions were confined to details regarding our checkposts and thier strength. I repeated the details as given on the previous day. He also enquired about the strength of the army. The Chinese disclosed to me, for the first time, that the Foreign Ministries of both the countries were in correspondence with each other about us (captured persons). The interrogation lasted for about 2 hours. I was not made to sigh any statement.

At about 1300 hours on the same day

(29-10-59), I was taken out of may tent together with Constable Shiv Daval and escorted by three Chinese soldiers to the scene of the incident in a truck. The new officer, who had examined me in the morning, occupied the front seat of the truck and four other officers sat with us in the rear. After reaching the place, I was made to stand, even though it caused me intense pain, near the base of the hill on the Hot Springs side and was ordered to point with my hand towards the hill and a photograph was taken, (as if I was pointing towards the Chines who were on the top of the hill). I was then taken to the base of a small mound behind which we had taken shelter when fire was opened on us. Constable Shiv Dayal was asked to take a lying position about 50 paces away from me towards the hill. I was given a handkerchief and asked to wave it as if to give a signal to the men to open fire. A snap was then taken. Constable Shiv Dayal was then taken to the place where one of the killed ponies were lying and another photograph was taken together with the dead pony. Then, the senior officer drew a sketch of the hillock and the adjoining area showing positions of the Indian and the Chinese soldier at the time of the encounter according to the Chinese version and got the same signed by me and Constable Shiv Dayal. Photographs were also taken of a few Chinese soldiers gesticulating from the hill. Late in the evening we returned to the camp.

My interrogation was resumed on October 30 morning at about 0800 hrs. and it lasted upto 1300 hrs. They questioned me again about the strength of each post. They also obtained my signature on a statement to the effect that the post at Hanley was established in June this year.

On November 1, interrogation started in the morning as usual. The senior officer had by then gone away. The other Chinese officers and the interpreter pursued the interrogation. I was asked

529

how we could claim this area when we had never visited it. I told them that I had myself gone beyond Lingzi Thang with about 10 persons in 1957 and upto Shamul Lungpa in 1958 where we had established a checkpost which remained there throughout the summer and was withdrawn during the winter. They asked me if we had set up any bounday pillar at Shamul Lungpa or Lingzi Thang and I told them that we had not done so because our boundaries extended hundreds of miles further. The interrogation lasted for about 5/6 hours. The following statement was briefly recorded and signed by me :-

"In 1957, I visited Lingzi Thang with 10 men and stayed therefor a few days. In 1958, I visited Shamul Lungpa, where we stayed for four months. On this occasion also there were about 10 men with me. We did not construct any huts at any place nor did we construct any boundary pillar at these places."

The Chinese said that Phobrang was our last post, and that we had no right to cross Marsimik La because the entire area beyond the pass was a part of Sinkiang and that this could be verified even from the older residents of Ladakh. I told them that our claims were based on authentic documents and, therefore, our maps were correct. They disposed of my argument by saying that our claims were based on demarcation by the British, who had usurped a lot of territory of Sinkiang and Tibet. They ridiculed our maps and said that these could be drawn by anybody while sitting at home. It was on this day that I was repeatedly asked about my maps and documents. I told them that I did not bring any such papers with me because I was well conversant with the area. The Chinese showed great anger during this discussion.

On the morning of November 2 at about 10.00 hrs., all the captured persons were brought to my tent. The interpreter then asked them in my presence whether it was a fact that all the dead had received bullet injuries in front which indicated that they were wounded while advancing towards the Chinese. To this, they replied in the affirmative. They said that they had wrapped up the bodies themselves and had actually seen the wounds. I was asked to attest their statement. I resisted, but was made to sign the following :-

"All of our men had received wounds in the front during the battle which indicated that they were wounded while advancing towards the Chinese."

Afterwards those who had bathed the dead

bodies disclosed to me at the first possible opportunity that in fact the injuries sustained by our men were on the front, back and sides and some had had parts of their heads blown off.

The same afternoon we all were taken out in the sun and made to sit in a semi-circle. Two watermelons were cut and distributed amongst us and a photograph was taken.

On November 3, the Chinese asked me to sign the following statement :-

"Chinese troops were armed with rifles, tommy-guns, LMGs and hand-grenades only. No heavy artillery or mortars were used by them during the battle."

I appended my signature as automatic weapons and hand-grenades had been used against my party and I was not aware whether any mortar had been used.

There was no further interrogation. In the afternoon we were taken out in the sun and given a lecture on the Sino-Indian friendship. On this occasion, I was pointed out to a new person dressed as a Chinese soldier. This person replied in the negative after looking at me. Later, this man was heard conversing in Ladakhi and remained at the camp throughout our stay there.

On the morning of Nevember 4, interrogation started at about 0800 hours. Only the interpreter examined me. He insisted that I should record in my own hand-writting the main points of the statement I had already signed. I pleaded I could not do so without my spectacles, but when he urged me again and again, I told him that as I was a prisoner they could force me to do anything, but it was not fair in view of their professed friendship for India. Ultimately, I scribbled down the following prepared statement which the interpreter had brought with him:-

"On 20-10-59, two of our men missed. Tyagi took about 60 men with him. I accompanied him. When we were at a distance of about 400 yards from the battle field a few Chinese were seen. Tyagi ordered me to take some men on the back of the hill. He himself proceeded to the front. We surrounded the hill. I have heard from my men that Indian soldiers fired first. Some horses of the Chinese were taken away by Indian soldiers. I have nothing but to thank the Chinese officers and soldiers for the kind

530

treatment that they had given us. Medical facilities were provided to us and we were neither beaten nor coerced."

The same afternoon I was again interrogated by the Chinese Officers and the interpreter. They brought a statement for my signature which included a sentence that on the 21st October, 1959, when we left our camp, Tyagi had disclosed that he was determined to fight the Chinese. I refused to sign it. They then took me down to a nullah threatening me on the way that they would dipose of me there. They threatened that I and my men were guilty of having killed their Second-in-Command and, therefore, it would be quite legal for them to shoot me. When I did not yield, he compromised to change the wording "Tyagi might have had an idea to fight the Chinese". It was extremely cold in the nullah. I was almost dying with pain in my feet and so I agreed to sign the amended statement which was as follws:--

"On 20-10-59, two of our men missed. Tyagi took 60 men with him with heavy arms including four bren-guns, four stenguns, about 50 rifles and hand-grenades. I also accompanied him. Tyagi might have had a mind to fight against the Chinese. We surrounded the hill where a few Chinese were seen. According to our men, Indian soldiers fired first. According to Shiv Dayal, constable, it was Manohar Lal, constable, who took away the Chinese horses."

