1962

January

Volume No 1995 Content Foreign Affairs Record Jan 01, 1962 Vol. VIII JANUARY No. 1 CONTENTS COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION CONFERENCE Prime Minister's Inaugural Address 1 COLOMBO PLAN Consultative Committee Report 4 DENMARK Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet in honour of Mr. Kampmann 9 Reply By Danish Prime Minister 11 FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS Vice-President's Republic Day Broadcast 12 Vice-President's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad 13 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in the General Assembly on Angola 14 Shri C. S. Jha's letter to President of the Security Council on Kashmir 21 UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Vice-President's Speech at Banquet in honour of	
Field Marshal Amer	22

Reply by U.A.R. Vice-President 23

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SRI LANKA DENMARK INDIA ANGOLA

Date : Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Prime Minister's Inaugural Address

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following speech at the inaugural session of the Second Commonwealth Education Conference in New Delhi on January 11, 1962 :

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen : I am happy to be here to accord you a warm welcome on behalf of my Government and, I may say so, myself, although I must say that I feel slightly intimidated when I come to conferences of specialists, especially a subject like-education. In the realm of other specialised studies one is not necessarily supposed to know very much. But education covers every aspect of life and therefore one feels, as I feel sometimes, a certain inferiority complex just as I think hardly anything can be more Intimidating than a conference of headmasters. They are used to have their way with nobody to challenge them and they get used to that habit and elsewhere too try to function in the same way. I suppose that does not apply to Ministers of Education who normally have the saving grace, if I may say so, of being politicians also and as politicians they have to bear many knocks* and many criticisms and cannot

function as from a pulpit.

When first, about three years ago, I learnt of this proposal to have this cooperation in the educational field among the countries of the Commonwealth, which led to the Oxford Conference, I was attracted by it. But ever since then I have been more than attracted and I have felt the importance of it more and more and, as Dr. Shrimali just said, a certain dynamism in it has become evident. Now, on the face of it, such an approach is a good approach from the point of view of our respective countries, from that of the Commonwealth and of the world at large. That is all very well but as soon as we really enter into details, there many things come up which require very careful consideration and on which there may be many differences of opinion. I am talking about the subject of education, not so much about this conference.

In India at present you may hear an abundance, of criticism about our educational system, about the languages to be used, the medium of instruction and how many languages should be taught and all that kind of thing. It is a difficult business to find a way out of this tangle. I myself take the liberty of criticising some part of our educational system from time to time although I know that I am not an expert at it and although I know that one of the biggest things done in India in recent years has been the growth of education, which, after all, is essentially the most revolutionary factor in the growth of a nation.

Whatever we may do--and we are doing a good deal in various fields of activity- I have always felt that the base of it all lies in educational advance both in quantity and quality; that is, in quantity, everyone should have a fairly good measure of education and some, and a good number, should have high class, at any rate everyone who is capable of profiting by it should have higher standards.

Dr. Shrimali gave you some figures. They are fairly impressive figures in so far as quantity is concerned but I think what has impressed me even more is that in spite of all the criticism that we hear about our educational system, it is producing young men and young women of quality and that after all is a very important thing. In specialised branches especially in science, in technology, engineering, etc., we are producing very fine persons indeed and the younger generation gives us a good deal of hope.

But, looking at it from the larger point of view, of the Commonwealth or the world, such a system of cooperation performs an extraordinarily useful service of bringing us together, widening our respective horizons, making us understand the other party a little more. I suppose that however much we may try to get out of our own shells, it is difficult to do so at a later age when one is relatively advanced in years. The impress of another country, another culture, another language is greatest in one's educational period. That is obvious.

And so it is desirable for people to under. stand each other, although I must say sometimes

1

I have felt that the more People understand each other, some of them, the mom they quarrel. But I do not think that is a safe guide. it is necessary to understand even though sometimes it might lead to quarrel. What does understanding mean ? Not a kind of superficial understanding, as real understanding, I believe, ultimately comes only either from personal experience or, at any rate, through a fairly good knowledge of the literature of the other country.

And one great advantage, I do not know if everyone realises it, in regard to the Commonwealth association has been and continues to be the very important part that the English languago plays in it. Whatever our political views may be, however much they may differ and however much we may be in conflict with each other, the fact that a large number of us have grown in fairly intimate contact with the English language and literature has powerfully impressed us and left its mark on us.

Many of my colleagues in political and other departments of activity in India accuse me of being too English in my thinking. Whether it is true or not I do not know because English people accuse me of being much too aggressively nationalist in my thinking. I merely mention myself but that applies to so many others. But whatever may be true, it means that we get out of our narrow shells, somewhat rigid shells and imbibe something from outside which is good.

Now look at India with its tremendous burden of the past. It is a good burden to some extent and not a good burden also to some extent. One might say with some truth that the whole basis of past Indian culture, thinking, the whole structure of the old Indian civilisation, if you have to express it in a sentence or two, you would say it is based on the Sanskrit language and all that it contains.

Almost everything has grown out of Sanskrit not in recent centuries-of course much has come from outsider, much has came from Western Asia, a great deal which has influenced India; much has come in later years, from Europe, especially from England--but essentially, if you go deep down, Indian civilisation and culture have been conditioned by the Sanskrit language or languages grown out of it --of course, our present-day languages. Now that is true and that is something that we greatly value.

At the same time there is another aspect of it. It has nothing to do really with the Sanskrit language but in that complex of culture that we developed in later years, we became a rigid (and rather closed society in India, because of our social customs. It was not a closed society in the heyday of Sanskrit culture but later it did become so. And that came in the way of our growth, this closed society-whether it was the caste system or this or that-and this has done us a great deal of harm. Now the caste system may be peculiar to India, more, or less, but some forms or some variations of the caste system exist in every country. They may be called by some other name and so, in a measure, every country is a closed society, some more, some less, and it is difficult for a country to understand another country really basically. Understanding is something different from agreeing. One may not agree always, one does not, one need not. And it is quite extraordinary how insular-I use the word closed society which we call it an insular society how they developed in countries, especially always, but to some extent, they become aggressive in the

days of nationalism. The incapacity to understand the other person, quite apart from agreeing or not, it is a very dangerous thing in the modem world, more so than in the past In the past we lived our separate lives more or less but in the modem world we are- thrown at each other, we live on each other's doorsteps and thresholds and unless there is a measure of understanding, it is exceedingly difficult to build up that kind of cooperative world that we aim at. So everything that helps in that mutual understanding is to be welcomed and this educational approach is obviously one which should help.

And then the question arises, in all our countries, as it arose sometime back in Europe, the so-called conflict between, well, the classical education and the humanitarian. We are facing that conflict now to some extent having lived so long immersed in the ancient classics of our country which we value greatly. We are suddenly thrown out in search Of technological and scientific knowledge and so much of our newer institutes of learning here are technological or scientific. The whole bent is gradually changing and you will find, I think, that the Indian students who go to other Commonwealth countries are very largely studying some scientific, technological subject instead of as they used to just humanitarian subjects, humanistic subjects and law and the like.

I am all for science. I have the greatest faith in science and yet, if I may remind you, I am still a relic of the 19th century although it is the second half of the 20th century and my

2

mind takes me to science, my heart still clings, to some extent, to classics, being of course equally ignorant of both. I am not talking in terms of any special knowledge but the attraction and I want to encourage scientific education very much because without that no country can get on but I do feel strongly that that kind of technological education by itself will exhibit a serious lack in the growth of the individual or of the social group. How one has to balance these things, one has to balance them, how exactly, I don't know. But the present tendency towards science is to be approved certainly but with certain reservations in favour of the humnanities.

So, these problems come before us and they will go on coming before us because I suppose the times we live in are probably more revolutionary, essentially so, than any other period of human history, revolutionary in the sense of a changing society. And we have, therefore continually to adapt ourselves to these changes and not to be left behind. We in India in this and other matters, and so also most of the many other countries of Asia and Africa, have to cover a long distance. We have to face two or three simultaneous revolutions, political of course, but the economic, the social, with this prospect before us that after a great struggle we arrive at a stage at which we aim at today, and by the time we arrive there, the rest of the world has gone further ahead and we have to try to catch up to that. I suppose one has to advance in numerous fields but wherever you go to, at the back of it, at the base of it, must lie education.

Many of you may have heard of some of our old books which are greatly valued in India, call them scriptures, call them books, the Upanishads, which contain the basis of Indian philosophy. Now, it is interesting, the very word "Upanishad", what it means? It means "sitting near each other". In other words, the teacher and the pupil sitting near each other and discussing a subject and trying to find out what the truth is. Now, it is an interesting approach to this problem of education and indeed of trying to solve any problem; almost one might say. a scientific approach even in the realm of metaphysics and philosophy. Now, questions will arise about the manner of education, what you should impose on the pupil, how you should mould him and all that. Well, again, you have to find a balance. You have to give some shape to the child's mind, a growing mind, and yet I think it is highly important that you should not make it rigid, that it should be flexible, it should have the capacity for selfgrowth.

Now, about these matters, opinions may differ. Speaking for myself, I entirely agree with, call what you like, the liberal, the democratic tradition in this matter but the world does grow more and more difficult to Eve in and more and more complex and always one has to find some kind of middle way. I don't know if your Conference is going to consider any of these aspects. They are really for each individual country to do so, but I have no doubt that whatever our problems may be in each country, this meeting together, in discussing them with people of other countries, who also have similar problems, must be to the advantage of all.

But the main thing is this large-scale exchange of students and teachers, I think, is extraordinary good. And most important today,, I am anxious-speaking for my own country, for our people here-on the one side to retain, well, their individuality, call it that, whatever virtues they may be supposed to possess. But I am equally anxious they should come out of this narrow, rigid outlook, which has resulted in this closed society in India. A closed society must necessarily lead to a certain closing of the mind and in India it is a most extraordinary thing that mentally speaking, there was not much rigidity at any time in our history. People could believe in anything. People could have any kind of philosophy and there was no suppression of thought but socially speaking we became rigid, with the greatest freedom in one way and many restrictions in another way.

So I should like to maintain the freedom aspect and to remove these restrictive things which affect our social group. Of course that is happening. Life itself is changing them but I should not like them to change them and leave a vacuum in its place. So one has to put something worthwhile in it.

It is fascinating, these problems of education and the way different countries deal with them and perhaps these meetings that you have will help each country, to some extent, in solving its own problems and the main thing it will do is these programmes of exchange of students and teachers, it will widen their outlook, make them know a little more of the wider world, of other countries.

And now, if I may say something which may perhaps surprise you, I do not know. We in India and may be in other countries of Europe, of Asia and Africa, realise that we have to learn much in science, technology and many

3

things, from what might be called, for lack of a better word, "western civilisation", a magnificent thin which has grown up in the last few hundred years. At the same time you know, we all know, that the whole thought patterns of the world are gradually changing on the one side and that what happened in the whole of the 19th century, in the first half more or less of the 20th century, of the dominance of Europe even in giving these thought patterns to the rest of the world, apart from science and industry, that kind of thing is rapidly diminishing.

In the 19th century you have a conflict, a nationalist conflict on the political field, but in other matters there was a certain acknowledgement because of Europe's pre-eminence in science and industry and the like, a certain acceptance of that. Now that is no longer so, not that Europe's achievements are not admired; they are admired very greatly; in fact, the mere fact that the people attempt to copy them is a test of our admiration but, in the political field as well as in many other fields, that predominance can no longer function. Other parts of the world are coming up.

Now, it would be a great pity if they came up in antagonism to Europe and what Europe stood for. They can no longer tolerate any kind of dominance of Europe even in that field. Therefore, the only way out is the recognition, a recognition of, well, the importance of every part of the world and that the world is not conditioned by one continent or one country or one thought pattern but by many thought patterns and that in coming together they affect each other, they help each other, in understanding the problems before us, that is to say, our approach can only be in future one of realisation that ours is not the only way of life, the only way of thinking, the only way of philosophy, the only way of anything, that this world is a place of great and tremendous variety and there may be, there is something in each of its many facets.

As I said, European civilisation has a magnificent record and yet many people immersed in European civilisation had in the past, not so now perhaps, no knowledge of the rest of the world and of the great things the rest of the world had done in the past. "at is not a good thing for any cultured and civilised man not to know what has happened elsewhere, things worthwhile. Of course, Europe has impinged itself on the rest of the world in the last century or so or more. That impingement is not likely to continue except in a limited field.

And one has to realise that each country has been conditioned by a variety of factors in its thinking--geography for one. The more I think of it, the more I feel how important geography has been in conditioning a country's thinking, and all its past experience, its history, its general development has conditioned it through centuries and sometimes, as in the case of India, thousands of years. We cannot get out of it. We do not want to get out of it except to some extent. We do not want to uproot ourselves from our past but what we do is to get rid of the dust of ages that may have gathered around us.

My point is that the only future way, both for nations, groups and individuals is one of tolerance, one of trying to understand, not an eager feeling of imposing oneself on others, if there is something good in us, others will understand it. If not, then imposition will not help, it will only create antagonism. It is essentially, in a world of atom bombs and hydrogen bombs, there is no other way, except the way of tolerance and understanding. And if you understand the other, you can help in the other understanding you. If you reject the other, the other's viewpoint, then the other tends to reject yours.

So that it seeing to me of the highest importance that education should aim at creating the spirit of tolerance and understanding of others which does not mean, I repeat, your necessarily adopting their way of thinking or the way of doing things or even accepting views fully, nevertheless, understanding that in the circumstances they have developed something worthwhile for themselves, it may be good for others also. In other words, we come back to the ancient lesson that it is Rood for any individual or country, the way of understanding, the way of tolerance, the way of charity and compassion is the best approach to life's problems and if our education helps in that it has been worthwhile.

INDIA USA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

COLOMBO PLAN

consultative Committee Report

The Tenth Annual Report of the Colombo man Consultative Committee, now published, seeks to look back on the experience and results of economic development in the region since

4

the beginning of the Plan ten years ago and outlines the tasks ahead.

The chapter on India reflects the achievements of the first decade of development and of the expansion of the Indian economy. It also shows how the outline of the country's future social and economic structures have been established and the potential for future growth strengthened.

The chapter sets out the trends in the Indian economy during the last year, the measures that have been taken to mobilise resources and also outlines briefly the prospects for the coming year.

The chapter begins with a review of the past ten years. During this period, says the report, India carried through its first two. Five-Year Development Plans involving an outlay of Rs. 10,110 crores. During this period, agricultural production rose by about 40% while industrial production rose by almost 75%. There was an increase of 42% in the national income and of 17% in the per capita income. The population increased at a mean decennial rate of 21.49 per cent. Prices rose by about 20-24% over these years. The massive development effort was not without considerable strain on the balance of payments. Gold and foreign exchange holdings declined during the period from \$ 1,998 million to \$ 637 million. The end of this ten-year period saw the launching of the Third Five-Year Plan.

Reviewing the economic and financial situation, the report says in the final year of the Second Plan ended March 31, 1961 the Indian economy registered a marked advance in agricultural and industrial production. But the rise in prices and the strain on the balance of payments persisted, reflecting a continued shortage of resources relative to demand. Industrial production increased by about 11% and agricultural production by 8% over the previous year. National income which had risen by less than 1% in 1959-60 because of adverse weather showed a substantial increase, of about 6.5% in 1960-61. There was also a further step up in investment, both public and private. The maturing of previous investments and also favourable weather conditions during the agricultural season helped to match the additional demands arising from increases in investment and incomes. There was evidence of shortages of coal, electricity, steel, cement and transport.