After that I was taken back to my tent and I was given a quilt. But in spite of this quilt the cold in the tent, where I had been kept since October 25, was so intense that I requested that I should be sent to the pit and this was conceded.

Right from the 25th October, 1959, pressure was brought to bear on me daily to confirm that Constable Mohd Khalil and his companions had been sent to Chinese territory for spying and that our object was to establish a checkpost in Chinese territory. After the first two or three days, they dropped the question of the checkpost and said that I might confess to the espionage mission. I told them that this was not a fact but that the patrol had been sent out to ascertain whether there were any Chinese patrols on Indian territory. They told me that they had already obtained a confession to this effect from Constable Mohd. Khalil and all that they needed from me was confirmation. I did not have to sign any statement to this effect.

On the same day, the Chinese Officer drew a sketch of the encounter on the same lines as was done by their senior officer on October 29, but on a bigger scale. After completing the sketch, signatures of all of us were obtained. My photograph was taken as I was signing.

On the afternoon of November 5, I was again taken out for interrogation which lasted three were ascertained, On this day, the interrogator addressed me as the famous man of Ladakh.

On November 6, they took us all to the Chang Chenmo river. I sat on the bank of it and the others were asked to stroll along the river in a leisurely manner. The escort was kept away and a movie picture was taken in order to show that we had freedom of movement.

On the morning of November 7, we were again taken to the bank of the river where a Chinese Officer using a Ladakhi interpreter and Constable Shiv Dayal as Hindi interpreter, gave a lecture on communism, condemning landlordism and capitalism. A rosy picture was painted of the communist regime. During the same lecture, it was prominently brought out that even now when India was a free country, the British and the Americans owned a number of industrial concerns and that there were still a number of Indian capitalists and landlords. The lecturer said that he hoped that India would get rid of these evils and prosper on the lines of China.

In the evening (November 7), I was taken out from the pit to a tent and informed that Constable Abdul Majid had confessed that the first shot was fired by Constable Ali Raza of our force. I refuted this and said that Constable Abdul Majid be called to state this in my presence. Consequently. Abdul Majid was summoned and when questioned in my presence, he said that what he had actually stated was that Constable Ali Raza had fired back long after the Chinese had opened fire. On this, the Chinese Officer got enraged and threatened to thrash Abdul Majid. He lost his nerve and admitted that Ali Raza had fired first. I was then forced to sign the following statement : --

"Constable Abdul Majid had stated that it was Constable Ali Raza who fired first. I believe that his statement is correct.

Then constable Shiv Dayal was brought before me and was asked to confirm his statement that the Chinese horses had been taken away by

531

Constable Manohar Lal. Shiv Dayal insisted that he had not said so rather he had stated that he saw Constable Manohar Lal touching a Chinese horse. On this, the Hindi interpreter was sent for, who also confirmed the statement of Constable Shiv Dayal. Therefore I refused to sign the prepared statement in possession of the Chinese interpreter which was that according to Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal had taken away the Chinese horses. Instead, I signed a statement as follows :-

"According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Manohar Lal, Constable of the ITB Force was seen touching a Chinese. horse. I believe what he states is correct."

Another lecture on Communist indoctrination was given on the morning of November 8.

At about 6 P.M., I was segregated from my companions and taken to a tent nearly 50 yards away. They then disclosed to me that the Government of India in their note to the Chinese Government had admitted that I was the Officer Commanding of the ITB Force. As I had from the very beginning given myself out as the Deputy Commander, I tried to modify the statement by giving the following explanations :

(a) That I was a Deputy Superintendent of Police and so was Shri Tyagi. In his

absence, I was always called as Officer Commanding.

(b) My promotion was due and it was possible that my Government may have promoted me since.

I was not made to sign any statement in this regard.

After this I was returned to the pit and Jem. Rulia Ram and Constable Shiv Dayal were taken to the tent for further interrogation about my exact designation. Jem. Rulia Ram on return informed me that the Chinese tried to argue with them that I was older than Tyagi in age and so how was it that Tyagi was senior in rank to me. They maintained that I was the Second-in-Command.

In the afternoon of November 9, we were informed that another senior officer had arrived and that we would be produced before him to make our statements.

It was either on November 9th or on the 10th morning that at about 0800 hours the Chinese took away Jem. Rulia Ram, Constable Shiv Dayal, and Abdul Majid and Mohd. Khalil informing them that they were to be released. In fact, they were not being released but were taken to the place of incident where a number of snaps and a cine film were taken to show that the Indian party had attacked the Chinese. They also took along the dead body of the Chinese soldiers in a coffin and it was used during the filming,

At about 8 p.m. on November 10th, I was again taken out of the pit and escorted to a tent by two Chinese sentries who threatened to shoot me. Only one mattress was provided. My interrogation was immediately begun by one officer and an interpreter. They repeatedly threatened me to accept that I had sent the patrol into Chinese territory for spying but I refused to agree. They kept on interrogating me the whole night through ; and I was given insufficient bedding, I was in great agony from the cold and pain in my feet,

At about 0700 hours, I was compelled to write out the following myself :-

"I and Tyagi started for patrolling of the border for establishing checkposts at Tsogstsalu, Hot Springs (Kayam) and Shamal Lungpa. on 29th and 27th September, 1959. We established a checkpost at Tsogstsalu and arrived at Hot Springs where also we established a checkpost. On the morning of 29th, our two men missed. Tyagi took about 60 men, 4 bren-guns, about 50 rifles, 4 sten-guns and grenades. I accompanied him. Tyagi may have had mind to fight against the Chinese. (They wanted me to write that Tyagi was determined to fight but I did not agree). I went to the back of the hill. We surrounded the Chinese. A Chinese was seen waving his hand so as to say "Go away ; do not adopt hostile attitude". According to Constable Abdul Majid it was Constable Ali Raza who flred first. According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal was seen touching a Chinese horse. Chinese troops used only rifles, sten-guns, LMGs and hand-grenades during the fight. They did not use any heavy artillery or mortars. ITB Force knows that area north, south and east of Kongka Pass, is a part of China. I and my men had never visited this area (battle field) before "

532

The interrogation was continued till about 11.00 hours when I was made to add the following paragraph to my statement :-

"I and my men have good treatment by the Chinese Officer and soldiers. I will never do anything which is against the five principles of the Sino-Indian Agreement any more nor I will enter Chinese territory again."

Before concluding, I was told that my statement would be tape-recorded some time that day and that I must answer questions exactly as in the statement written out by me. I was feeling very depressed and did not refuse to comply. In the evening at about 16.00 hours, a new face, reported to be their senior officer, came into my tent together with the interpreter. He also brought a doctor along who dressed my frostbitten feet and movie and still pictures were taken. After this, a tape recorder was brought in my tent and the following conversation was recorded :-

Q. Give brief details of the incident.

A. On the morning of 20th, a few of our horses were found missing and we sent two constables and a coolie in search. They did not return. On the morning of 21st, Tyagi and I started for their search with about 60 men. We had four bren-guns, three or four sten-guns, about 50 rifles and hand-grenades.

Q. What was Tyagi's intention?

A. He did not express his intention to me although inference could be drawn that he may have had an intention to fight.

Q. Who fired first?

A. According to Constable Abdul Majid, Constable Ali Raza fired first.

Q. Do you know some Chinese horses were taken away by the Indian soldiers ?

A. According to Constable Shiv Dayal, Constable Manohar Lal was seen touching a Chinese horse.

Q. Did the Chinese use any heavy artillery or mortar ?

A. Chinese soldiers had rifles, tommy-guns, bren-guns and hand-grenades. No heavy artillery or mortars were used by them.

Q : Did you and your soldiers surround the Chinese soldiers ?

A: Yes.

Q : What did the Chinese do when they were surrounded ?

A : The Chinese soldier was seen waving his

hand.

At this stage, I was told that further questioning would be done the next day.

On the night between November 11 & 12, all my companions were taken out one by one from the pit for tape-recording their statements. Before they were actually, taken each one of them was properly tutored and warned that he must stick to the statement that had already been signed.

After my statement had been tape-recorded, I was returned to the pit on the 11th evening and proper bedding was provided.

There was nothing of particular interest the next day.

On November 13, at about 1500 hours, we were all taken of the pit. All of us were given a small towel each, sweets and cigarettes in the presence of a senior officer. Both movie and still pictures were taken. Then we were taken to another tent where a meeting was held. A tape-recorder had been fixed in this tent. The senior officer said that we would be released the next day but before that we wanted to hear our ideas and views, especially about the incident. I was asked to speak first in Hindustani. When asked about the incident, I said "One cannot clasp with one hand alone, and there is no fight without mistake on both sides. Both sides should be careful in future".

After that Rulia Ram and Shiv Dayal spoke briefly. There was nothing of interest in Rulia Ram's speech. Constable Shiv Dayal said, if the Chinese had not captured their men, this encounter would not had taken place as they had no plan to come in this direction. At this stage, as the Chinese felt that in my presence the men were not making statements to their liking, I was asked to go back to my pit and rest there. On the 13th evening, I was persuaded to accept the Namda boots which I did.

On the morning of November 14, we were

533

worked up at 0400 hrs. and asked to get ready. A meal was served at 0430 hours. We were informed that we would be released at 10.00 hours, Peking time. We were taken in trucks to the place of

handing over. The dead bodies and our arms and ammunition were also taken.

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinghai-Tibet Highway

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on December 1, 1959 on the Chinghai-Tibet highway:

On the 27th of November the Hon. Member. Shri R. Goray, tabled an adjournment motion in the House, based on the newspaper report about the Chinghai-Tibet highway. In that news, paper report it was suggested that this was across Indian territory. I stated in the House that, according to my information, this did not pass through Indian territory, that it was an entirely different route and had nothing to do with the other route which might be in the people's minds, which goes across the Aksai Chin area. In fact, the Chinghai-Tibet highway goes through the north east of Tibet. We have enquired about this matter further, and what I have stated in this House has been confirmed. The Chinghai highway is nowhere near Indian territory.

CHINA USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Swedish Prime Minister's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India the Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Tage Erlander accompanied by his wife paid a visit to India during December, 1959. On December 19, a State Banquet was held in honour of Mr. Erlander by Prime Minister Nehru.

Welcoming the Swedish Prime Minister, Shri Nehru said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, a few days ago we had the privilege of welcoming with great warmth and cordiality the distinguished Head of a great nation Today it is a peculiar pleasure to us to welcome you, Sir, and Madame. Your country is not nearly as big as the United States of America or India, but we have long learnt to attach value not to bigness but to other qualities in a nation. And among those qualities your country appears to possess many in an abundant measure. You have built up a society which is free, democratic, progressive, and which has ensured to its people a high standard of living and social security. Two and a half years ago I visited your country and you were good enough-and your people-to give me a warm and a cordial welcome. I saw that beautiful country, little bit of it, and more especially, I was naturally interested in the scheme of social security and the great advance you have made in the co-operative movement and in so many other things in which you are distinguished.

I said then, I remember, that in this changing world where Governments change, frequently and Prime Ministers come and go, the Prime Minister of India had managed to stay-on for a long time. In that matter, you, Sir, as Prime Minister, are a year ahead of me. I believe you have been Prime Minister for over 13 years now, and I have been Prime Minister only for 12 years. Before that for many years you were a Minister also, and it is during the period of your stewardship in Sweden that great reforms have been introduced more especially in the realm of social security and high standards have been obtained, All this has been done in a society, in a structure of government, which is as free as any in the world and where everyone has opportunities for progress and advancement.