The programme of development carried through in the Second Plan has added substantially to the productive capacity of the economy and increased greatly the potential for further growth. The Third Five-Year 'Plan, which' commenced in April 1961 envisages a further increase in the rate of investment and will require a larger inflow of external resources. But the determining factor in the success of the development programmes envisaged in the Plan will be the scale and intensity of domestic effort towards increased production and savings. The task for the coming years will be to secure better results in terms of production from past investments and to bring new investment into productive use. At the same time, restraint on consumption will have to continue so that there may be a steady increase in domestic savings from the larger flow of resources becoming

available year by year.

Agricultural production, the report observes, had attained a record level in 1958-59, but declined by about 2.5% in the next year because of unfavourable weather. In 1960-61, however, overall agricultural production rose by about 8%. The output of foodgrains is estimated at a record level of 79.27 million tons as compared to the Second Plan target of 80.5 million tons. The index of agricultural production (base year 1949-50) which had declined from 132.0 in 1958-59 to 128.7 in 1959-60 rose to 139.1 in 1960-61. The output of foodgrains was 6% higher and that of other crops by nearly 11%. Among the commercial crops the output of cotton which had fallen sharply in 1959-60, went up by 47%, though there was only a nominal increase in the area under cotton. The production of raw jute, however, continued to decline because of reduced acreage.

Industrial production which had shown a marked upward trend in 1959-60, maintained the same rate of growth of 11% in the year under review, with new units going into production and fuller utilisation. of existing capacity in industries like cement, steel, sugar and engineering. The man-days lost in industry were about 1/4 th less than in the previous year. The general index of industrial production (base year 1951) was 174.5 as compared with 156.9 in the previous year.

The increase in industrial output was shared wide-spread. The most marked increases were in iron ore, iron and steel, electricity, sugar, paper and paper-boards, rubber products, chemicals, cement, general and electrical engineering goods and transport equipment. A further rise in the output of various types of industrial machinery such as machinery for tea processing, sugar and cement manufacturing, etc. was also

5

an important feature of industrial growth during the year.

There was a substantial increase in productive capacity in a large number of industries such as sulphuric acid, caustic soda, cement, diesel engines, power-driven pumps, looms, power transformers, electricity and automobiles. Consumer goods industries such as radio receivers, motor-cycles, paper and vanaspati also added to their installed capacity.

Production in some 16 major industries show an increasing trend in the last three years.

Industrial production during the year under report was about three-fourths higher than in 1951, with consumer goods industries as a group showing an increase in output of about 50%. The output of inter-mediate products and capital goods were nearly doubled.

According to preliminary estimates, national income at constant (1948-49) prices showed a rise of barely 1% in (1959-60). More tentative estimates for 1960-61 indicate a further rise of about 6.5% in real national income. Over the decade ended 1960-61, national income at constant prices is estimated to have gone up by 42% and per capita income by 17%. The growth, however, has been uneven particularly since 1956-57. The fluctuations in output, mainly agricultural, affected domestic prices and the balance of payments.

Despite the increase in agricultural production larger food imports and the increase in industrial output there was a further rise in prices during the year, the report says. The whole sale price index with 1952-53 as base year, advanced to 127.5 in March 1961, as compared with 124.8 in December 1960 and 118.8 in March 1960. The average index for the year 1960-61 was 124.8 which is 6.6 per cent higher than for 1959-60.

A feature of price situation during the year was the sharp rise in the prices of industrial raw materials (18%) and manufactures (11%). The rise in prices of industrial raw materials was mainly in respect of raw cotton, raw jute and oilseeds the production of which had declined in varying degrees in 1959-60. The higher prices of these raw materials affected the prices of edible oils and of cotton and jute manufactures. If oilseeds, edible oils, raw cotton, raw jute and cotton and jute manufactures are excluded, the index of prices of other commodities would show a rise of 1.5% in 1960-61 is against 7.2% in 1958-59. Since April 1961, the pressure on wholesale price has been somewhat less marked. For the period April-August, 1961, the average level of the index of wholesale prices was 126.6 as against 123.2 in these corresponding period last year. The relative improvement in the position is due mainly to lower prices of cotton and cotton manufactures. The level of prices of cereals in August 1961 was 4% lower than a year ago and for the group 'food items' about the same as in the previous year. The All-India working class consumer price index (base year 1949) was relatively stable during the year.

The report reviews the employment situation and says the increase over the last two years in agricultural and industrial production as also in construction activities and social services. have no doubt enlarged the demand for labour. In certain industries such as handloom, weaving, there are indications of some reduction in underemployment. Many of the new and rapidly expanding industries particularly engineering industries, both large-scale and small-scale, have contributed substantially to the creation of new employment opportunities. Nevertheless, it is evident that the creation of new employment opportunities during the Second Plan has on the whole, lagged behind the increases in the labour force.

Despite the rise in unemployment, employers have experienced shortages of man-power in certain categories such as mechanical and civil engineers, overseers in civil engineering, draughtsman, doctors and nurses. Shortages are also reported of skilled craftsmen in different occupations. Stenographers and qualified typists and trained teachers are also in short supply. The surplus categories include untrained teachers person without requisite skills those seeking white-collar employment. Suitable provision has been made in the Third Plan for augmenting the number of trained personnel.

An important new measure in the creation of employment opportunities is the scheme for utilisation of man-power through rural works programmes. Thirty-four pilot projects were started in the States early this year. It has now been decided to treble this number in the current year. Tentatively it is envisaged that through such works, employment would be found for about 100 days in a year for about one lakh persons in the first year, four lakhs to five lakhs in the second rising to about 25 lakhs in the last year of the Plan.

Reflecting the continuing high level of economic activity both money supply with the public

6

and credit given by scheduled banks increased sharpy during the year under review. Money supply with the public increased by 7.3% to Rs. 2,901 crores, which was however a slightly lower rate of increase than in the preceding year. Aggregate bank credit recorded a sharp increase of about Rs. 231 crores, as compared with Rs. 1,148 crores in the previous year.

The expansion of tank credit of the private sector was much larger than in the previous year and was the most important factor accounting for the rise in money supply. In contrast to the previous year, time deposits actually recorded a decline and thus exerted an expansionary impact on the money supply. Part of the difference in the year under report as compared with 1959-60 was due to the revision of the arrangements regarding PL 480 funds. In the past, these funds were deposited with the State Bank of India, which, in turn, invested them mainly in Government securities, since May 1960, PL 480 funds flow directly to the Government through the issue of special securities.

The increased demand for bank credit was met by substantial net sales of Government securities by scheduled banks and by a larger resort to the Reserve Bank of India despite the introduction in October 1960 of the system of progressively increasing interest charges for borrowings above specified limits. The scheduled banks sold securities worth Rs. 156.2 crores in 1961 as against net purchase of Rs. 101.4 crores in 1959-60.

As compared with the previous year there was some deterioration in the balance of payments during the year despite a substantial increase in net official capital receipts. The current account deficit doubled from Rs. 182.6 crores to Rs. 365.1 crores. The principal factor in this was the widening of the trade deficits despite continued improvement in export performance. Imports rose by 18% to Rs. 1,088.0 crores, and there was a decline of Rs. 30.1 crores in net receipts from invisibles other than official donations. On the other hand, exports showed a modest improvement from Rs. 623.2 crores to Rs. 631.9 crores. Net receipts from official loans increased from Rs. 160.6 crores to Rs. 224.5 crores. Despite this increase foreign exchange reserves declined further by Rs. 59.2 crores as against the decline of Rs. 16.1 crores in the previous year.

The increase in imports was divided equally between Government and private imports. Almost the entire increase on Government account was in foodgrains including PL 480 imports which went up from. Rs. 151.6 crores to Rs. 238.4 crores. Private imports increased by Rs. 83.4 crores, the main items being iron' and steel, machinery, non-ferrous, metals, vehicles, and raw materials. Thus while part of the rise in imports reflected the accelerated pace of development part was also due to inventory accumulation, particularly increases in stocks of foodgrains. There was also the need to meet the current raw material requirements of industries, especially the cotton and jute textile industries which had to face shortages following poor crops.

The main factor in the improvement in export earnings was the increased value of export of jute manufactures mainly on account of higher prices. There was also some increase in exports of metallic ores, spices and cashew kernels. This was partly off-set by declines in export earnings from tea, cotton, vegetable oils, hides and skins and cotton manufactures.

Altogether, India's balance of payments has become more vulnerable than ever before. New investments involving imports of capital goods is now increasingly dependent on foreign assistance. Even a reasonable level of maintenance imports, the demand for which inescapably increases with the rising level of economic activity in the country, is also likely to require a certain amount of external aid which is not tied to particular projects. Although, a wider appreciation of India's problems has led to substantial offers of aid from friendly foreign Governments and international organisations the short-term prospect is still one of strain on the balance of payments. However, as the progress of planned development enlarges productive capacity, it will enhance the ability of the country to meet its current and capital needs in an increasing measure from larger exports. Recent developments in the field of oil exploration may also lead to some relief in external payments.

Foreign loans and grants, excluding assistance under PL 480 and PL 665 authorised from April 1956 for utilisation during the Second Plan amounted to Rs. 1,080.3 crores. The carry-over of external assistance from the First Plan was Rs. 180.7 crores excluding PL 665 assistance amounting to Rs. 11.8 crores. Thus the total external assistance, excluding commodity assistance amounted to Rs. 1,261.0 crores. Of this, Rs. 891.9 crores was utilised in the course of the Second Plan, leaving a balance of Rs. 369.1 crores as carry-over for the Third Plan.

7

Commodity assistance under PL 480 and PL 665 authorised for the Second Plan period amounted to Rs. 1,128.0 crores and including a carry-over of Rs. 11.8 crores under PL 665 from the First Plan the total amounted to Rs. 1.139.8 crores. Out of this, imports worth Rs. 544.7 crores were received before the end of March 1961 leaving an unutilised balance of Rs. 595.1 crores. According to the Report, the total external assistance available for the Third Plan amounted to Rs. 1,787.0 crores made up of : carry-over from Second Plan Rs. 369.1 crores; loans authorised in the Second Plan, but for projects included in the Third Plan Rs. 329.3 crores and aid agreed to in the consortium meeting in May-June last year Rs. 1,088.6 crores.

Thus, against a total requirement of Rs. 2,600 crores, excluding commodity assistance under PL 480, external assistance of the order of Rs. 1,787 crores is covered by agreements already concluded or due to be concluded.

The two main problems of policy, says the report, are effective mobilisation of domestic savings and conservation and expansion of foreign exchange resources. Fiscal, monetary and commercial policies have, in recent years, been shaped with these considerations in mind, adjustments being made at appropriate points in the light of the emerging economic situations.

There has been a progressive, reduction in the combined over-all deficits of the Central and State Governments, notwithstanding the steady growth in Plan outlays from Rs. 632.8 crores in 1956-57 to Rs. 10,771 crores. in 1960-61. The budgetary deficits declined substantially in 1958-59 and 1959-60. In 1960-61, there was on present estimates an over-all surplus of Rs. 53 crores. For the entire Second Plan period, deficit financing totalled Rs. 949 crores, which was less than the original estimates, of Rs. 1,200 crores. The progressive decline in deficit financing was made possible by an increase in tax receipts and additional taxation, larger, small savings and increased external assistance.

In the field of monetary policy, the system of selective credit controls with a rising scale of interest charges was continued. These measures resulted in an upward adjustment of interest rates generally.

In view of the difficult foreign exchange situation, import Policy continued to be stringent in 1960-61 though there was some increase in import licences for raw materials and intermediate goods. The main factors determining the level of licensing have been the availability of external assistance, the requirements of capital goods for new developments and the need for adequate supplies of raw material and components to keep the expanding industrial capacity in full production. The problem is to balance requirements for new capital goods and maintenance imports against foreign exchange earnings and available external assistance.

Export promotion received increasing attention and a number of further incentives were adopted during the year. The export duty on tea was reduced, customs duties on imported raw materials were revised and provision was made for rebates of excise on indigenous materials. The policy of removing quantitative restrictions on exports was continued and controls over the exports of agricultural coommodities and manufactures were abolished. Certain export items were placed on the free licensing list. There are now only 35 commodities subject to export control. The purpose of these controls is to provide for defence needs to ensure industrial raw materials for export industries or to conserve supplies of certain essential items like foodgrains. for domestic consumption. These controls are kept under constant scrutiny from the point of view of promoting exports. Credit facilities for exporters were strengthened by the extension of cover provided by the Export Risks Insurance Corporation to packing credits. Two Committees have been set up by Government, one for examining the question of quality control and pre-shipment inspection of export products and the other for examining the working of import and export controls and import priorities.

The rise in wholesale prices for the major part of the year was a matter of some concern. To overcome shortages of raw cotton and raw jute and to augment the supplies of foodgrains, larger imports were arranged as far as possible on terms not involving foreign exchange expenditure. To help remedy wide disparities between the price of foodgrains. in different parts of the country steps were taken to encourage freer movement, of foodgrains, from surplus to deficit areas. Various measures were also taken to keep in check the rising prices of raw jute, oilseeds and mill cloth.

The increase in agricultural output in 1960-61 (July--June) will, to some extent, says the Report, influence the price trends in the earlier part of the cur-rent year. It is too early to pre. dict the outlook for the Kharif crop. There have been floods in various parts of the country but the impact of these on the crops is not yet clear. The raw jute crop is expected to be much larger than in the last two years, and

8

these expectations have already influenced the trend in prices of raw jute. The Government, in cooperation with the jute textile industry, have taken measures to prevent an excessive fall in prices. They also have in hand nearly three million tons of, foodgrains, including about a million tons of foodgrains, including about a million tons of rice. The off-seasonal pressure on foodgrains prices has been much less this year and, with a substantial amount of authorised imports under PL 480 outstanding, there should be less difficulty in keeping prices in this vital sector reasonably stable.

The rising trend in industrial production has continued in the first few months of the current year, although the rate of growth is somewhat slower than in the corresponding period of the previous year. The smaller rate of growth is partly because much of the expansion in installed capacity and output had already taken place by the last quarter of 1960. There have also been specific factors affecting output in particular industries such as shortage of raw materials, difficulties in respect of transport or power, and, in a few cases, slackening of demand. On present indications, increases may be expected in the output of iron and steel, cement and coal, textiles, paper electricity, chemicals and certain engineering products including machinery. The crucial factor, of course, is the supply of imported raw materials and components; but it seems like that the level of industrial production in the current year will be some 8 to 10 per cent higher than last year.

The measures taken by the Reserve Bank have helped to restrain credit creation. There was a large decline (Rs. 76.3 crores) in scheduled bank credit during the current slack season (April-September 1961) as compared with a small increase (Rs. 5.4 crores) in the slack season of 1960, and a substantial decline of Rs. 100.00 crores in 1959. The budget for 1961-62 imposed additional taxation amounting to Rs. 57.1 crores and the Government's recourse to the banking system is, on present indications, not likely to be very large. Fiscal and monetary policy aims at restraining the growth of aggregate demand in the economy.

In regard to the balance of payments, much will depend on the availability of external assistance and how quickly it can be utilised. The import policy for the current year continues to be restrictive, and it is expected that the various export promotion measures will help to increase export earing. There is no scope for drawing down any further foreign exchange reserves and indeed, the objective has to be to bad up the sterling balances to a somewhat higher figure than at present to meet seasonal fluctuations in foreign exchange receipts.

The pressures of demand both for consumption and for investment, are expected to be somewhat larger. The level of public investment envisaged for the cur-rent year is about 7 per cent higher than in 1959-60, and private investment is also likely to rise. Increased exports will also mean an additional claim on national output. In addition, the growth in population and incomes would inevitably mean some increase in consumption. AR these considerations point to the need for increasing production and for ensuring some restraint in consumption, particularly at those points where domestic consumption impinges directly on exports, the report adds.

SRI LANKA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA RUSSIA

Date : Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

DENMARK

Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet in honour of Mr. Kampmann

Speaking at a banquet given in honour of His Excellency Mr. Viggo Kampmann, Prime Minister of Denmark, on January 18, 1962, at Rashtrapati Bhavan, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I have great pleasure in welcoming you, Sir, and you, Madam, to our country. Our country, in size, is very much bigger than your country. Indeed, you are one of the smaller countries of Europe in size, but the quality of a country does not depend upon its size, as is well known. Your country is a country of quality, and you have shown how small countries with very few natural resources can rise and keep an emblem of high civilisation and high quality in so far as material comforts of a general people are concerned. You are a country where there are very few rich and practically no poor. You are a country where there is no unemployment and which has survived many difficulties and crises in the past, and you have applied yourself with intelligence and scientific research and hard work to the improvement of your people and have succeeded.

9

You are a country, in fact, which is devoted to the ideal of social democracy.

We have a similar ideal here, and we labour for it, but we have a very large population, and we have really started on this road ever since independence came to us about 14 years ago. We admire all the Scandinavian countries for their general life, for their social democracy and for the success they have achieved in fashioning a life full of normal contentment for their people without applying any forcible measures for that purpose. In a sense, you might say that in many ways we look up to the Scandinavian countries for their ideal of social democracy and the results they have achieved. Your country has, I believe, no natural resources, or hardly any, and yet not only has it succeeded in farming to the extent that it produces more per acre than almost any country in the wide world, but even in industry it has succeeded to a very large extent even without those natural resources by hard work and scientific research. I should think that if other countries function like yours, the world would be a more peaceful place to live in because your people are a peaceful people, surrounded by big countries which, in these days of cold war, are constantly indulging in activities which are far from peaceful. In spite of that, you have continued in a peaceful career in a peaceful avocation and succeeded in that and you have converted your people into a co-operative association of farmers as well as of industrial people.

Our ideal has been, as we declared long ago, even before independence to establish a cooperative commonwealth in India. We attach value to many of the things we have achieved, like co-operation for instance, and we feel that by having a co-operative method of work in both agriculture and industry we shall be able to avoid, as far as possible, the extremes of wealth and poverty which you have succeeded in avoiding. Only we have to deal with a very large number of people, and also a people who have been. used to old methods of production, and it is not an easy matter to change them quickly. Yet, they are changing fairly rapidly and, I believe, we are making good progress. We will, therefore, look up to your advancement and to the way you and the other countries in Scandinavia have set this example to all of us, the way of a successful democracy.

I believe it was some time late in the Last century that Denmark had a crisis when her products which were chiefly wheat, could not be exported because of other countries producing wheat in larger quantities and exporting it for cheaper prices.

What is interesting is how deliberately your country changed over to a somewhat different economy and made a success of that. And now Denmark is probably the best known country in the world for dairying and animal husbandry. And so we feel we have much to learn from you, and your visit here is welcome as from a country which is peaceful, which exhibits all the qualities or many of the qualities that we admire in a people, and with which we have very friendly relations. I am glad and thankful for'; the way you have helped us in various ways, especially in dairying, starting specialised schools for dairying, and for your folk schools, which have already started in Mysore, which you told me you intend to expand. These folk schools are particularly helpful to us because, apart from giving the normal knowledge which is given in a school, they train people for practical work. I think these folk schools will be very useful to us and very helpful to us, if they spread a little and convert our people to industry and agriculture on a co-operative basis.

Some time ago we had the pleasure of welcoming your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Hansen, and the memory of his visit here still endures, and more so the memory of my visit to Denmark where you were kind enough to give me a very cordial welcome. So, we value very much the friendship of Denmark with our country, and we hope and we are sure it will endure and prosper and we shall learn much from your country.

I am sorry that your distinguished Foreign Minister has not accompanied you. We looked forward to seeing him, and I hope that he will come some time later to visit us. We shall be very glad to have him, to discuss many matters which we have in common and to have his advice on many things.

I hope that you will, during your brief visit to India, see something of what we are trying to do in agriculture and industry as well as in animal husbandry, and you will advise us where we are lacking and what we can do in regard to them.

I trust that you and madam and your party will enjoy your visit to India. Fortunately, you have come at a time when we have tried to reproduce to the best of our ability something of your climate, although it is a poor approach I know, but still it is some approach. I am afraid, you will find in the rest of India the climate to be much warmer than the climate you are used to in Denmark. However, that warmth will be made up. by the warmth of the welcome that you will receive wherever you go.

10

I am sure that this visit of yours will strengthen our friendship and our close relations and we shall learn much from these relations.

I asked you, ladies and gentlemen and Your Excellencies, to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of Denmark and Madam Kampmann.

DENMARK USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA PERU **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

DENMARK

In his reply, the Prime Minister of Denmark, His Excellency Mr. Viggo Kampmann said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I want first of all to thank you for the kind words of welcome which you have addressed to my wife and me. The cordial and truly magnificent reception which the Government of India and the Indian people have extended to us has been an experience we shall never forget.

This is, as you know, my first visit to India. I am looking forward with great expectations to the many opportunities which the interesting programme for our stay here will give us to see and visit different places and regions in this great country. It is a whole continent, that is what we feel.

The people from every part of the globe, but perhaps especially to us from Northern regions, the name of India holds a fascination of its own. From childhood we are familiar with pictures of the snowclad mountains of the Himalayas, the luxuriant green of impenetrable jungles, and of the bustling cities. We have heard about the charm of Indian village life as described in Rabindranath Tagore's tales, about picturesque processions and about temples and monuments, awe-inspiring and beautiful. Many people from our part of the world have been spell-bound by the depth and 'the greatness of Indian philosophy and poetry which have exerted immeasurable influence on peoples and cultures all over the world.

But the most fascinating experience, in my opinion, is that this rich cultural heritage is not considered as relics to be placed in museums; that the Indian people never allowed their ancient spiritual springs to dry up but preserved them as a constant, source of inspiration for contemporary man. In a modem world mainly given to matters of fact India has-by making the past an integral part of the present-lived up to her cultural heritage and thus found her own answers to her own problems, in keeping with the great traditions of the past.

Ever since India won her independence we have, in my country, followed with keen interest this great venture of modern India as we know it to-day. We have learned with admiration of the ceaseless efforts to build up a democratic state in this continent, of the untiring work to exploit the natural resources of the country and to change the economic and social pattern of a traditional community into a modern industrialized society devoted to the welfare of the people. We admire the achievements already made and we appreciate the enormous task you have undertaken to solve the many problems still ahead. And another fascinating experience in your approach, to witness how the innate sense-of beauty and of graceful human intercourse enrich everyday life in India.

We know of Mahatma Gandhi's great efforts in behalf of present-day India and we realize, Mr. Prime Minister, your own unique contribution to the building up of this great nation and to securing for India the very significant position which your country holds to-day among the nations of the world.

This is true not least in the United Nations where our two countries meet on common ground. We share with you our belief in this World Organization. As one of the practical manifestations of this belief I may mention that to-day Indian and Danish soldiers serve together under the United Nations flag in the Middle East and the Congo, safeguarding international peace and security.

The relations between our two countries are not, however, limited to international organizations. An important aspect of our direct contacts over the years is trade. I am happy to know, therefore, that our commercial relations have developed during the last couple of years in a way which is satisfactory to both countries. In recent years Danish imports of Indian goods, especially textiles and feeding stuffs, has doubled. Atter a decrease in Danish exports to India in the last few years these exports-especially consisting of machinery and equipment of importance to the industrial development of modem Indiaagain showed a satisfactory though small increase in 1960. It is a pleasure for us to know that Denmark through the Technical Assistance Programme is making her own modest contribution towards the building up of modem India, an aim likewise pursued by Danish civil engineering firms working here.

The cordial relations between our two countries have also been strengthened by the personal contacts between the Heads of our Governments. I recall the enthusiasm with which my

11

predecessor, the late Prime Minister H. C. Hansen, spoke of his short visit here in the early spring of 1957. And I wish to assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that I carry with me the greetings and good wishes from everybody who met you during your stay in Denmark in the summer of 1957. The wisdom, the friendliness and the sense of humour of this great representative of a great nation will long be cherished by the Danish people.

I propose, ladies and gentlemen, that we raise our glasses to the Prime Minister of India and to the happiness and prosperity of the Indian people.

DENMARK INDIA USA CONGO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

Vice-Presidents Republic Day Broadcast

The Vice-President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan made the following Republic Day broadcast to the nation on January 25, 1962:

Friends, our honoured President, Dr. Rajendra

Prasad, in spite of weak health has been gracious enough to send a message to the nation which I shall now read :

"On the happy occasion of our thirteenth Republic Day, I would like to greet all my countrymen and Indian nationals abroad. I wish them happiness and the best of luck in the coming year. Ever since the formation of our Republic in 1950, I have been addressing them my best wishes. I am happy that year, but on account of indifferent health, just at present I have to content myself with offering them my best wishes. I am happy that Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, our Vice-President, will be addressing the nation. Familiar as our people are with his thought-provoking speeches, I am sure his address will inspire them.

"I hope and pray that the current year may continue to be a year of peace in the world and of prosperity for our people and the country."

Our heartfelt prayers, it is needless to say, go out for the President's rapid recovery and restoration to health.

May I join the-President on this happy occasion in greeting our countrymen here and abroad and wishing them all a happy and useful year.

It is the first time that the people of Goa are joining the Republic Day celebrations. Though a part of Indian society they were politically separated for many years. That separation has now ended, I extend to them a special welcome.

We will have the general elections next month and over 210 million Voters are eligible to vote. I have no doubt that the candidates and the voters will act with dignity and decency and not yield to the pressures of caste and community. What counts is not so much victory or defeat as civilised behaviour.

We are in the first year of the third Five Year Plan and our achievements this year are not inconsiderable and we have every hope that at the end of the Plan period our targets will be reached. Our progress is achieved by our men and women who are vital, capable, devoted, ready to sacrifice their personal interests for public good. The Indian sections of the recent Industries Fair showed the marked advance we have made in many branches. Our national income and per capita income have registered a substantial increase as the result of the efforts of the last ten years. There is, however, no ground for complacency. Millions of our people still live in conditions which are far from satisfactory. The deaths due to cold and exposure reported in recent weeks are an indication of the vast work that lies ahead of us. Mother earth out of her bounty gives freely to us all sunlight, air and water; in the same spirit, we should distribute our resources of food, clothing and shelter equitably. They should not be used to enslave fellow men or secure domination over the lives of others. We have to speed up the economic revolution that is now in progress, if we are to make up for the neglect of centuries.

More important than the political and economic changes are the social ones. We cannot live two or three thousand years ago; we can live only in our own time. We cannot contract out of the present. We have to win freedom in our generation by vigilance in the face of social institutions which tend to enslave us. Our Constitution rightly repudiates the restrictions of caste and the practice of untouchability. If we are to weld together the different sections of our society in a homogeneous community these provisions should be strictly enforced. We must fight prejudice by our example, defend social equality even in the face of persecution. By removing poverty and economic backwardness from which

12

many people suffer we help to establish an equitable social order, a stable society. Social justice is the basic condition for national cohesion.

National integration can be achieved only by combating communal tendencies, caste discrimination and developing national feelings. We should not blast the hopes of the future by the hatreds of the past, Our mind must shed its dead ideas even as a tree throws off its withered leaves.

The perils facing our nation can be overcome and its latent possibilities realised only if we educate every one to the full extent of his capacity. It is not enough to increase the number of schools and colleges. We must maintain high standards and impart knowledge in depth as well as in breadth. We can save ourselves and help to save mankind if we maintain righteous standards and grow in wisdom and humanity.

In the international sphere, we are in a period of tensions and anxieties. Though the cold war is still continuing, there has also been competition in the realm of science, in space flights, for example. These adventures into outer space should induce in us a sense of humility and of the oneness of the tiny world in which we live. We must dispel the mists of misunderstanding, the clouds of suspicion, by patient and determined effort to understand one another and end the war of nerves. Harsh words, angry accusations, do not help, however justified they may be. There is so much goodwill and friendship in the heart of man whether lie is an Asian or an African a European or an American. These require to be tapped. High is the dignity of man, lofty his aspirations, deep arid wonderful his comprehension of the marvellous world that he inhabits. He can certainly reshape history.

The prospect ahead of us is bright; only we should make ourselves the servants of the future. If we have no cause to live for, we tend to live for ourselves and our lives become petty, trivial and futile. Let us today dedicate ourselves to the building of a new India on moral foundations and the making of a new world.

USA INDIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

Vice-President's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad

Dr. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of India, broadcast from All India Radio the following message to Indian nationals abroad on the occasion of the Republic Day, January 26, 1962:

Friends, our honoured President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, in spite of weak health has been gracious enough to send a message-to the nation which I shall now read:

"On the happy occasion of our thirteenth Republic Day, I would like to greet all my countrymen and Indian nationals abroad. I wish them happiness and the best of luck in the coming year. Ever since the formation of our Republic in 1950, 1 have been addressing the people on this occasion year after year, but on account of indifferent health, just at present I have to content myself with offering them my best wishes. I am happy that Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, our Vice-President will be addressing the nation. Familiar as our people are with his thought-provoking speeches, I am sure his address will inspire them.

"I hope and pray that the cur-rent year may continue to be a year of peace in the world and of prosperity for our people and the country."

Our heartfelt prayers, it is needless to say, go out for the President's rapid recovery and restoration to health.

May I take this opportunity to greet our countrymen-abroad and wish them well in the new year.

We are glad to welcome into our fold the people of Goa who have been long separated from us.

You, as representatives of our nation abroad, have a special responsibility in defending our honour, in representing our culture, in spreading right knowledge about our policies and programmes, political and economic.

The prospect ahead of us is bright; only we should make ourselves the servants of the future. If we have no cause to live for, we tend to live for ourselves and our lives become petty, futile and trivial. Let us today dedicate ourselves to the building of a new India on moral foundations and the making of a new world.

13

INDIA USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Shri C. S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on January 25, 1962 on Portuguese colonisation in Angola:

MR. PRESIDENT,

Three times during the space of the last twelve months the situation in Angola has compelled United Nations' attention. Twice the question of Angola has been before the Security Council as a situation endangering the maintenance of international peace and security and causing international friction. The fifteenth General Assembly at its resumed session considered the question in April of last year. Now for the fourth time the Members of the United Nations are obliged to give their attention to the situation in Angola as a source of great danger and conflict in Africa and as a total denial of the Angolan people's birthright of freedom and independence. The fact that the United Nations has had to consider the Angolan situation so frequently is no cause for satisfaction to anyone; on the contrary, it is a measure of the continuing frustration. and increasing gravity of the situation which it is imperative to resolve without further delay in conformity with the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514

(XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

The United Nations has adopted more than one re-solution in regard to Angola. The first was resolution 1603 (XV) of 20 April 1961. Subsequently there was a resolution of the Security Council adopted on 9 June 1961. The resolution of the General Assembly called upon

"... the Government of Portugal to consider urgently the introduction of measures and reforms in Angola for the purpose of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), with due respect for human Tights and fundamental freedoms and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

and decided to appoint a fact-finding Sub-Committee which was to report to the General Assembly.

The Security Council went on record stating that

"...the continuance of the situation in Angola is an actual and potential cause of international friction and is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security". (S/4835)

The resolution called upon Portugal to act in accordance with the General Assembly resolution and

"...to desist forthwith from repressive measures and further to extend every facility to the Sub-Committee to enable it to perform its task expeditiously". (Ibid.)