I venture to compare your long period of stewardship in Sweden with mine, which is somewhat lesser, but when I think of this I would wish that the tremendous achievements which you have brought about in Sweden during your period might have been ours also. But our achievements naturally cannot compare of course, the backgrounds have been different-and we had to stand and start at a very much lower level. But I believe it is true to say that in so many things, in some of our basic policies, whether external or internal, in our outlooks there has been a very great deal of similarity. Indeed, if I may say so we look upon your country as a model State to which kind of State we would like to aspire in India in many ways. Your people

534

have had one rather unique experience which, I doubt, if many countries or any country has had. You have been free from war for 150 years. Even though tremendous and disastrous wars raged all round you, yet you kept yourself out of them, not through any weakness, but through strength of will and policy and strength of the nation. As a result of that and your other qualities, you have built up Sweden as she is today, and now you follow a policy which is dear to us and which we have tried to follow firmly and propose to follow in the future, that is, a policy of non-alignment which is sometimes rather mistakenly called neutrality-non-involvement in military alliances and non-alignment. And so, wherever we have had occasion to work together, whether in the United Nations or elsewhere, there has been a great deal of co-operation between our representatives and delegations on these border matters, whether it is this policy or whether it is a policy of the banning of nuclear weapons or of progressive disarmament, or some thing in regard to which your country has declared its policy with the greatest firmness-its opposition to racial inequality.

So we have worked together in many fields, and we have tried to learn many things from your country's example and the way you have built up social democracy in that country.

I hope the time may come when we might also take some pride and pleasure in advancing much more along that line. In that process I am sure we can learn much from you and we propose to do so. So, for a variety of reasons, we welcome you and Madame here. And one thing also which has struck us is that, in spite of your high standards, in spite of the many things you have achieved in agriculture and industry, yet, in a sense, if I may say so without disrespect, you are a simple people, not pompous as some of us are, dignified and there is certain graciousness about the life of your people which is not always evident in the world today. For all this and for your own self, Sir. who has been such a builder-up of modern Sweden, we welcome you.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of Sweden and Madame Erlander.

SWEDEN INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Mr. Erlander's Reply

Replying to the toast, His Excellency Mr. Tage Erlander, Prime Minister of Sweden, said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

May I just say a few words thanking you for the kind words you addressed to my country just now, Mr. Prime Minister. If we Swedes have succeeded in some way to build up a social welfare State, you have yourself given the explanation. We had peace for more than one hundred and fifty years, and this has given us the chance, not our own ability and cleverness.

I believe it is a very good idea, for not only the Prime Minister of that little Sweden to come here, but even for the statesmen from the big countries, the United States and the Soviet Union, who have come and tried to learn from the wisdom of India or the wisdom of the Prime Minister of India.

You have given us a great honour by inviting my wife and myself to come to India, I wish to express our sincere gratitude for that gesture of goodwill and friendship. We recall with great pleasure the visit you paid to Sweden more than two years ago. That visit made a deep impression on the minds of my countrymen and stirred our interest in the life and work and beliefs of the great Indian people. If I say that we do, indeed follow your national developments with keen interest and warm sympathy. The first is that we are aware of the important role which India has to play owing to her key position in world affairs. We find that your approach to international problems, be it inside or outside the United Nations, often coincides with our own. As your relative weight and influence is much greater than ours, it is only natural that we study your words and actions with particular interest.

The second reason is our knowing that what you do under your five-year plans-that great experiment of speedy economic development, social welfare and democracy in action-may well be one of the most significant contributions to a happy and peaceful evolution in the whole of Asia. And there are features of those plans which will have an inspiring effect on political developments in many other countries. I am thinking of the expressed purpose of the plans to engage the enthusiasm of the whole people and to mobilise dormant energies in the broad masses for its realisation.

Just because we feel this kinship with your ideals and your strivings, I think I have the right and also the duty, to share with you some of our

535

thoughts, hopes and misgivings in the face of the great problems that beset the modern world.

One used to say in the 1920's and the 1920's

that peace was indivisible, This statement may have been true or not at that time, but today there is no doubt whatsoever that it is a correct description of the kind of world we live in. The growing interdependence of all nations is dramatically demonstrated by the man-made planets that circle our little planet. None of us can now escape the consequences of any conflict in however remote a part of the world we have a common stake in peace everywhere we have a collective interest in a system of collective security. We don't have that system yet, for the simple reason that the powers have not been willing to give up enough of their sovereignty.

There is a long road ahead of us before the principle of the rule of law will guide international action as it now guides internal developments in countries like yours or mine. Instead, the security of the world rests on the modern version, of the old concept of the balance of power. This modern version, the nuclear equilibrium, is unstable and precarious. If it is to be preserved at all and, even more, if it is to develop into an order where we may really live free from fear, two conditions have to be fulfilled. One is that we all consciously strive to look objectively and with goodwill at each other. Nations can't afford any longer to misunderstand each other and to let necessary caution be degraded into absolute distrust. The risks are too great. We may not be certain that trust creates trust with the same automatic precision that mistrust breeds mistrust, but we have to try again and again the road of confidence, of understanding, of trust, of frank talk and of direct contacts between responsible leaders. In that way we may at least be able to remove some of the causes of international friction, knowing well that there will remain many other conflicts where national interests can only be harmonised by careful negotiation and cornpromise.

The second condition I am thinking of is that any use of armed force to settle international conflicts must be avoided. No spark should be allowed in a powder house. Political pressure and military incidents can easily lead to consequences which are neither foreseen, nor desired by any party. War no longer solves any problem. If we carry this painfully acquired knowledge with us into the future, then we may face even the nuclear age with confidence. I thik, Mr. Prime Minister, I may be allowed to say this although I represent a country which has built up and maintained, by considerable financial and personal sacrifice, a relatively strong defence preparedness. However, there is no inconsistency here. Only if our territorial integrity or national freedom is attacked, do we intend to make use of armed force as is the right of every country.

I am happy to know that the Indian people, by instinct and by cold reasoning, share our conviction about the need for an international order based on peaceful cooperation and the avoidance of violence. It is my sincere hope that the future trend of events, both in the West and in the East, will reflect . these principles in a growing measure. Some recent developments in the world, but by no means all developments, seem to indicate that this hope is not entirely without foundation. I have in mind the agreement on the Antarctic which has just been concluded between all the interested parties. I also think of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations to set up a committee on outer space where India and Sweden serve together with several other countries including the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Finally I want to refer to the hopeful development of the talks in Geneva on the cessation of atomic tests, which incidentally is another matter on which Sweden and India have worked together in the United Nations.