The Security Council also quite rightly expressed the hope that a peaceful solution would be found to the problem of Angola in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

These resolutions, namely 1603 (XV) of the General Assembly of 20 April 1961 and S/4835 of the Security Council of 9 January 1961, were adopted by a remarkable measure of unanimity. The General Assembly resolution was adopted by a vote of 73 in favour and 2 against, Portugal itself being 'absent, having boycotted the proceedings of the Assembly. The Security Council resolution encountered no opposition and there were only two abstentions. In spite, however, of the overwhelming expression of opinion by these two principal organs of the United Nations, the problem of Angola still remains with us in all its intensity and potentiality for conflict in Africa. It continues to strain international relations at a time when the nations in mutual understanding should devote their energies sincerely and wholeheartedly to the solution of the problems of war and peace and the economic problems of large parts of the world, particularly in Asia. and Africa, which are clamouring for solution. The ferocity of Portuguese armed action and repression aimed at cowing down the Angolan people continues undiminished. Today, in spite of the assertion of the Portuguese representative the other day that all is quiet in Angola, the Angolan situation is much more dangerous than ever before. The challenge to the United Nations is greater and indeed the whole. future of cooperative relations within the United Nations and outside,

14

between important groups of countries, is in jeopardy.

Who is to blame for this regrettable and explosive impasse? Not the United Nations, certainly not the countries of Asia and Africa. Indeed, the Members of the United Nations have pronounced themselves on the rights and wrongs of the Angolan situation. They have in unmistakable terms declared that Angola is a colony of Portugal whose natural and inalienable destiny is freedom and independence. The resolutions of the United Nations both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council are significant for their great moderation and restraint. Indeed, the whole attitude of Members of the United Nations--particularly Members from Asia and Africa who, it is no secret, have been the prime movers behind these resolutions --has been eminently reasonable and constructive and has demonstrated their desire for a peaceful evolution of Angola to freedom and independence. They have even been prepared for a measure of gradualness in the march of the Angolan people towards independence. Why is it then that this grave problem is still with

The sole negative factor has been the intransigence of Portugal and its total imperviousness to world public opinion as reflected in the United Nations resolutions, and its determination to hold on to Angola at all costs, unmindful of its obligations under the Charter and of the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, notably resolution 1514 (XV).

The archives of the Assembly are replete with evidence of the obstructive attitude of the Government of Portugal. Let me cite only a few examples. At the meeting of the Security Council on 14 March 1961, the Portuguese representative stated:

"I repeat : The Portuguese have been in Africa five centuries and they intend to stay, whatever the cost. And I add, the Portuguese of all colours, creeds and races intend to stay in Africa, whatever the cost". (S/PV. 945, p. 77)

A few days later, speaking in the General Assembly on the question of Angola on 23 March 1961, the representative of Portugal said :

"My delegation must strongly repudiate the contention that Angola is a 'classic case of colonial domination and suppression'. By traditional right, constitutional law, administration and practice, Angola is a province of Portugal, an integral part of a unitarian State". (A/PV. 966, p. 11)

At the Security Council meeting on 9 June 1961, the representative of Portugal again gave expression to his Government's attitude in the following terms:

"....our view has been that the United Nations has no right to impose err even to suggest the application of a special international statute to certain Provinces of our unitary State, against the national structure of my country and against the principles of the Portuguese Constitution. It is illegal for the United Nations to vote discriminatory resolutions against Portugal." (S/PV. 956, pp. 37-40)

Again, only the other day the representative of

us?

Portugal characterized the present debate as "illegal, pointless and wasteful". (A/PV. 1088, p, 37).

What is the significance of these statements? We are living in a fast moving world--a world of change, the dizzy pace of which is shattering old and outmoded concepts and prejudices. Even during the last twelve months, to take the latest segment of time, the dimension of man's knowledge and achievement, especially in space, and his future prospects have themselves changed beyond recognition. This has spurred a revolution in the world of ideas. Yet, while the world has moved on at a breathtaking pace, Portugal has remained still, as indeed it has for the last 400 years. It is this paralysis in Portuguese thinking that is solely responsible for the fact that there has been no progress towards solution of the problem of Angola, and the people of Angola are not a whit nearer to the freedom and independence which is their fight to have and enjoy.

The Sub-Committee of five nations, Bolivia, Dahomey, the Federation of Malaya, Finland and Sudan, appointed by the President in terms of General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) and presided over by Mr. Salamanca of Bolivia, has submitted an honest, objective, able and painstaking report (A/4978) to the General Assembly. Despite the severe handicap of Portuguese non-cooperation and Portugal's refusal to permit the Sub-Committee to visit Angola, the report is an exhaustive and illuminating document and gives ample facts to enable us to assess the situation in Angola. Hardly anyone in the General Assembly will dispute the conclusion of the Committee that:

"the disturbances and conflicts in Angola are mainly the consequences of genuine

15

grievances of the indigenous population against the administration of the territory, including dissatisfaction with economic conditions, the impact of African nationalism, the rise of political groups seeking redress of grievances and the right of self-determination, and the severe repression to which these groups had been subjected." (A/4978, para. 436)

The Sub-Committee goes on to say

"The disturbances and conflicts have resulted in the loss of thousands of lives, the flight of nearly 150,000 refugees from the territory, and the creation of a 'veritable atmosphere of war'. They have involved much brutality against both the Portuguese and the Angolans, accompanied by fears and charges of attempts towards the 'extermination' or `annihilation' of racial group's that is, of a racial conflict of a genocidal nature." (Ibid., para. 437)

Further:

"During the past few months the situation in Angola has not improved but deteriorated. The conflict has increased the problems and heightened passions". (Ibid., para. 438).

The Sub-Committee naturally could not report the precise figures of the number killed, especially since it was not allowed to visit Angola. Press reports have indicated the African casualties so far to be somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000, and, even if we assume that these figures might be somewhat inflated, we have it on the authority of persons of standing who were actually in Angola during the first months of the Angolan revolution that the number of Africans killed runs into thousands. According to the Reverend Malcolm McVeigh, a missionary of the Methodist Church of New Jersey from 1958 to 1961, who returned to the United States in July last year, at a conservative estimate 1,000 Europeans and 25,000 Africans were killed during the first three months of the uprising. Many more must have been killed since then, as the conflict has continued and Portugal has persisted in using increasingly brutal measures and armed action against the Angolan people.

The representative of Portugal told the Assembly the other day that: "the internal life of the region affected by terrorism has returned to normal." (A/PV. 1088, page 7). He further remarked: "With the reinforcement of troops, and, above all, with the active co-operation of the local populations, terrorism has been practically overcome. Law and order have been restored; peace and work have been guaranteed. Military operations, as such, have ended. One does not exclude the possibility, for some time, of an isolated shot or a treacherous ambuscade. But such things do not alter the general normalcy of the region nor do they affect its peaceful progress." (Ibid., page 16)

We are not persuaded of the truth of these statements. What the representative of Portugal cynically describes as a problem of internal law and order was described by one of the eminent ministers of his Government some time ago as "a veritable state, of war". In reality it is nothing short of a ruthless and aggressive colonial war for the suppression of freedom in which some 25,000 Portuguese regular troops and thousands of colons are engaged against unarmed African people. As The Observer of London pointed out in its issue of 18th June 1961, the magnitude of this war is indicated by the budgeted expenditure by Portugal of some (pond)28 million Sterling for it. The statements of the Portuguese representative. minimizing the scope and magnitude of the conflict will, therefore, deceive no one. The peace of the grave can never be substituted for freedom. So far as we know this war goes on even if its intensity is temporarily diminished, as the Sub-Committee itself has indicated in its report that the situation has deteriorated.

The problem of Angola is not merely one of freedom of the people of a single country in Africa. Even if it were possible to treat it as an isolated problem, the problem itself would be grave enough. It has, however, much broader aspects and is involved not only with the great movement of the disappearance of colonialism in our time; it even goes to the roots of the Charter of the Organization as a whole. The process of liberation of peoples from domination and alien subjugation is an irresistible and irreversible process of history. Wisdom demands that that process be assisted to full consummation. There could be no graver folly than to place obstacles in the way of that process. Barring Portugal, and perhaps one or two other countries, no one here will accept that any particular provision of the Charter or the spirit of it as a whole are designed to perpetuate Portuguese colonialism. It is, therefore, clear that not only to meet the requirement of international understanding and good will, which are basic to the solutions of the critical problems of

16

war and peace which face the, world today, but also to meet the need for the continued effectiveness of the United Nations, Portuguese colonialism-which typifies that system in its most vicious and virulent form and of which Angola is the worst example-has to go. The question is whether the United Nations can assist in bringing about its dissolution and disappearance peacefully, and with sufficient rapidity. For go it must; and if Portugal persists in blocking the doors of peaceful change, and if the United Nations, or more importantly Portugal's powerful friends, cannot persuade it to see the error of its ways, the inexorable processes of history, of change through violence, revolution- and war, are likely to take over. If Angolan freedom should have to come that way it will have been won in desperate conflict and bitterness, with resultant upheaval and disruption all round, which would be tragic indeed.

The United Nations, therefore, has to take up the challenge of Portuguese colonialism in Angola. This is necessary not only for vindicating the ethos of the United Nations in the matter of freedom to colonial peoples but also for ensuring the effective realization of the principles and purposes of the Charter. The question arises what can we do to assist in the emergence into full freedom and independence of the people of Angola. It is obvious that first of all the obstacle of Portuguese intransigence should disappear. Hitherto, Portugal has not shown any signs of shifting from its mental and psychological attitude of 400 years ago. One has good reason to despair of the possibility of any voluntary change in the attitude of Portugal. The United Nations, however, has the obligation to help in every possible way to bring about this change. Those Members of the Organization which have friendly relations with Portugal and are in special relationship with it

through military and other alliances must bring the whole weight of their influence and persuasion to bear on Portugal.

In this connexion my delegation would like to state, in agreement with the Sub-Committee, that the so-called reforms which Portugal is said to have initiated can be regarded as nothing but shadowy, superficial and a mere eye-wash. If Portugal thinks that merely by an act of legislation of this nature it can satisfy the yearning for freedom, while maintaining the myth of Angola's being a part of Portugal, it is living in a world of tragic make-believe.

Even a cursory examination of these reforms would reveal their superficial character. The line of authority in Angola with the Governor-General at the apex, supported by District Governors, administrators and chiefs of post, remains unchanged, for these high officials will continue to be Portuguese. The Reform Decrees of 1961 are nothing more than panegyrics to Portuguese colonialism, for which they claim almost divine inspiration. One of the allegedly important features of these reforms is the decision to recognize African traditions and customs. One wonders whether this decision should not have been taken 400 years or more ago when the Portuguese first arrived in their colonies. James Duffy's observation that the Portuguese envision of equal status for the Africans in another 200 to 300 years would still appear to hold good. As one student of Portuguese affairs has remarked, these reforms propose no significant changes and are hardly worthy of the name.

There is no significant expansion of the functions of local government, the area which these reforms are intended mainly to affect. There is no provision for any election of local officials. They are to be appointed by the Governor of a district or administrative official merely on "consultation". The Governor's powers remain unchanged.

The practical reality of this matter is that while ink has hardly dried on the paper on which these decrees were inscribed, a sinister design for the expropriation of the lands of Angolans and for the colonization of that territory through further Portuguese settlement has been put into implementation. On I September 1961, in a special despatch from Luanda to The New York Times, Henry Tanner, a well-known reporter, wrote:

"Mass immigration by thousands and eventually perhaps millions of white settlers is the idea most frequently mentioned here by officials and private citizens searching for a long-range solution to Portugal's problems in Angola.

"Immigration plans vary in form.

"A Portuguese officer exultantly declares that 'almost all' conscript soldiers who came here during the last five months 'like it in Angola' and plan to settle here with their families after the war. His dream is that all 20,000 men now fighting the rebels in the north will become 'soldiersettlers'."

There are references to this policy of settling soldiers in Angola in part IV, section III, subsection (b), of the Sub-Committee's report (A/4978). To the Sub-Committee's fears and apprehensions, the Government of Portugal has

17

responded in its traditional manner. The Portuguese delegation's comments on the Sub-Committee's report read as follows :

"Unless the Sub-Committee wishes to demonstrate its anti-white racism, one does not understand such concern over the co-existence of different races in the same territory. From this part of the report it seems possible to infer that the ideal solution of the problem, in the pinion of the Sub-Committe, would be the expulsion of all persons of the white race from that African territory....." (A/5082, para. 82).

The Assembly must carefully weigh the consequences of this Policy of settling soldiers in Angola. The role of the armed Portuguese civilians in Angola during these recent months of repression has been described by the Sub-Committee in paragraph 127 of its report. Brutal acts of Portuguese settlers in Angola have also been brought to light in greater detail by Methodist and other missionaries who have recently returned from there. Therefore, this proposed settlement of Portugucse soldiers in Angola in larger numbers there can have no other meaning than that of determination to suppress the people and to place them at the mercy of ruthless colons in the style of Algeria, the already existing thousands of whom have worked havoc with Africans in the, recent uprisings.

We strongly deplore this Policy and we fear that its implementation can only lead to an aggravation of the present conflict in the Portuguese colony of Angola.

One of the basic challenges to the United Nations and its ethos, to the philosophy of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights in Angola is the continued denial of human rights to the African peoples. In paragraph 142 of its report, the Sub-Committee notes :

"Many complaints concern the denial of human rights, abuse of authority and high-handedness, especially by local administrative officials". (A/4978, para, 142)

The report goes on to add :

"The Sub-Committee has heard a number of complaints against arbitrary arrests, long periods of imprisonment without trial, physical ill-treatment of prisoners, and the disappearance of prisoners." (Ibid).

The representative of Protufal, speaking in the Assembly the other day, said :

"And foremost among these principles"which inform Portuguese nationhood-"is the development and stabilization of a multi-racial society without any sort Of discrimination based on the highest ideals of human, brotherhood, not in theory alone but also in practice....." (A/PV. 1088, p. 33)

This, like many other Portuguese claims, is a very tall claim little substantiated by reality. Them is hardly an observer who has gone into one of these Portuguese colonies and come back bringing confirmation of pronouncements of this character. In the revised 1961 edition of African Survey by Lord Halley, it is stated :

"There is little opportunity in the present circumstances for the exhibition in Portuguese territories of the spirit of Africanism, for there is a severe measure of restriction on the expression of public opinion."

More recently, James Duffy in his Portuguese Africa has observed :

"Signs on the boards of Angolan restaurants reading 'Right of Admission Reserved' are not accidental phenomena any more than are the creation of almost exclusively white towns and colonization projects in the interior".

James Ritner, in his book The Death of Africa, published in 1960, observes :

"Any one who takes an interest in Africa learns that Portuguese Africa is one of the worst governed areas of the world."

Dr. Rowley, the Chairman of the Baptist Missionary Society, in a recent statement accused the Portuguese military authorities of "utmost barbarism". He said that "Years of repressive Portuguese government have exhausted the patience of the Angolans", and described Angola as "the blackest spot on the continent of Africa".

Reverend Malcolm McVeigh, who served in Angola as a missionary of the Methodist Church for four years and was compelled to return from there, in July last year, has written much about the state of human rights in Angola. Missionaries are not given to extremist expressions and their observations, therefore, should carry special weight. There have been stories in the Press of mass massacres in Angola. This is what Reverend McVeigh has to say:

18

"In the past three months thousands have disappeared, carried by the local militia, government officials, or the troops. We have heard of very few new prisons being built and no one has ever heard of a concentration camp. The prisons are constantly being filled and emptied and very few returned to their families. One of the big questions is : Where are they going? The rumour in Malange (I have heard this from whites, Mulattoes and Africans) is that they are being killed and buried in mass graves by bulldozers."

Of the prevalence of forced labour Reverend McVeigh says :

"On the international level, Portuguese officials quite often deny that forced labour is still practised in Angola. And it is not unusual, for them to produce a mountain of official documents to prove that the system was abandoned many years ago. Of course, this is pure and simple 'propaganda' issued for world consumption.... Interestingly enough, in Angola itself no one would ever think of denying that it still exists, Naturally, there would be little value in trying to deny that anything so common exists."

He goes on-and this is a particularly tragic aspect of forced labour in Angola :

"It is not uncommon for women and older children to be separated, some working on one plantation while others work on another. Spiritual degradation - is the result of the forced separation of families and the unhealthy moral life on the plantation compounds. This is especially a problem for young teen-age girls who become the victims for satisfying the desires of unscrupulous whites, mulattoes and blacks".

Bisbop Dodge has stated that the indignation of the churches against the regime of Dr. Salazar arises from four main sources : "brutal treatment of Africans, terrorist tactics and intimidation; religious discrimination; and absence of forthrightness in official dealings".

Speaking of Portuguese terrorists, the Methodist Board of Missions, on the basis of reliable reports received from Methodist sources in Angola, says :

"Generally speaking, they are European merchants or farmers who operate either with the consent of the local Portuguese authorities or behind their backs. Their apparent object is to decimate if not annihilate the male African population of Angola, especially those who have some professional and academic training."

I apologize for offering so many quotations but, in the present state of a complete news blackout and a ruthless system of censorship, anyone who is interested in the problem of Angola has no option but to rely on these very sound sources of information coining from gentlemen of high character and standing and organizations of the same character. These give the lie to the much vaunted claim by Portugal of equality and of the observance of human rights in Angola.

The Sub-Committee on the situation in Angola has appropriately devoted a part of its report to an examination of economic conditions prevailing in the territory. The report shows the extent of exploitation of the Angolan people by Portugal. Economic exploitation, which always goes with colonial domination, is practised as a fine art by the Portuguese in Angola. Not only is cheap forced labour used on Portuguese plantations carved out of land belonging to Angolans, but the primary products and raw materials of Angola, which feed Portuguese industry in Portugal, are purchased at prices artificially fixed well below the world prices. Likewise, the industrial products of Portugal are forced into Angola at prices artificially fixed higher than world prices. This is an economic stranglehold maintained on Angola, for the benefit of Portugal, denying the Angolan people any hope of enjoying the fruits of their land and labour and raising their standards of living.

The tragic state of economic backwardness in Angola resulting from centuries of cruel exploitation makes it necessary that the United Nations, with whatever resources it has at its disposal, should find ways and means of going to the assistance of Angola. We hope that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the specialized agencies will give the necessary

attention to this aspect of the matter.

The United Nations has shown great patience. In paritcular, as I have said earlier, the attitude of the Asian-African countries, despite the gravest provocation by Portugal, has been eminently reasonable and actuated by a desire to bring about peaceful evolution of Angola to independence. While hoping that the friends of Portugal will bring it round to acknowledging the tide of history, the General Assembly can do no better than to adopt a firm but

19

constrictive resolution giving Portugal another chance to live up to its obligations to the Angolan people and to the world community.

It is the view of my delegation that Portugal should agree to Angolas independence and announce its intention to transfer power by a very early date. This will at once have an electrifying effect. It will help pacify the Angolan people and reduce bitterness. Among the national characteristics of the peoples of Asia and Africa are their tolerance and forgiveness and, once Portugal announces its firm intention to transfer power to the Angolan people and follows it up by concrete measures, it can hope for the building up of future relations with Angola on the basis of understanding and friendly co-operation and equality. We are glad that this has been urged by countries like Brazil and Australia, which have been traditionally friendly and sometimes, one may feel, even partial to Portugal. Among the concrete steps that should be taken immediately is the introduction of elective assemblies at local and national levels on the basis of universal adult suff rage. It is, of course, necessary that prior to such elections there should be complete political amnesty and release Of political prisoners as an essential basis for the creation of the right atmosphere for the introduction of farreaching reforms and future co-operation between Portugal and the Angolan people. To the elective bodies so created power should be transferred, and there should be complete transfer of power by the appointed date of independence.

Meanwhile, it is the duty of the international community of the United Nations, through its

various agencies, to render technical assistance to Angola for the building up of the necessary technical and administrative cadres and for ensuring that Angola has all the necessary services of its own when it emerges into independence.

My delegation can visualise no other way in which the problem of Angola can be solved in a peaceful manner, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and without continuing conflict of a most serious nature.

Before concluding, I should like to submit a few remarks of a general character on a subject which has tended to be connected with the one under discussion.

Recently, it seems to have become fashionable in certain guarters to attack Afro-Asian countries for their uncompromising attitude on colonial questions. They have been often called intransigent and unreasonable and charged with having double standards. It has been said that their attitudes endanger, in some mysterious way, the United Nations, and indeed undermine the very foundations of the Charter and this Organization. So far as my country is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that we are uncompromisingly anti-colonialist. We have seen the end of the colonial era in our own country, and we are anxious to see the end of colonialism everywhere else. We shall unhesitatingly give our support and sympathy to those who seek the same objective; and no apology is necessary for this attitude. If recent history is any guide it should be realised by those who profess to be disturbed by the fire of Afro-Asian anti-colonialism that it is possible--indeed, it is the only wise course-to end colonialism and yet maintain understanding and good relations between the erstwhile colonial Power and a newly emergent State. The mutual relationship between India and Great Britain is an example in point, as also is the relationship between Ceylon, Pakistan, Malaya, Ghana, Nigeria and others with the United Kingdom, with which they are associated in the Commonwealth.

The second largest empire was that of France, and, except for Algeria, on the subject of whose freedom France is at odds with practically the whole of Asia and Africa, the former colonial world maintains good. relations with France. Indeed, a large number of independent African States represented here, which were formerly French colonies, maintain very close ties with France. Let it therefore not be said light-heartedly that the African and Asian countries in this Organization are carrying on some kind of crusade against the countries of the Western world or that it is a creed with them to oppose the West. That is indeed not true, though there is no doubt that these African and Asian countries, having suffered from a long era of colonial domination and having known its evils first-hand, will have no truck with colonialism. The truth is that those whose positions are more or less static and immovable regard and resent even moderate winds of change from Africa and Asia as a destructive hurricane. There is no doubt that, if Portugal were to act with the same wisdom which informed the actions of other colonial Powers such as Britain and France, it would receive here the same understanding and sympathy as these other colonial Powers, which have shown a capacity and readiness for adjustment to changing times.

20

It is a well known fact that a large number of countries of Asia and Africa are non-aligned as between the Eastern and the Western groups of Powers. These countries have no vendetta to pursue against any particular country or group of countries. They are content to define their responses and attitudes concerning each particular issue as it arises, on its own merits, and to concentrate their energies on their own internal problems which are many and varied and very complex. If, on the question of Portuguese colonialism, the Western Powers come under Afro-Asian criticism, such criticism is not altogether without reason or foundation. In this whole question of Portuguese colonialism special responsibility devolves on Western countries, especially those of the NATO alliance. For, without the prop of the NATO alliance, Portuguese colonialism would perhaps already have met its destined end. We have no desire to dwell on this aspect of the matter at great length. I would like only to conclude by quoting a passage from an article by Professor Basil Davidson, a distinguished and respected student

of contemporary African history. Writing in the August 1961 issue of the New Statesmen, Professor Davidson says :

"There can be no real doubt that Portugal has used and is using NATO armaments in Angola. Without such NATO supplies, the Portuguese could never have deployed the aircraft, weapons and destructive techniques they have operated and still operate against African men, women and children. Only Norway among the NATO powers has refused to sell arms to Portugal; because, as Foreign Minister Lange said on 21 June, 'Norway regards it as a burden for the whole western alliance that one member-country seeks to retain colonies by force'.... "

The Afro-Asian countries and the people of Angola would have liked to see other NATO Powers adopt the attitude taken by Norway.

The countries supplying NATO arms have stated that the arms supplied to Portugal are not intended for use in Portuguese colonies to suppress freedom movements. But the prohibition is obviously futile. Professor Davidson's comment in this regard is pertinent :

"Salazar is faced with a challenge in Angola (and may be soon in Mozambique) that he is failing to meet with the resources now at his disposal. He is not winning his colonial war. Ms regime is weakened in Portugal itself. He will therefore clamour for more help, more arms, more ammunition, more bombs, more tokens of friendship. Will he be permitted to get this help?"

And the help he refers to is from NATO.

These are also the questions which often arise in the minds. of Afro-Asian delegations. To these questions, we hope, the Western Powers concerned will be able to provide answers satisfactory to Asian African opinion.

I have ventured to bring up the matter of the current misunderstanding, in some quarters, of the Afro-Asian position, not in any spirit of criticism but in the hope that mutual understanding would be promoted by frank exposition of our view. It is colonial questions which are proving to be the deepest divisive factor and solutions of these without further delay are imperative for removing the causes of division and disharmony in the United Nations.

The draft resolution introduced by forty-two countries, of which my delegation has the honour to be a co-sponsor and whose primary purpose is to promote Angola's independence, adopting a peaceful approach, has precisely these aims. It embodies the constructive approach which, in our view, ought to be brought to bear on this question. We trust that it will be adopted unanimously.

INDIA ANGOLA USA PORTUGAL BOLIVIA FINLAND SUDAN UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA RUSSIA MALDIVES AUSTRALIA BRAZIL GHANA NIGER NIGERIA PAKISTAN FRANCE NORWAY MOZAMBIQUE

Date : Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's letter to President of the Security Council on Kashmir

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on January 16, 1962 requesting him not to entertain Pakistan's request for a Council meeting to consider the Kashmir situation:

I have been instructed by the Government of India to invite Your Excellency's attention to Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter dated 11 January 1962 requesting you to convene a meeting of the Security Council as early as may be convenient to consider the Kashmir situation.

The Pakistan Permanent Representative has

in support of his request for early consideration contended that the efforts for direct negotiations have failed and that there is a grave threat to the maintenance of peace in the Kashmir region. That these contentions of the Pakistan Permanent Representative are completely

21

unfounded and that the Government of Pakistan am deliberately attempting to exploit the Council as a propaganda forum against the Government of India would be clear from the factual position stated in paragraphs 3 to 5 below.

So far as the Government of India are concerned, not only have the avenues of direct negotiations not been exhausted but they are and have always been open in conformity with the Government of India's settled policy to arrive at peaceful settlements by negotiation. The Prime Minister of India answering a question at his press conference as late as 28 December 1961, stated: "We have always agreed to talk with Pakistan about this subject as on every other subject. We have never refused. We may start with the assumption as we do that there is not much room to talk about the Kashmir problem if what is intended is an upset of everything in, Kashmir. We can talk about anything but we are not going to invite something which will upset the whole of this continent and instead of bringing peace bring war all over. Our view has been that we should start with the acceptance of things as they are and let us talk about adjustments etc." The invitation extended by the Prime Minister during his visit to Pakistan in September 1960 to the President of Pakistan to visit India still holds despite aggressive and provocative anti-Indian speeches made by Pakistan leaders.

The Pakistan Permanent Representative has in his letter quoted out of context extracts from individual speeches made by members of the Congress Party at the Congress Session at Patna to create a false impression about India's international policy. What is relevant in this connexion is the official position the Congress Party adopted at the Congress Session. The resolution on international affairs adopted at the Congress Session specifically directs that "the Government would seek all avenues of peaceful settlement". It is clear that this resolution poses no threat of any kind to the maintenance of peace in the Kashmir region. It is Pakistan who by its aggressive efforts and instigation of continued attempts at subversion and sabotage poses a threat to the maintenance of peace in this region.

The Graham Report was submitted to the Security Council in March 1958. For four years the Government of Pakistan did not consider the matter relevant or urgent enough for consideration by the Council. That Pakistan should now on the eve of India's Third General Elections when her national leaders are fully preoccupied with election activities, ask for an early meeting to consider this report clearly demonstrates the purely opportunist, agitational and propagandist approach which has nothing to do with the merits of the situation.

I have been instructed by my Government to request the Council, in the light of the position stated in paragraphs 3 to 5 above, to refuse to entertain the request made by the Pakistan Permanent Representative for a meeting of the Council. The members of the Council will appreciate that the eve of the General Elections is hardly the proper time either for direct negotiations between the two Governments or for discussion of the situation in the Security Council.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA TUNISIA **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Vice-President's Speech at Banquet in honour of Field Marshal Amer

Speaking at a banquet given in honour of Ms Excellency, Field Marshall Abdel Hakim

Amer, the Vice-President of the United Arab Republic, on January 24, 1962, the Vice-President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said:

Mr. Vice-President, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen :

I should like to express to you, Sir, and the members of your party a very cordial welcome on behalf of the Government and the people of this country. I understand that you and many members of your party are for the first time visiting this country. The short stay you are putting in of ten days is, I think, much too short to see anything of our ancient monuments or modem achievements.

Ours is also a country like yours with a long history. We passed through troublous times and we emerged into independence some 15 years ago. You have taken independence as the starting point and you are attempting to build a kind of social democracy on the basis of that independence.

We in our country and you in your country and many others in Asia and Africa have suffered on account of our religious reaction, our feudalistic structure of society, our superstitious outlook and our technical backwardness.

22

It is these defects that we have to remedy when we have the opportunity to do so. You are attempting to do it, and your goal is to establish a socialist co-operative democracy. You do not take socialism in any doctrinaire sense, but you are using it in a pragmatic way, and it is democracy that you wish to safeguard in the interest of the individual. Islam has stood for democracy, and if any religion has practised it, it is Islam that has practised it. You will find in the mosques top people and low class people, all of them treated alike as citizens of one brotherhood. Though we have accepted it in theory, there art many countries professing Islam which are not practising democracy. You are attempting to do it in your country today. We are happy about it.

You believe in co-operative farming; you believe also in rural reconstruction. You wish to apply the modem techniques of science for reclaiming a large part of your country which is still a desert area.

We have heard about the work which you are doing. Only this afternoon, I was told that every third day you start a new school. In other words, your boys and girls from 6 to 15 are being given free education. That is what I was informed. But the trouble is with regard to the higher technical, medical, engineering and other colleges. You will succeed in achieving them also.

Our relations have become closer and more intimate. We have, established cultural exchanges. On the question of saving your Nubian monuments, we sent some of our archaeological experts, and another team is trying to go there again. Our Atomic Energy Commission and your Atomic Energy Establishment are working together. It is unnecessary for me to say with my Defence Minister by my side and with you as the Field Marshal and Defence Minister that there is co-operation even in defence services.

Apart from all these national things, in international problems also, we are trying to work together. Our relations have become much more friendly and intimate after the Suez Canal events. One of the happy factors in our relationship is the friendship between your President and our Prime Minister. That is one of the basic conditions which is bringing our two countries together. You fight against colonialism. You are arguing for disarmament. It is easy to speak about these things. But the more difficult thing is to develop the mind and the will. There is the great Sphinx standing there beckoning to all people the problem which civilisation poses-the human face and the body of a brute, the body of a lion. The beast is not outside us; it is in us. The elements of brutality, violence etc. are not to be found elsewhere. The mere liberation of the intellect is not enough. The liberation of the heart, the liberation of the instincts, is also necessary.

The Sphinx, if it signifies anything, is a call for integration, a call for a balanced development of our life. The inquisitive mind is there; the sensitive spirit is there; the emotional heart is there; but all these things will have to be coordinated and the individual must become a balanced one. It is only then that we will be able to build a peaceful world here. Therefore, we feel that your country and our country are working together for similar purposes, similar objectives, both in the national and in the international sphere.

Mr. Vice-President, I would like you, to convey to your President, your Government and the people our best wishes for your progress and prosperity. I have no doubt that you will feel here the warmth and the friendliness of our people for your country and its achievements; and we wish you well.

May I request you to drink to the health of the Vice-President of the United Arab Republic?

USA **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Reply by U.A.R. Vice-President

In his reply, His Excellency Field Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, Vice-President of the United Arab Republic, said :

MR. VICE-PRESIDENT

I am indeed happy that my first visit to great India should take place shortly after the important historical event when the Indian Armed Forces moved and, with a swift and decisive blow. removed from the sub-continent the last vestiges of imperialism and- domination in Goa.