Agreements such as these provoke a feeling of solidarity and companionship between the participating countries and produce a climate favourable to further cooperation for common aims. They create, as it were, vested interests in peace. We should, I believe, approach the economic problems of the world in the same spirit, recognising the close interdependence between nations and continents also in this field. We should start and keep up the momentum in the direction towards a world of peace, security and prosperity.

Let me finish these few remarks by saying once again how grateful I am at the warm welcome that is given to me.

May I ask all of you to join me in a toast to the health of you, Mr. Prime Minister, to a

happy future for the Indian people and to the friendship between our two countries.

536

SWEDEN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND PERU

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

President Eisenhower's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, paid a visit to India from December 9 to 14, 1959. On December 10, President Rajendra Prasad held a State Baquet in honour of President Eisenhower at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Speaking of the occasion, the President Dr. Prasad said:

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

May I on behalf of the people and the Government of India extend to you once again a hearty welcome to our country. Our Prime Minister had the privilege of visiting your great country, Mr. President, two years after India achieved independence, and then again in 1956. Through all these years it has been the hope of the people of India that the President of the United States of America would be able to visit and honour us with his presence, and see for himself the high regard in which the people of India hold the American people. It is for the first time in history that a President of the United States of America is visiting our ancient land and we are indeed happy that you have been able to come.

It has been our pleasure and privilege to have you, Mr. President, amidst us only for a little over 24 hours and I may assure you that within this short time you have been able to create an impression the impact of which is going to be of a far-reaching character in cementing the bonds of friendship that exists between your country and mine.

Between the United States and India friendly and cordial relations existed even before India gained her independence. No Indian can forget that in the days of our struggle for freedom we received from your country and your people a full measure of sympathy and support.

We have, Mr. President, much in common in our aims and ideals. Like yours ours is a democratic country, a Federation and a Republic. Our two Republics have a common faith in democratic institutions and the democratic way of life and are dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom. We admire the many qualities which have made your country great, and more especially, the humanity and dynamism of your people and the great principles to which the fathers of the American revolution gave utterance. We wish to learn from you and to enlist your co-operation and sympathy in the great task we have undertaken in our own country.

Our struggle for freedom was based on the principles of peace and non-violence and behind us is the centuries old tradition of peaceful living. We believe in the message of peace and freedom in the right of every man and woman to peace and happiness in life. In international affairs, we have endeavoured to follow these principles. In the United Nations and in other international forums, whenever freedom has been menaced or justice threatened, we have raised our voice in the defence of these sacred principles, principles which enshrined in the consciousness of our nation as they are in the hearts of the American people. We believe that the interest of mankind lies in not resorting to war and bloodshed to settle differences. Indeed, today when distance between country and country has almost been eliminated, security could only lie in a warless world.

We are happy that you, Mr. President, whose humanity and whose distinguished and devo-

ted service to the cause of peace have won for you a unique place among the statesmen of the world, and the leaders of other great and powerful nations have been meeting and will be meeting soon in an endeavour to end the cold war and to achieve world cooperation, so that the tremendous advances in science and technology could be directed towards the economic and social progress of the people all the world over. For us, as indeed for all others, it is imperative that world peace should be assured; that there should be no more wars, great or small. It is gratifying, therefore, to discern indications that the great nations and their state men are applying their minds and bending their energies in the direction of discovering means and creating conditions for lessening tension and, in due course, eliminating war. You, Mr President, are making your own invaluable contribution to it and it will be a happy consummation when we could all sing in joy that "peace hath her victories no less glorious than war."

We in India are engaged in an economic revolution of vast dimensions. This is a stupendous task which, because of our arrested growth, demands that we catch up more rapidly with the advanced nations in an effort to raise the

537

standards of living of our people. We value the co-operation and assistance we have received from the American people. We greatly appreciate the friendship and goodwill which your great country has always extended to us. These have strengthened the invisible yet unbreakable bonds of undersstanding between your people and ours.

I thank you again, Mr. President, for having found the time to come to our country. I earnestly hope that you will see glimpses of the changing face of India. I feel confident that your visit will enrich further the deep friendship between our two countries. May I ask you to take back with you a message of affection, friendship and goodwill from the people of India to the people of the United States of America ?

May I, Mr. President, also thank you for the noble and inspiring message which you delivered to our Parliament this afternoon ? I was listening to it and as I was listening to it, I was feeling what a great impact it was going to make on not only the relations between India and your country but on world politics at large. I felt all the time as I was listening to it that you have come at a very very opportune moment in history and I hope that your visit will bear all the fruit that you expect of it.

USA INDIA OMAN

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

President Eisenhower's Reply

Replying to the toast. President Eisenhower said:

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen-ladies and gentlemen that I hope from this day forward I can call my personal friends:

First, Mr. President, may I thank you sincerely for the over-generosity of the remarks you have made about my country and about me. I assure you that with whatever talents the good Lord may have endowed me, the effort that I shall make for the peace of the world shall never cease.

As you say, I have been in your great country only a little more than twenty-four hours, but the welcome accorded me, the things I have seen and the places I have gone, the distinguished citizens with whom I have talked, make this short time an unforgettable experience for me.

In the hours I have been here, I have had the privilege of paying my tribute to your late great leader Mahatma Gandhi and feeling the serene beauty of the Memorial erected to him. I have talked with you and your colleagues, leaders in the victorious struggle for political independence and in the present striving for economic wellbeing. I have visited your Parliament and have spoken with the men and women there who are together working for the common goal of India and America: peace and friendship, in freedom.

Everywhere I recognize a remarkable unity of purpose as the people of India work together to build the sort of country envisaged by her Constitution. Of course, Ambassador Bunker and others who have lived here had already told me about some of these things. I suppose I had grasped the significance of their words as well as one could who had not himself seen and felt what they had felt and seen.

But, in a scant twenty-four hours, the strength of India's spirit, which seems to me to be compounded of faith, dedication, courage and love of country, has been borne in upon me in a most remarkable way. It is a spirit which will not be denied-no one who has felt it could fail to be uplifted by it.