One thing I would like to add to this, namely that the bearing of this event is not restricted

to the removal of one of the remaining imperialist pockets, but will make itself very much felt in the course of the liberation movement in Africa where Portuguese imperialism holds important strongholds in the very heart of that continent-in Mozambique in the East and in Angola in the West.

23

It is indeed a strong impetus for the fighters in Angola and Mozambique to see that great India is taking a positive action in their direction in the direction of justice and history.

None of us should heed the striking campaigns to which India has lately been exposed from those who tried to picture India's liberation of Goa as if it were incompatible with the policy of non-alignment, or as if it showed a decrease in faith, in peace and in peaceful means for the settlement of all problems.

Those who raced to launch the poisonous campaigns against India, first have to adjust their understanding of different values.

Non-alignment does not mean refraining from liberating usurped parts of our land; moreover, peace differs immensely from surrender. Yet, those elements refuse to understand because understanding conflicts with their imperialist interests and with their insistence on exploiting and dominating peoples.

Our people were exposed to the same policy of organised, unjust campaigns and deceiving envenomed propaganda only because our people insist on liberating usurped Palestine and on restricting the Arab land to the Arab owners. This land was usurped in a way unprecedented in the history of mankind. Moreover, what adds to the ferocity of the campaigns launched against us in that battle fought on the Arab land of Algeria for years, between struggling people with a right to freedom and independence on the one hand, and imperialism seeking to impose its domination on those people, on the other. We, for our part, can but side with our Algerian brethern with all our might, inspired not only by Arab brotherhood and blood relations but also by our faith in the sound principles urging the ending of foreign domination and calling for every

people's right to govern themselves by themselves and their right to self determination.

Mr. Vice-President,

I am also pleased that my first visit to India should coincide with the happy national festivities marking the anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of India. Developments leading to this historic event are a further testimony to the fact that imperialism weights matters only in conformity with its interests and influence. Yet, the peoples will always examine matters in the light of what rightness and justice impose. The little that imperialism refused to given to India in 1928 was compensated by an enormous power in the Indian people's pledge and determination a year later; and imperialism gave in before the fight and will of the people of India.

Mr. Vice-President,

The bonds that unite the battles of the Arab Nine Valley and those of the Indian sub-continent, are old and deeply-rooted in the annals of history. We can trace the seeds of those ties back in the old civilisations and in the epochs of flourishing trade between the two regions.

In fact, the crisis to which we have both been exposed helped link our causes; one definite fact is that when British imperialism established itself in India, it pretended that its occupation of Egypt was because the latter was on the route to India.

Therefore, it is not strange that our efforts and yours in the course of national liberation have come close to each other on many occasions particuarly in that of organised popular struggle following the First World War.

These efforts drew closer and were about to join as the national struggle extended heading for the new phase with its grand aspirations and wide scope. We then met along the path of non-alignment and marched together along the road to Bandung. We exerted our utmost endeavouring to mobilise all peace potentialities in our world, consolidate them and increase their possibilities by striving to end imperialism and its hostile bases the dangers of which we felt and still feel, and also by putting a halt to the mad nuclear and non-nuclear arms race and by resisting underdevelopment among all peoples in the world society.

Mr. Vice-President, Friends,

The slogans on the banners raised by the people of India today are the same slogans that echo in my country on the banks of the Nile, confirming justice for man, demanding dignity for the individual, and seeking the establishment of world peace.

Means adopted by nations aspiring for progress and glory may differ, yet those nations are ultimately united by the one aim, namely, the freedom and honour of man.

Today, in the United Arab Republic we call this battle, the battle of 'liberating the citizen' just as we named the fight against imperialism, the battle of 'liberating the Father-land'. That was the battle of political freedom; today, we, you and many others in Asia and Africa face their inevitable obligation towards the battle of social reconstruction and social freedom which calls for the removal of the big barriers standing in the people's way. Foremost among those

24

barriers, as Your Excellency is aware, is feudalism; also on the list is exploiting domination and hateful reaction.

Mr. Vice-President, Friends,

I carry with me greetings from my people to the great people of India, to the President of the Republic, Dr. Prasad and to the nationalist leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru whose visit to our country on numerous occasions has afforded our people the opportunity of welcoming a leader of national struggle and a fervent believer in world peace and justice.

A strong, dear friendship has grown between our President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime, Minister Nehru along the road of struggle for the Nehru along the road of . struggle for the realisation of the aims which all mankind aspires for. It is indeed a creative and construtive friendship. As I convey to you the greetings of the President of the United Arab Republic, I ask you, gentlemen, to raise your glasses with me in honour of the Indian people and of the Vice-President of the Indian Re, public.

25

INDIA MOZAMBIQUE ANGOLA USA ALGERIA EGYPT INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jan 01, 1962

February

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Volume VIII	Feb 01, 1962 FEBRUARY		No. 2	
CONTENTS				
BULGARIA Protocol Signed		27		
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in the Security				
Council on Kashmir Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in the Political		27		
Committee on Cuba Shri C.S.Jha's Statement in the Trusteeship		31		
Committee on Rwanda-Urandi			34	
RUMANIA Indo-Rumanian Trade	Agreement Extended			39

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	
Indo-Soviet Contract for Project Report Signed	39
Indo-Soviet Culture Letters Exchanged	40

YUGOSLAVIA Indo-Yugolsav Trade, Protocol Signed 40

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

BULGARIA INDIA CUBA USA RWANDA YUGOSLAVIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

BULGARIA

Protocol Signed

Talks between a Trade Delegation from the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the officials of the Government of India ended in New Delhi on February 1, 1962 with the conclusion of a Protocol indicating new schedules of goods available for export and import between the two countries for the calendar year 1962.

The Protocol was signed by Mr. Dragan Draganov, Leader of the Bulgarian Delegation, on behalf of his Government, and Shri B. N. Adarkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India.

In the course of the discussions, the two delegations reviewed last year's trade and the steps to be taken to develop trade between the two countries to a comparatively higher level during 1962. The volume of trade during 1961 is estimated to be of the order of Rs. 2 crores both ways.

The commodities to be imported into India

will continue to include capital goods and machinery items, steel materials, chemicals and other industrial raw materials, fertilizers, machine tools, cables, bleached wood pulp etc.

Exports from India to Bulgaria, on the other hand, will be rolled steel products, cotton and woolen fabrics, leather footwear, tinned fruits and juices, tinned fish and prawns, coir products, wood screws, diesel engines, air compressors, spectacle frames, rubber goods, asbestos manufactures, coke-oven bye-products, railway wagons, jute manufacturers, linoleum, sports goods, handicrafts, chemicals, deoiled cakes. drugs, and medicines, tanned and semi-tanned hides and skins etc., apart from other traditional goods like tea, coffee, spices, cashew kernels, essential and vegetable oils, mica, etc.

BULGARIA INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UINTED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in the Security Council on Kashmir

Shri C. S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on February 1, 1962, urging postponement of the consideration of Kashmir question in the Council :

Allow me to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to make a brief statement before the Council.

The representative of Pakistan, in his letters of 11 January, 1962 (S/5058) and 29 January 1962 (S/5068), alleged that efforts for direct negotiations had failed and that there was a grave threat to the maintenance of peace in the Kashmir region. In the statement we have just heard he has elaborated and embellished the same theme. I have already, on behalf of my Government, stated in my letter (S/5060 and Corr. 1) of 16 January 1962 that these contentions of the Pakistan Government and their permanent representative are completely unfounded, and that the Government of Pakistan is deliberately attempting to exploit the Council as a propaganda forum against the Government of India. Nothing the representative of Pakistan has said today alters that position. On the contrary, it furnishes confirmation of the attempt to build up an artificial and wholly false impression of Pakistan's being threatened by India.

I have asked to be allowed to appear before the Council not for the purpose of participating in a substantive discussion of the question of Kashmir or of making detailed refutation of the many charges and allegations which have just been made in the statement of the representative of Pakistan. Actually, the time-for that will be at a later date when the Council is in a position to bear the representative of the Government of India, and we hope that the meeting will be held after the elections and after the formation of a new Government.

In our view no new factor has emerged in relation to Kashmir since the last meeting of the United Nations Security Council in 1957 to

27

merit reconsideration. I have already pointed out in my letter of 16 January that there is no basis for the allegations made and that there is no urgency whatsoever for the consideration of the Kashmir question by the Council. The present time, when India is on the eve of general elections of unprecedented magnitude in its history and involving an electorate of nearly 210 million registered voters, is, for reasons which it is not necessary to elaborate, hardly appropriate either for direct negotiations between the two Governments or for discussion of this question in the Security Council.

This question, as the Council is aware, has a history of fourteen years, and it was last considered by the Council in the winter of 1956-1957. At that time also Pakistan brought up the matter on the eve of a general election. It is obvious that, on grounds which appear to us to be rather specious, Pakistan has again tried to take advantage of the Indian Government's preoccupation with the election. We are deeply disappointed that the Council, in its wisdom, did not think fit not to have a meeting now as requested by us. The convenience of the Indian Government has not been consulted and, overriding our objections. the validity and force of which have been acknowledged to us by many Members in conversation, the Council has thought fit to hold a meeting. As I have already stated, it is highly inconvenient for the Government of India to take substantive part in the Council's discussion of the Kashmir question at this time. I have, therefore, been instructed by my Government to request the Council to defer the discussion of this matter to some appropriate time after the Indian general election to enable the new Governmerit to participate fully in discussions in this Council.

While making this request I should like to take the opportunity to state briefly but categorically that there is no threat of use of force to Pakistan from India. We have repeatedly made it clear that we shall not attack Pakistan or use force against Pakistan. We have made it equally clear that if attacked we shall defend ourselves. That has been always our position, and that is our position today. Members of the Council are aware that on numerous occasions my Governmerit has offered to enter into a simple, unconditional no-war declaration with Pakistan. The object of this was to create an atmosphere free from any apprehension, and thereby to facilitate the holding of any negotiations or discussions between ourselves for the settlement of this issue. That offer stands, and it was repeated yesterday in a public statement by the Prime Minister of India. The representative of Pakistan has also referred to the suggestion made by India for a no-war declaration, but be has said that Pakistan wanted first certain matters to be settled, and that in particular it wanted the processes for the settlement of the Kashmir question to be decided upon before it could enter into a no-war declaration.

However, if Pakistan has a sense of fear or apprehension of an attack by India, of aggression by India, or of whatever else it might be called, would it not be in Pakistan's own interest to accept our offer today and sign a declaration that there should be no war, leaving all our problems to be settled by peaceful discussion ?

That is the position that I would like to bring before you and members of the Council. On the other hand, from Pakistan through the statements by their leaders and in their Press comes a constant barrage of threats of using "other means", including the use of force for the so-called liberation of Kashmir, and appeals to religious fanatism and "jehad", which means holy war.

I have here before me several volumes of reprints of such published statements. One of these is already on the records of the Council, and perhaps at a suitable 'time my delegation will take the liberty of circulating it to the members of the Council for their perusal. It is not my intention to burden the Council with these at the present moment. I shall only cite two instances.

On 7 October 1960, according to the news paper Dawn of Karachi, the President of Pakistan declared : "The Pakistan army as a defender of the motherland could never afford to leave the Kashmir issue unsolved for an indefinite time." And as late as a few days ago, according to The New York Times of 21 January, "he announced his intention to use arms supplied them by the United States Mutual Security Act against anyone, irrespective of United States wishes, whom be considered a threat to Pakistan".

And today the representative of Pakistan tells us that Pakistan is threatened by India.

I only mention these facts and I leave it to the members to place them in juxtaposition to enable the Council to view this matter in the right perspective. I also do so to show that the complaint of threat by India to Pakistan is nothing out, and I may be excused for using this rather slang word, bogey. If we were disposed to come to the Security Council in connection with such statements, I dare say that this august body would be perpetually in session, because these

28

volumes are a testimony to what I am saying. And I dare say that the representative of Pakistan can also find some statements which have been made in India. As a matter of fact the massive campaign of the character to which I have just referred that comes from Pakistan is so great that occasionally it is a fact that there are reactions in India and statements are made. But I would say that the scale is very much weighted on their side in regard to such statements and provocative utterances and incitements to liberation, "jehad", and so forth.

The representative of Pakistan has picked out a few statements, notably one said to have been made by Mr. Reddy, the President of the Congress, some weeks ago at a flag-hoisting ceremony. But as a matter of fact, subsequently at the very same Congress session and after a thorough discussion of the Government's foreign policy, the Indian National Congress formally adopted a resolution which the representative of Pakistan has quoted and which I shall quote again : "the Congress emphatically supports the Government in its policy in regard to our neighbouring States, Pakistan and China, who continue to be in illegal and forcible occupation of our territories. The Congress considers that consistent with India's basic policy and methods, the Government should seek all avenues of peaceful settlement and approves of the policy of the Government in the vacating of all aggression".

As I have said, the representative of Pakistan has also read out that quotation. You will find in this very quotation that they want to seek all avenues of peaceful settlement. What more can a responsible political party-and this, after all, is a declaration of a political party-say ?

Grievance is made of the fact that we call the occupation of a part of Kashmir by Pakistan as an aggression. It is true we say that, but we do not just say it today. We have been saying that for the last fourteen years. That was the case with which India came to the Security Council, namely that there had been aggression and an invasion of Kashmir. But the mere fact that we adhere to our point of view cannot be regarded as aggressive or as a threat to Pakistan. I really fail to understand that argument.

Is it not clear from what I have just read out from the resolution of the Indian National Congress, which is the largest political party of the country, that we are in favour of the settlement of disputes, including the question of Kashmir ? In his letter of 29 January to the Security Council,' the representative of Pakistan quotes a statement from the Tribune of India of 12 July 1961 said to have been made by the Defence Minister of India. In this statement itself the Defence Minister has clearly stated : "We do not want to settle down to a war situation. . . . We still stand by the commitments we have entered into. But if aggression comes, we are determined to and we will meet it. For our sovereignty, dignity and honour are involved in Kashmir."

I very respectfully submit that this is not a war-like statement. On the contrary it is, as the Council knows, a reaffimation of something which we have stated again and again and which is our basic position, namely that there has been aggression against India in Kashmir and that Kashmir is an integral part of India. Also, we have stated in the Council time and again since 1948 that this aggression must be vacated, and when we say that we mean to say vacated by peaceful means. It is a reaffirmation of our intention to defend our position in Kashmir and to prevent any further aggression. Surely it is given to a responsible minister of government to state the determination of his government to defend the territory of his country and its rights. Such a statement, incidentally, one sees almost every day in the Press by members of Governments of many nations sitting round this very table in the Security Council.

Grievance is made of the statement of the Defence Minister of India on 20 January 1962 that India was prepared to negotiate with Pakistan any time on the Kashmir issue "but not on the basis of surrender of our sovereignty". Again this is quoted in the letter of the representative of Pakistan to the Security Council. Now what is wrong with this statement? It is a plea for negotiations without surrender of sovereignty, to which none can really object.

In his letter of 29 January again, the representative of Pakistan alleges troop movements in India. He complains of "the continuous deployment and redeployment of Indian forces within easy striking distance of Pakistan borders". The Government of India officially described as baseless these persistent reports appearing in the Pakistan press about the concentration of Indian troops on the border of Pakistan. It so happens that traditionally a part of the Indian army has been stationed and garrisoned in northwest India for the normal defence of the country. Undoubtedly there are seasonal and incidental movements of army groups for exercises and manoeuvres which have no policy significance. None of the troop movements within India that may have taken place in recent weeks had any relation to Pakistan. This position, I might add;

29

was explained by the Prime Minister to one of the Ministers of Pakistan who called on him in New Delhi in the early part of this month. And I am sure that the representative of Pakistan will himself agree that such army manoeuvres and exercises also take place on the Pakistan side close to our borders from time to time.

The representative of Pakistan has sought to impress the Council with the grave threat to Pakistan. In our view, no rational basis for any such apprehension exists, and I should like to place before you some statements from my Prime Minister which should leave no ground for apprehension.

Speaking in the Lok Sabha, the House of the People, on 16 August, 1961, the Prime Minister said :

"We want Pakistan to co-operate with us and we shall co-operate with them, because that is the normal thing for two countries, any two adjoining neighbouring countries, today, more especially with a country like Pakistan which has been a part of us-I am saying even now, because there are so many contacts, human contacts, apart from geography, cultural and historical contacts, but somehow all this is wasted."

--and there he was referring to the negative approach. The Prime Minister, speaking in the Rajya Sabha, the upper house of the Indian Parliament, on 22 August, 1961, stated :

"We are not going to take any military measures to push out the Pakistan Army or the controlling operatives from that area."

This means the area under Pakistan occupation. I repeat:

"We are not going to take any military measures to push out the Pakistan Army or the controlling operatives from that area. It is our right, and we are prepared to consider that when the time comes" and again I should like the Council to note this-"in a peaceful way. That is going pretty far, as the House will appreciate, when we say that we are not going to take any military steps in that area which is occupied by Pakistan."

What can be clearer than this statement?

At a press conference in New Delhi on 28 December, 1961 the Prime Minister, among other things, said :

"We have always agreed to talk with Pakistan on this subject as on every other subject. We have never refused."

Again, at the annual session of the All-India Congress on 6 January, 1962 the Prime Minister stated that India wanted friendship with Pakistan. He said :

"There are many things in common between the two. India and Pakistan for thousands of years have remained one. Our language, our food, our dress are the same. We are almost one nation. Pakistan was formed by partition. It was done by the agreement of India. We do not want that this should be changed."

There are many more statements of this nature right through the years and up to the present time-up to the last few days as a matter of fact. These are statements by the Head of the Government which Pakistan wishes to make out is threatening the territory of Pakistan.

The letter of 29 January, 1962 from the representative of Pakistan quotes from The Times of London of 25 January, 1962-and the representative has repeated this here-in which the Prime Minister of India is reported to have said that India

"had to keep an army on the Punjab frontier because it did not trust the intentions of Pakistan."

I have seen only the first report and must assume that that is a correct version of what the Prime Minister said. Let us look at the facts. After the events of 1947 and 1948, when Pakistan-aided tribesmen and Pakistan forces invaded Kashmir, and in the context of the statement and the cries for Jehad raised in Pakistan, can India be blamed for taking precautions ? But this does not affect our determination to seek settlement of our outstanding problems with Pakistan peacefully and through negotiations and. to live in friendship with it and indeed with all our neighbours.

India has always made it clear, and I repeat now, that patient discussions and negotiations and the continuing search for a possibility of accommodation are the only accepted ways of reaching an amicable settlement As recorded in The New York Times this morning the Prime Minister has stated only yesterday :

"We have clearly said that whether they (the leaders of Pakistan) agree with us or not on any point, we will not start a war against

30

Pakistan." (The New York Times, 1 February 1962, page 8).

It is a continuing policy of India to settle its disputes with Pakistan by negotiation and through peaceful means. The Prime Minister of India has sent an invitation to President Ayub Khan for a visit to Delhi to talk over the differences between Are two Governments. We hope that this invitation will be accepted and that nothing will be said or done either inside the Council or in Pakistan, to spoil the atmosphere of the talks after the general elections.

I have taken the time of the Council to make various quotations from our Prime Minister but I have done so deliberately, because I should like again to say that there is no desire in India, there is no desire in the Government of India, to settle. our differences with Pakistan by any but peaceful means and by negotiations. It is our earnest desire, it is the desire of the people of India, and I think I may say without fear of contradiction that it is the desire of the people of Pakistan-that we should live amicably, because we are neighbouring countries. History and geography have made us neighbours and not only neighbours but close neighbours bound together by ties of ancient history and culture. That is our hope, that is our wish, and that is the desire of the Indian people.

Having said this, I go back to where I started from and I would urge that the Security Council, with it view to giving the Government of India, the new Government of India, an opportunity after the general elections to participate fully in the discussions in the Security Council and make its submissions to this Council, should defer its consideration of this matter until a convenient time in the future which is agreeable to Pakistan and to ourselves after the Indian general elections and the formation of the new Government.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA PERU CHINA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UINTED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in the Political Committee on Cuba

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent. Representative to the United Nations, made a statement on February 14, 1962, in the Political Committee debate on Cuban complaint of threats to international peace and security arising from the U.S. Government's new plans of aggression against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba.

The following is the full text of his statement :

Mr. Chairman, during the past few days there have been discussions in the Committee, often marked by acrimony, of complaints and countercomplaints, coupled with dissertations on the juridical nature of certain actions and of the relationship between regional organizations such as the Organization of American States and the United Nations. My country is situated thousandsof miles away from Cuba and from the Western Hemisphere, and we recognize that the present discussions concern mainly, though not solely, the countries of the Western Hemisphere. We would have preferred not to intervene in the debate but, since certain issues basic to the Charter of the United Nations and to the maintenance of friendly relations between Members of the Organization have been raised during the discussions, we feel impelled to place briefly our own views before the Committee.

We have no partisan feeling in the differences and disputes that have arisen and have been ventilated in this Committee. We have the highest regard and friendly feelings for the Government and people of the United States, who have over the years been staunch upholders of the United Nations. We have nothing but respect and cordiality for the countries of Latin America, whose contributions to the United Nations are imbued with such dignity and sense of justice and law. We have friendly feelings for the Government of Cuba; and the Government and the people of India have sympathy with the Cuban people's desire for social and economic justice which is among the basic motivations of the Cuban revolution. We venture to think, therefore, that when we view the issues that have been brought up before this Committee we do so from a unique perspective of friendship and sympathy towards all those who are primarily concerned in the matter before this Committee.

We in India have adopted and are deeply devoted to the system of government and political institutions which go by the name of parliamentary democracy and which they seek to uphold in the Western Hemisphere. I should like, therefore, to assure members of the Committee that if we venture to make some observations it is with feelings of greatest goodwill towards the Member States which are principally concerned in the controversy.

The Government of Cuba proposed an item for discussion at the sixteenth session of the

31

General Assembly which was admitted into the agenda without objection as :

"Complaint by Cuba or threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba."

The representative of Cuba repeated allegations against the United States in his statement the other day before the Committee, citing various statements in newspapers and by governmental authorities in the United States. Without pronouncing on the validity of Cuba's complaint, I think one can fairly say that the Government of Cuba is in fear of possible attack and preparations for attack by the United States.

The existence of, such fear is understandable when one remembers the present state of tension in the relations between Cuba and the United States and also the fact that Cuba is a small country situated close to the United States, which is among the largest and most powerful countries in the world. The representative of the United States, Mr. Stevenson, in answer to the Cuban charges, said on 5 February, 1962 :

"The United States has not been and is not preparing any aggression against Cuba." (A/C.1/PV.1231, page 42).

Mr. Plimpton repeated this assurance in his statement of 7 February 1962. He said :

"I simply want to point out.... and to repeat that the United States is not-I say 'not'-planning the slightest armed attack on Cuba." (A/C.1/PV.1233, page 81).

These appear to us to be categorical assurances; and, although the Cuban delegation has expressed scepticism, so far as the United Nations is concerned it does and must welcome, them. Faithfully translated in practice, these assurances should help in allaying fears and in creating a better international atmosphere between Cuba and the United State, as indeed in the Western hemisphere in general.

A further complaint of the Government of Cuba is one of intervention by the United States against the Republic of Cuba. Cuba has, during the last year, repeatedly made such complaints both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. It is alleged that the intervention is intended to briny, about the over-throw of the present Government of Cuba and a change in the system of government that Cuba has adopted. On this question, I can do no better than to restate what my delegation said at the 1156th meeting of the First Committee on 19 April 1961, when the Committee discussed the complaint by Cuba of aggression against the United States :

"While we recognize the inherent right of peoples in a free society to change the government by means of a revolution, including sometimes armed revolution, however much we may regret the use of violence, we at the same time consider that any outside assistance for such purposes is inadmissible, just as it is inadmissible for a State to assist actively in the suppression of an internal uprising in another State. The norms of international behaviour are clear in these matters. They derive from the basic necessity of good neighbourliness and non-intervention, principles which are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Departure from these norms always creates a dangerous and confused situation and would make peaceful and friendly relations between States difficult.

"This principle is not affected by considerations of whether a particular Government is good or bad, whether it is progressive or not and whether its international behaviour is approved by some other countries or not. The Government in Cuba may be controversial and may not be liked by some of its neighbours in the Western hemisphere, but the fact remains that it is the present, lawful Government of Cuba, whose delegation sits in the United, Nations and which is recognized by and has diplomatic relations with a large number of States Members of the United Nations." (A/C.1/PV.1156, pages 21 and 22).

Cuba, like any other country, has the undoubted right to decide on the form of its government and internal administration. as also its particular political Philosophy. It is irrelevant whether its form of government is regarded by others as good or bad, or whether or not it is liked by other countries. Like other sovereign States, Cuba is master of its own house. It has a right not to be interfered with; and it would be justified in making a grievance of any kind of intervention of pressure from outside to change its system of government, and domestic policies. Likewise, as a counterpart to this, it has an obligation not to interfere in the affairs of its neighbours or to try to impose its own particular brand of political philosophy, whatever it may be, on any other State having a different politi-

32

cal system. These principles are self-evident and go to the very root of the United Nations Charter and the maintenance of international relations in conditions of peace and harmony.

We note in this connexion that the representative of Cuba said on 5 February 1962

"Again, much is made of the exporting of the revolutionary idea. Cuba does not want to change, and is not interested in changing, the governmental forms of any country, just as it will not tolerate any neighbouring country's trying to change Cuba's form of government. That is essentially a domestic matter for each and every country to settle for itself." (A./C.1/PV.1231, pages 34-35).

This is a healthy assurance, which should be welcomed. Not only that : I believe that the United Nations has a right to receive assurances of this kind from both sides and from all sides.

Much of the discussion and exchanges in the Committee have been devoted to the recent resolutions by the Consultative Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este, though the action of the regional organization of the O.A.S. is not strictly related to the item before the Committee. It is not my intention, nor do we think it is entirely relevant, to undertake an analysis of the resolutions and actions decided upon by the O.A.S. or to pronounce on their justness and juridical validity. Regional organizations can perform a valuable role to the extent that their actions are intended to promote the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the general purposes of international cooperation and harmony. As congregations of sovereign States, such organisations are free to act in terms of their agreed Charters, but, as Article 52 of the United Nations Charter emphasizes, and as indeed the Charters of such organisations themselves enjoin, their actions must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.. It is open in international law to any State to approve or not to approve of the form of government of another State. According to international practice, it is the sovereign right of any State to have or not to have diplomatic or other relations with other States. But at the same time we do not consider it desirable or permissible for States to take concerned action to put pressure on other States to change their social and political systems. Nor can one accept the idea of a separate and special code of international law over and above the code of international relations embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. We note in the statements of some Latin American countries, themselves members of the O.A.S., a clear recognition of this principle, and I quote as an instance the statement of the representative of Brazil made before this Committee on 8 February :

"However in this connexion I must stressas the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Relations emphasized at Punta del Este-that Brazil would prefer co-existence under certain, freely accepted, limitations to any isolationist formula such as exclusion. In the United Nations, an American State may adopt a form of government it considers will best meet its internal needs and any pressure exercised against such State for this reason is a violation of the principle of non-intervention contained in Article 2 of the San Francisco Charter." (A/C.1/PV.1234, page 27).

I do not wish to say much more-indeed, it is not necessary to say more. So far as my Government is concerned, we have consistently expressed our firm belief in peaceful coexistence among States with varying social and political systems as among the fundamental bases of international relations, as envisaged in the Charter. Tolerance and good-neighbourliness are not only desirable but a necessity dictated by realistic considerations. By several unanimous resolutions, namely resolutions 290 (IV), 1236 (XII) and 1301 (XIII) the Assembly has specifically reaffirmed and commended the observance of the principles of non-interference and good neighbourly relations among States.

For some time now the relations between Cuba and the United States have been strained. The facts of geography, even more than those of history, cannot be obliterated. The physical and geographical propinguity of Cuba and the United States cannot be altered. The natural equilibrium of relations between Cuba and the United States and, for the matter of that, other Latin American countries, is one of good neighhourly relations. We regret that that equilibrium is temporarily disturbed. Its restoration is most desirable since continued disequillibrium must inevitably result in disagreeable consequences and conflict. Positive steps by all concerned in the direction of peaceful adjustment of relations are overdue. It is our earnest hope and faith that misunderstandings and fears which at present cloud the relations of Cuba with the United States will, with the exercise of patience and mutual tolerance and indulgence, disappear or at least be reduced to the minimum. To this end the General Assembly can fairly and legitimately expect all concerned to regulate their international relations in accordance with the Charter.

33

INDIA CUBA USA BRAZIL **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UINTED NATIONS

Shri C. S. jha's Statement in the Trusteeship Committee on Rwanda- Urundi,

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Trusteeship Committee on February 8, 1962 on the question of the future of Rwanda-Urundi, a Belgian-administered Trust Territory :

MADAM CHAIRMAN

The Assembly has been seriously concerned with the question of the future of Rwanda-Urundi during the past two or three sessions. Three important resolutions were adopted by the Assembly at the XVth Session, namely 1579, 1580 and 1605. These resolutions crystallise the Assembly's approach to the solution of the problems which have arisen in Rwanda-Urundi, and to the question of emergence of this trust territory into independence. They lay down the general framework for the evolution of Rwanda-Urundi to independence. In particular, they seek to mark the guidelines for the creation of conditions of peace, freedom and tranquility in which the territory should attain its freedom. On the question of the future of Rwanda-Urundi itself, the Assembly has not yet pronounced itself specifically except to say, as in paragraph 11 of resolution 1579(XV) adopted on December 20, 1960 "that in view of the essential community of interest and the facts of history and geography, the best future for Rwanda-Urundi lies in the evolution of a single, united and composite state with such arrangements for the internal autonomy of Rwanda and Burundi as may be agreed upon by their representatives". This same conviction has been reiterated in operative paragraph 15 of resolution 1605 adopted by the General Assembly on 21 April 1961. Under resolution 1579(XV) a three-man commission was appointed to proceed to Rwanda-Urundi to perform certain specific tasks to which an additional task concerning the holding of a referendum on the question of the retention of the Mwami in Rwanda was added by resolution 1580(XV) of 29 December 1960. In the last of this triology of resolutions, namely 1605(XV), the General Assembly envisaged the termination of the trusteeship agreement at the earliest possible date.

I have enumerated briefly the sequence of the consideration of this question and the resolutions of the General Assembly to emphasize two points : First, the General Assembly's emphasis and insistence on the observance of certain processes and on the creation of certain specific conditions in Rwanda-Urundi; and second, the goal of a single, united and composite state which the General Assembly has set for itself and for the people of Rwanda-Urundi. It seems to my delegation that the approach of the United Nations to the future of the territory of Rwanda-Urundi for which under the trusteeship system it bears a special responsibility is the right one, which should be pursued steadfastly.

Permit me, Madame Chairman, to proceed now to elaborate the views of my delegation in the light of the Report of the Commission, the statements of the petitioners, and the views expressed in this Committee, notably that of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Belgium, the leaders from Rwanda and Burundi and many African delegations.

At the outset, I would Eke to pay a tribute to the work of the Commission. Ambassador Dorsinville, Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Ernest Gassou of Togo and Mr. Majid Rahnema of Iran were entrusted with an extremely onerous task which they had to undertake in difficult conditions.