And Mr. President, I should say, too, that this idealism that I felt is not merely one of academic theory, it is a practical idealism. All around me I see evidences of India on the march. I hear of fertilizer plants being built, production in your agriculture multiplied. I hear of students being sent abroad so that they may come back to you with new techniques and disciplines-professors and other technicians have been brought in by your government to help in this whole great work.

To my mind this is the kind of idealism that translates itself into the good of people, to give them the opportunity for the fulfillment of their own destiny in the best possible way.

And you, Sir, are the Head of a great Republic. To its present world position you have contributed much. Distinguished lawyer, devoted fighter for independence, and President of India fashioned out of years of struggle and now advancing in the light of a grand vision, yours is a life upon which a man may look with satisfaction and a feeling of accomplishment.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to raise your glasses and drink with me to the health of the President of India and Mrs. Prasad.

USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

President Eisenbower's Address to Parliament

President Eisenhower delivered the following address before a Joint session of Parliament on December 10, 1959.

With a sense of high distinction I accepted the invitation to address you. I deem this a great personal honour, and a bright symbol of the genuine friendship between the two peoples you and I represent.

I bring to this nation of 400 million assurance from my own people that they feel the welfare of America is bound up with the welfare of India. America shares with India the deep desire to live in freedom, human dignity and peace with justice.

A new and great opportunity for that sort of life has been opened up to all men by the startling achievements of men of science during recent decades. The issue placed squarely before us today is the purpose for which we use science.

Before us we see long years of what can be a new era; mankind in each year reaping a richer harvest from the fields of earth...gaining a more sure mastery of elemental power for human benefit ...sharing an expanding commerce in goods and in knowledge and wisdom...dwelling together in peace.

But history portrays a world too often tragically divided by misgivings and mistrust. Time and again, governments have abused the fields of earth by staining them with. blood and scarring them with the weapons of war. They have used a scientific mastery over nature to win a dominance over others ... even made commerce an instrument of exploitation.

One blunt question I put to you and to all everywhere who like myself share responsibility assigned us by our people:

Must we continue to live with prejudices, practices and policies that will condemn our children, our children's children, to live helplessly in the pattern of the past-awaiting possibly a time of warborn obliteration ?

We all fervently pray not. Indeed, there can be no statesmanship in any person of responsibility who does not concur in this world-wide prayer.

Over most of the earth, men and women are determined that the conference table shall replace the propaganda mill; interternational exchange of knowledge shall succeed the international trade in threats and accusations; and the fertile works of peace shall supplant the frenzied race in armaments of war.

Our hope is that we are moving into a better era. For my part, I shall do all I can, as one human working with other humans, to push toward peace; toward freedom; toward dignity and a worthy future for every man and woman and child in the world.

If we give all that is within us to this cause, the generations that follow us will call us blessed. Should we shirk the task or pursue the ways of war-now become ways to annihilation and race suicide-there may be no generations to follow US.

I come here representing a nation that wants not an acre of another people's land; that seeks no control of another people's government; that pursues no program of expansion in commerce or politics or power of any sort at another people's expense. It is a nation ready to share its substance in assisting toward achievement of mankind's deep, eternal aspirations for peace and freedom.

I come here as a friend of India, speaking for

180 million friends of India. In fulfilling a desire of many years, I pay, in person, America's tribute to the Indian people, to their culture, to their progress, and to their strength among the independent nations.

All humanity is in debt to this land. But we Americans have with you, a special community of interest.

You and we from our first days have sought, by national policy, the expansion of democracy. You and we, peopled by many strains and races speaking many tongues, worshipping in many ways, have each achieved national strength out of diversity. You and we, never boast that ours is the only way. We both are conscious of our weaknesses and failings. We both seek the improvement and betterment of all our citizens by assuring that the state will serve, not master, its own people or any other people.

Above all, our basic goals are the same.

Ten years ago, your distinguished Prime Minister, when I was his host at Columbia University in New York, said

539

"Political subjection, racial inequality, economic misery-these are the evils we have to remove if we would assure peace."

Our Republic, since it founding, has been committed to a relentless, ceaseless fight against those same three evils: political subjection; racial inequality; economic misery:

Not always has America enjoyed instant success in a particular attack on them. By no means has victory been won over them and, indeed, complete victory can never be won so long as human nature is not transformed. But in my country, through almost two hundred years, our most revered leaders have exhorted us to give our lives and our fortunes to the vanquishment of these evils. And in this effort for the good of all our people we shall not tire or desist.

Ten years have passed since Mr. Nehru spoke his words. The pessimist might say that, not only do the three evils still infest the worldentrenched, and manifold; but that they will never lose their virulence. And the future, he might conclude, will be a repetition of the past; the world stumbling from crisis in one place to crisis in another; given no respite from anxiety and tension; forever fearful that inevitably some aggression will blaze into global war.

Thus might the pessimist speak. And were we to examine only the record of failure and frustration we all would be compelled to agree with him.

We Americans have known anxiety and suffering and tragedy, even in the decade just past. Tens of thousands of our families paid a heavy price that the United Nations and the rule of law might be sustained in that Republic of Korea. In millions of our homes there has been, in each, the vacant chair of an absent son who gave some of the years of his youth that successful aggression might not come to pass. The news that, through these ten years, has reached us in America, from near and distant places, has been marked by a long series of harsh alarms.

These alarms invariably had their source in the aggressive intentions of an alien philosophy backed by great military might. Faced with this fact, we in America have felt in necessary to make clear our own determination to resist aggression through the provision of adequate armed forces. They serve, not only ourselves, but those of our friends and allies who, like us, have perceived this danger. But they so serve for defensive purposes only. In producing this strength we believe we have made a necessary contribution to a stable peace, for the present and for the future as well.

Historically and by instinct, the United States has always repudiated and still repudiates the settlement, by force, of international issues and quarrels. Though we will do our best to provide for free world security, we continue so urge the reduction of armaments on the basis of effective reciprocal verification.

Contrasting with some of our disappointments of the past decade, and the negative purposes of security establishments, Americans have participated, also, in triumphant works of world progress, political, technical and material. We believe these works support the concept of the dignity and freedom of man. These hearten America that the years ahead will be marked by like and greater works. And America watches, with friendly concern, the valiant efforts of other nations for a better life, particularly those who have newly achieved their independence.

Ten years ago India had just achieved independence; wealthy in courage and determination but beset with problems of a scale and depth and number scarcely paralleled in modern history. Not even the most optimistic of onlookers would then have predicted the success you have enjoyed.

Today, India speaks to the other nations of the world with greatness of conviction and is heard with greatness of respect. The near conclusion of her second five-year program is proof that the difficulty of a problem is only the measure of its challenge to men and women of determined will. India is a triumph that offsets any world failure of the past decade; a triumph that, as men read our history a century from now, may offset them all.

India has paced and spurred and inspired men on other continents. Let anyone take a map of the earth and place on it a Rag wherever political subjection has ended, racial prejudice been reduced, economic misery at least partially relieved--in the past ten years. He will find evidence in the cluster of these flags that the ten years past may well have been the most fruitful in the age-old fight against the three evils.

Because of these ten years, today our feet are set on the road leading to a better life for all men.

What blocks us that we do not move forward instantly into an era of plenty and peace ?

540

The answer is obvious. We have not yet solved the problem of fear among the nations. The consequence is that not one Government can exploit the resources of its own territory solely for the good of its people.

Governments are burdened with sterile expenditures...preoccupied with attainment of a defensive military posture that grows less meaningful against today's weapon carriers. Much of the world is trapped in the same vicious circle. Weakness in arms often invites aggression or subversion or externally manipulated revolution. Fear inspired in others by the increasing military strength of one nation spurs them to concentrate still more of their resources on weapons and war-like measures. The arms race becomes more universal. Doubt as to the true purpose of these weapons intensifies tension. Peoples are robbed of opportunity for their own peaceful development. The hunger for peace justice and goodwill inevitably become more intense.

Controlled, universal disarmament is the imperative of our time. The demand for it by the hundreds of millions whose chief concern is the long future of themselves and their children will I hope, become so universal and insistent that no man, no Government, can withstand it.

My nation is committed to a ceaseless search for ways through which genuine disarmament can be reached. And my Government, even as I said more than six years ago, in April of 1953, still "is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction."

But armaments of themselves do not cause wars...wars are caused by men.

And men are influenced by a fixation on the past, the dead past, with all its abuses of power; and its misuses of responsibility; all its futile- convictions that force can solve any problem.

In the name of humanity, can we not join in a five-year or a fifty-year plan against mistrust and misgiving and fixation on the wrongs of the past? Can we not apply ourselves to the removal or reduction of the causes of tension that exist in the world? All these are the creations of Governments: cherished and nourished by Governments. Nations would never feel them if they were given freedom from propaganda and pressure.

My own experience in the past ten years convinces me that much of the world's fear,

suspicion, prejudice, can be obliterated. Men and women everywhere need only to lift up their eyes to the heights that can be achieved together; and ignoring what has been, push together for what can be.

Not one wrong of years ago that still rankles; not one problem that confronts us today; not one transitory profit that might be taken from another's weakness should distract us from the pursuit of a goal that dwarfs every problem and wrong.

We have the strength and the means and the knowledge. May God inspire us to strive for the world--wide will and wisdom that are now our first needs.

In this great crusade, from the history of your own nation, I know India will ever be a leader.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN KOREA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dr. Radhakrishnan's Welcome Speech

Welcoming President Eisenhower on behalf of the Members of Parliament the Vice President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, said : Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Members of Parliament, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My first duty is to offer a most cordial welcome to President Eisenhower on behalf of this Parliament, the people and the Government of India, Yesterday evening we had a memorable experience; the reception given to him was impressive beyond words. It shows how the people of this country have warm and friendly feelings towards him, whom millions regard as symbol of democracy, peace, and freedom. Our relations with the United States have been friendly all these years.- The United States herself emerged from colonial status to independence after a struggle; so she had sympathy for all nations who struggled for independence. During our struggle, we had the moral sympathy and support of the people of America and the Government of America. After Independence, in our attempts to build an economy suited to the new expectations of our people, we have received assistance from them

541

also.

Even as social disparities resulting from inequalities of wealth and opportunity affect the stability of a nation, the gaps between advanced nations which are rich and the desperately poor nations are an obstacle to the security and stability of the world. So it is we who have to look upon the world as a single unit for economic affairs. This is admitted in theory, but not implemented always in practice. We, in our country, have been attempting to raise our standards of living, increase employment opportunities by the encourage ment of business, agriculture and industry. We do so within the framework of free institutions.

If you look at our Constitution, Mr. President, you will see there echoes of your Constitution, equality of opportunity, respect for law, individual dignity, social justice and progress. The bond of shared ideals is stronger than military pacts, Mr. President.

As a great General with a knowledge of the nature of war and a knowledge of the modern weapons of destruction, you know the unintelligence, the futility, the stupidity and the waste of war as a method of settling international disputes. You are new, therefore, attempting with all your wisdom and great authority to reduce international tensions and bring about disarmament.

But recent events in the East as well as in the West may not encourage optimism, but they do not forbid hope. It is with that hope you have undertaken this long journey, visiting distant countries and explaining to our people, the peoples of the different countries you visit, the passionate interest which you and your country have in peace and human welfare.

Of course, there is only one way for peace,that is, co-operation and understanding between nations. We should not lose heart, we should never despair, we should never lose patience. Human nature is not unchanging. Political institutions are not exempt from the law to which all other things are subject. If you understand the resilience of human nature, the mutability of social and political institutions, the healing power of time and the mercy of Providence which keeps a constant vigil over the fortunes of this tormented troubled and turbulent world, we may yet be spared the fate of nuclear annihilation, universal death, and step into a new and better world.

We greet you, Mr. President, as the servant of that new and nobler world. We assure you of our wholehearted co-operation in your attempts to secure peace. We wish you god-speed in your efforts.

USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Vote of thanks by Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar

Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, extended a vote of thanks to President Eisenhower after be addressed the Members of Parliament :

The following is the text of his speech:

On behalf of the Members of Parliament, I express our grateful thanks to you, Mr. President, for the very inspiring and reassuring address that you gave us this evening. As the Supreme Commander, you won the Great War. We pray to Almighty that He may give you health and strength to win peace equally well.

The world is anxious and is looking to you and some other friends to establish permanent peace on the globe. So far as we are concerned, we are an ancient nation. For ages we have been wedded to peace. Lord Buddha, the apostle of peace, was born in our country. He was followed by Asoka, the Emperor who, for the first time in the world's history, established the rule of law as superior to the rule of force, and he adopted peaceful methods both in internal administration and in his relations with foreign countries. In more recent times, Mahatma Gandhi followed this example. His instruments for winning freedom were truth and non-violence. Many a doubting Thomas was doubting if after all soul force would succeed. He did succeed and won us freedom by peaceful means.

We assure you, Mr. President, in the name of the 400 millions of our countrymen that we all stand by those honest men in the world who strive honestly for peace. We wish you godspeed in that direction.

You, Mr. President, have referred to many parallels between your country and ours. Yours is a great democracy. Ours is equally one. There are some persons who doubt. I can tell them that in the recent two elections that we had, as many as 180 millions of our population--equal to your population-were enfranchised and nearly 70 per cent of those voters voted, and there was not a single incident. I believe that there will be

542

no more, proof necessary to show that we are wedded to democratic institutions.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that we will be the bulwark of democracy and you can go back with this assurance that with your cooperation and our continued friendship we will establish permanent peace in the globe.

You have stayed in our country only a short while. I wish you had been able to spare some longer time to go from end to end of our country and have an idea about our ancient culture, how our people live and how democracy has entered into our veins and how we have adopted it as our way of life. But all the same we trust that you will go back to your land with very happy memories of your short stay and carry to your people and convey to them the greetings of 400 minions of Indians, and our desire for our continued friendship and cooperation and for your everincreasing prosperity.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Press Communique

On the conclusion of President Eisenhower's visit to India, lasting from December 9 to 14, 1959, the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, issued the. following Press Communique on December 14,1959 :

At the invitation of the Government of India the President of the United States of America paid a visit to India, lasting from December 9 to 14. President Eisenhower received on his arrival in New Delhi a warm and cordial welcome, marked by popular enthusiasm and goodwill. Throughout his stay and wherever he went, these friendly manifestations of goodwill were repeated by millions of Delhi citizens and others who had come to Delhi to join in this welcome. During his strenuous four-day visit, President Eisenhower fulfilled a number of public engagements. He addressed Members of the Indian Parliament. received an Honorary Doctorate of Laws from the University of Delhi, participated in the inauguration of the World Agriculture Fair, attended a civic reception on behalf of the city of Delhi and visited rural areas near Agra.

In thus fulfilling a desire of many years,

the President was deeply touched by the warmth of the welcome extended to him by the people of India, by the generous hospitality of the Government and the excellence of the arrangements made for him.

The President was impressed by the vitality of India's democratic institutions, of Parliament, Press and University, and by India's strength of spirit combined with practical idealism. He saw how India, like the United States, has created national strength out of diversity, neither country boasting that theirs is the only way. He confirmed the bond of shared ideals between India and the United States, their identity of objectives, and their common quest for just and lasting peace.

President Eisenhower met the President of India, the Prime Minister and other members of the Government of India. He and the Prime Minister had intimate talks in which they reviewed the world situation and exchanged views on matters of mutual interest. Among other things, the President told the Prime Minister that he was happy to report to him that all the leaders of the countries he had visited during his recent journey had expressed to him the hope that problems involving one form or another of conflict of interest or views could be solved by peaceful methods of conciliation. He said that this was true in Italy, Turkey, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The President found-this heartening and in harmony with his own thinking. He did not wish in any way to minimize the importance of, or the inherent difficulties involved in, some of the problems. The spirit he found was good and forwardlooking.

The Prime Minister expressed gratification and pleasure at President Eisenhower's visit to India, and thanked him for the warmth and generosity of the sentiments he had expressed. He assured the President of the whole-hearted support of India in his unremitting efforts in the cause of world peace. India herself is dedicated to a policy of peace and has been steadfast in her conviction that difference between nations should be resolved peacefully by the method of negotiation and settlement and not by resort to force. She has consistently pursued this policy in relation to problems of this nature affecting her and other countries. The Prime Minister gave President Eisenhower a review of the major aspects of some of these problems and of recent developments in regard to them.

The Prime Minister also referred to the great effort that India was making, through her Five Year Plans, to develop the country, both in regard to agriculture and industry, so as to raise the living standards of the people as rapidly as

543

possible. To this great task, involving the 400 million people, India was devoting herself with all her strength and will.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their deep satisfaction at the friendly and cordial relations existing between their two countries, and their firm belief that, their common ideals and objectives and their quest for peace will ensure the maintenance and development of the strong ties of friendship between the two countries.

President Eisenhower's visit to India has afforded the welcome opportunity of a meeting between the Presidents of the two countries, and for the renewal of the friendship between him and the Prime Minister of India. He was happy to meet other members of the Government, as well as men and women, young and old, in city and village, in Parliament and University, and to bring to them, personally, assurance of the genuine friendship of the people of the United States for the people of India and their sincere and continuing interest in India's welfare. To the people of India, this visit, which had been long hoped for, has given the opportunity for the demonstration of the sincere friendship, goodwill and sympathy which they feel for the people of, the United States.

USA INDIA AFGHANISTAN ITALY PAKISTAN TURKEY **Date :** Jan 01, 1959

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U. S. Agreement Signed

The U.S.A. and India signed an agreement in Washington on December 7, 1959 which provides additional encouragement for investment of private American capital in business enterprises in India.

The Agreement, which was signed by Mr. G.O. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for near Eastern and South Asia Affairs, and Shri D.N. Chatterjee, Charge d' Affaires of the Indian Embassy, amends the Convertibility Guarantee Agreement of September, 1957.

This amendment provides that American investors, for a premium, will be able to receive insurance for reimbursement in dollars- by the United States Government, of losses which may be incurred because of nationalisation.

The U.S. investment guarantee programme in India has been in effect since the signing of the original Agreement of September 1957. Until today's Agreement, the programme was limited to guarantees that capital invested and Indian receipts (rupees) from new or expanded American private enterprises in India could be converted into dollars.

544

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1959