In the earlier part of their work, as stated by the Commissioners in their interim report, they did not receive the co-operation of the Administering Authority and the local officials. We are however glad to acknowledge that with the change of Government in Belgium and the advent of Mr. Spaak as Foreign Minister, the Government of Belgium, the Administering Authority in, the words of the Commissioners "displayed a general willingness to appreciate what was being aimed at and to act in a spirit of comprehension and sincere co-operation". We are impressed by the manner in which the Commissioners carried out their tasks and by the excellence of their reports. We are also impressed by the forthright statements of the three Commissioners before the Committee. The Commission's report and the statements of the Commissioners; are no doubt a valuable guide to us in reaching a sound and just conclusion on the question before us, namely, the future of Rwanda and Burundi.

From the present discussions in the Committee, three main issues seem to emerge :

I. Validity of the results of the referendum on the question of the retention of the

Mwami;

- 2. The question of the validity of elections in Rwanda and Burundi
- 34

3. Whether Rwanda and Burundi should emerge as a single united composite state in the words of the resolution 1579(XV) or as two independent states and at what time and under what modalities.

I propose to deal with these issues separately.

Regarding referendum on the retention of Mwami, we are bound to note with regret that contrary to the United Nations resolution, the Mwami was arrested soon after he returned and two days before the election, he was sent out of the territory and was thus unable to participate in the referendum campaign. It is a pity that the Administering Authority did not observe and implement the resolution of the General Assembly in this regard. Indeed, the Belgian administrators showed determination to act in pursuit of arbitrary decisions taken by them earlier concerning the question of the Mwami. Not only were the measures suspending the powers of the Mwami not revoked but also nothing was done to facilitate his return. These acts of the Administering Authority must necessarily cast a reflection on the character of the consultations held in the month of September 1961. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that an overwhelming majority of the electorate voted against the institution and person of Mwami. We doubt, therefore, if anything more can be done about this matter. We consider, however, that as an important part of the processes of reconciliation and establishment of normal conditions and peace within Rwanda, the Mwami should be permitted to return as a citizen in his individual capacity, free from any restraint and capable of taking part in the political life of the country, if he so wishes.

With respect to the conduct of the elections, the Assembly resolution 1605(XV) had laid down :

1. That the local government in the two parts of the territory constituted somewhat irregularly should be dissolved and "broadbased caretaker governments" be constituted pending the formation of new governments on the basis of elections to be held under UN supervision.

2. That the Administering Authority, in the fulfilment of its obligations and responsibilities, create the necessary conditions and atmosphere for the proper conduct of the elections.

3. That full and unconditional amnesty, as envisaged in resolution 1579(XV) be immediately granted to all political prisoners and detenus.

4. Legislative or administrative orders impinging on the exercise of public freedom and normal political activity by all political parties be rescinded.

5. That the Administering Authority take steps to ensure the expeditious return and rehabilitation of thousands of refugees who, as a result of disturbances in Rwanda in 1959-60,, were compelled to take refuge away from their homes. This was considered necessary not only from a humanitarian point of view but also with a view to enabling these unfortunate victims of an ugly political upheaval to exercise their right of vote in their home areas.

We note with satisfaction that the pre-existing regimes in Rwanda and Burundi were suspended and caretaker governments established. It is true that the caretaker government in Rwanda came into being rather late and was perhaps not as broad-based as many members of the Assembly would have wished it to be; but the fact that an unconstitutional regime was abolished with the agreement of the political parties is evidence of the earnestness and good faith not only of the Belgian authorities but also of the local political leaders and parties. We attach special importance to this act of deference on their part to the Assembly's wishes. One of the basic conditions laid down by the Assembly for the proper conduct of the elections was thus fulfilled.

In regard to political amnesty, while the application of the amnesty might have been unduly delayed in several cases, the Government of Belgium and the authorities in the territory responded to the Assembly's recommendations and the appeals and protestations of the Commission. We feel, therefore, that the basic requirement of amnesty as laid down by the General Assembly was substantially met.

Likewise, there is evidence. in the Commission's Report that undesirable legislation and administrative orders etc., restricting the exercise of public freedom and the conduct of normal political activity were suitably abolished or amended. it, however, appears that in practice difficulties continued to be placed in the way of some Rwandese political parties concerning the conduct of their election campaign and the exercise of freedom of assembly and speech.

The most serious lacuna in the establishment of the conditions desired by the General Assembly

35

was the situation with respect to the refugees Despite attempts to remove legal difficulties in the way of participation of large numbers of refugees and adjustment of voting procedures to enable many refugees in various parts to cast their votes on the polling day, a very large number of refugees still remained away from their homes. In fact, there are thousands of refugees in the neighbouring territories of Uganda, Congo and Tanganyika and in Burundi who have still been unable to return to Rwanda. The inability, of thousands of refugees to vote in the election in their home constituencies must be noted as a serious failing, even though it may be recognised that the voting in each area or district was so decisive one way or the other that the votes cast by the returning refugees in their particular districts or constituencies may not have materially affected the results of the voting.

In Burundi, the elections were on the whole held properly and in conditions of freedom. We have no doubts about the validity and propriety of those elections but following the elections and the formation of a popular administration, a tragedy of the gravest magnitude took place in Burundi when its popular Prime Minister Prince Rwagasore was assassinated.

We have heard enough in this Committee from many petitioners and from the Representative of Tanganyika of the serious unsettling effect in Burundi of this tragic event, and, what is worse, of the indications that the assassination of the Prime Minister was engineered by forces which may be at work to undo the results of the elections and create chaos in Burundi.

The picture painted by the Commission of the general atmosphere and conditions prevailing in Rwanda before the elections, the prevalence of mistrust and antagonism, of recurring disorders, of attempts to bypass the law, of the absence of freedom of assembly for minority groups and parties, leaves much to be desired. We wish the elections were held in conditions ensuring tranquilty and the fullest freedom of political activity. We, however, take note of the fact that in Rwanda there is a government with a Prime Minister, formed after the elections, in which the government party received an overwhelming majority of votes and in which 95 per cent of registered voters went to the polls. Without expressing any final and definitive opinion to the validity or otherwise of the elections in Rwanda, we have to take the new administration there as a fait accompli.

I wish to emphasize here, Madame Chairman, that we must approach the question of Rwanda-Urundi looking more into the future than harping back on the past. That is all the more necessary since the United Nations by its famous Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in resolution 1514(XV) and in accordance with its latest trends and ethos, is committed to the freedom of all dependent peoples at the earliest possible date and to immediate steps being taken for the transfer of power. The problem of Rwanda-Urundi today must be viewed in the light of this new, enlightened and compelling perspective. There is, therefore, no question but that we wish to see the Trust Territory of Rwanda-Urundi attain independence with the least possible delay, and I wish to make the position of my delegation crystal clear in this regard. My delegation, however, feels that the Assembly has a special responsibility to ensure that between now and the emergence of the territory into independence, conditions are established which will make freedom a reality, which will enable Rwanda-Urundi to start on its independent career in the most favourable conditions and ensure the development and progress of the territory under

democratic conditions. It is in the light of these considerations that, while deploring the lack of conditions of complete freedom in Rwanda-Urundi in the past, we are particularly anxious to see that there should be no trail of bitterness and internal conflict within the trust territory at the time of the emergence of the territory into independence. We feel, therefore, that the Assembly has to pay particular attention to the aspect of conciliation and to the establishment of political freedom in Rwanda before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Much of the discussion in the Committee has for reasons which I have already indicated been concentrated on the question of the termination of the trusteeship and the emergence into independence of the trust territory and the question whether it should emerge as a single state or two states. These matters are undoubtedly important and the Committee is rightly exercised about them, especially in the context of the rapidly changing face of Africa. However, there are many considerations to which it is our duty to give due weight.

First, there is the paramount question whether Rwanda-Urundi should emerge as a single, united and composite state or as two separate states of Rwanda and Burundi. The arguments in favour of two states are partly historical but largely related to the wishes of the people. The representatives of the newly formed administrations, of Rwanda and Burundi have expressed their

36

desire to become separate independent states. The advocates of the emergence of Rwanda-Uruadi as two separate and independent entities base their plea mainly on the ground that the wishes of the people must prevail. As against this, there is the consideration that the elections field recently in Rwanda and Burundi had as their sole purpose the replacement of the previous rather irregularly constituted administration in the two parts of the trust territories by those formed after free elections. These elections cannot be treated as a referendum on the question of emergence of Rwanda-Urundi as a single or separate independent entities. Furthermore, the United Nations General Assembly in resolutions 1579 (XV.) and 1605 (XV) affirmed and reaffirmed respectively its conviction that the best future

for Rwanda and Burundi is in the accession (if that territory as a single united composite state with such arrangements for internal autonomy as may be agreed upon by their representatives. We see no reason to depart from these solemn declarations.

The question of the date of Rwanda-Urundi's independence has also been discussed in the Committee. The representative of the Administering Authority, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Belgium, has, indicated that the Administering Authority would be ready to see Rwanda and Burundi emerge into independence after April and the representative of Burundi has sug gested 15 May 1962 for the independence of Burundi. The Administering Authority has, of course, proceeded on the fundamental assumption that Rwanda and Burundi should be two separate independent states. Incidentally, in the protocols signed by Belgium with the Governments of Rwanda and Burundi separately which have been circulated as document A/C.4/517 of 15 January 1962, the future separateness of Rwanda and Burundi as sovereign entities has already been recognised and accepted by the Administering Authority. We regret that this was done and thus direct encouragement provided to the fissiparous tendencies in the trust territory, contrary to the aims and objectives of the United Nations resolutions. If the Assembly accepts the position that Rwanda and Burundi must emerge as separate independent states, my delegation would regard the proposal to terminate the trusteeship agreement sometime in May as proper. and logical. We are, however, not convinced that that would be the right course or there is any warrant at the present time for the United Nations or the Administering Authority to pursue that course.

I should again like to make it clear that we do not wish that there should be more than a minimum interval between now and the independence of Rwanda-Urundi. We also recognise that the wishes of the people are entitled to the greatest respect. Nevertheless, in the matter of bringing trust territories into independence, the United Nations has responsibilities which it cannot abdicate. There is no dispute about freedom and independence and there can be none. But it is a matter for serious consideration whether the United Nations should be a party to the breaking up of trust territories or of other dependent territories, which have hitherto functioned as single units, into a number of independent states. If in deference to the regional wishes of people within territories which have been hitherto single entities, separate states are formed, that in our opinion, would go against the grain of the United Nations. In particular, it may he an incentive to the further fragmentation of Africa-a continent which unfortunately was already badly divided up during the colonial period. Another question which faces the United Nations is whether it should be a party to the emergence of economically and politically weak units where this can be avoided. My delegation is of the opinion, Madame Chairman, that while we must pay due regard to the wishes of the people, we cannot, merely on the basis of the statements made in the Committee by the representatives of the administrations of Rwanda and Burundi and the suggestion of the Administering Authority, agree to the principle of fragmentation of Rwanda-Urundi, in derogation of the conviction affirmed and reaffirmed in the General Assembly resolutions 1579(XV) and 1605 (XV).

There is yet another reason which goes against the fragmentation of Rwanda-Urundi. Unity of the territory is firmly established in the trusteeship agreement; and paragraph 6 of the General Assembly resolution 1514(XV) says :

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

The Assembly cannot very well go against the essence of the Trusteeship Agreement and its own solemn declarations.

On political grounds also, grounds which members of the United Nations cannot altogether ignore, we are. reluctant to favour the idea of emergence of this trust territory into two separate States. The consequences of a precedent in the case of Rwanda-Urundi, in other territories, such as South West Africa and the still remaining

37

colonial territories, have to be carefully weighed.

The trust territory is located in the sensitive heart of Africa, and, therefore, the effects of the Assembly's decision concerning its future are likely to be felt elsewhere. These must be carefully taken into account.

There are other equally important considerations which reinforce our belief that any conciliation on the basis of the division of the territory will not be in the best interests of the inhabitants. From the point of view of economy and economic development, the prospects of a divided Rwanda-Urundi are grim. The prospects of a single independent State would undoubtedly be much better. There is some realisation of this as both the spokesmen for Rwanda and Burundi have expressed a desire to maintain economic unity and this is favoured by the Administering Authority also. Paradoxically enough, it is proposed at the same time to liquidate or disband other existing common services without which joint economic planning and development will become impossible. The very same reasons which compel the recognition of the need for economic unity must necessarily bring home the need for political unity.

Both Mr. Ngendandumwe (from Burundi) and Mr. Rugira (from Rwanda) have invoked sentimental and historic reasons in support of the proposed division of the Territory into two independent States. We do not disregard these reasons. or make light of the people's susceptibilities; but, on the other hand, both have spoken in terms of a possible reunion of or increasing co-operation in political and other spheres between the two states in the future. Of particular significance is the statement made at the 1265th meeting of the Fourth Committee by the Deputy Premier of Burundi in which he said that :

"Burundi has friendly feelings for its neighbour, and that as soon as the situation becomes normal again, it is prepared to negotiate freely in order to agree on a system of union."

We have no doubt that the desire for a union is genuine and exists on both sides; but in the dark mood of the moment difficulties, such as they are, tend to be unduly exaggerated. Our humble and sincere advice to the parties and people, in Rwanda-Urundi is not to act on the spur of the moment, and not to throw away the gains of a common history during the last 40 or 50 years. That Rwanda and Burundi were two kingdoms in the past is no reason that they should remain so in the future, The origins of the human society are rooted in the family or the tribe, and if man were to live in the past, there would be no states of the modem kind anywhere in existence today. If they contemplate union tomorrow, division today is hardly the way to achieve it. The unity that exists, in law at least, should be reinforced by the forging of new links, or improvising and adapting the existing ones.

My delegation also feels that the fact of Rwanda having a republican and Burundi a monarchical system should not prove an insuperable difficulty in the establishment, by agreement, of joint and common political institutions for the whole territory.

To sum up the views of my delegation, Madame Chairman,

(1) Date should be fixed for the independence of Rwanda-Urundi. 'Ibis should be 31 December 1962.

(2) Between now and the date of independence, earnest efforts should be made by all concerned to establish in the trust territory conditions of peace and freedom which would enable the accession of Rwanda-Urundi to independence in the most favourable conditions. These should include, among other things, return and rehabilitation of all refugees, reconciliation of various political factions in the territory, guarantee of human rights and fundamental freedoms including freedom of speech and association and political activity in conditions of peace, maintenance of law and order and replacement of Belgian military and paramilitary forces by indigenous police forces.

(3) The United Nations should assist in the achievement of these objectives by sending out a new Commission to Rwanda-Urundi, which, with the full co-operation of the political parties and their leaders should try to secure agreement, on the basis of understanding and conciliation, to the creation of autonomous units of Rwanda and Burundi with common and joint political institutions which, among other

things, could be entrusted with the security, both external and internal, of Rwanda-Urundi and the external relations of the new State. The Commission should also submit a report to the Assembly as to the necessary arrangements and modalities for transfer of power and for the supervision thereof and in addition make recommendations as to the assistance that the United Nations can provide to deal with the social and economic problems of the territory. These arrangements and modalities may include a final ascertainment of the wishes of the people priof

38

to independence.

(4) The Assembly should consider the report of this Commission at the next session of the General Assembly at the latest and in the light thereof take final decisions as to the independence of Rwanda-Urundi.

Madame Chairman, these are the observations of my delegation on the very complex and highly important issues with which this Committee is faced. We have no doubt that given goodwill and realisation of the larger interests of the African continent, the assistance of United Nations, and goodwill and enlightened co-operation of the Government of Belgium, which we have no doubt will be forthcoming, the people of Rwanda-Urundi should be able to decide on their future in the best interests of themselves and of Africa, and play a worthy role in the comity of nations.

INDIA RWANDA USA BURUNDI BELGIUM IRAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO UGANDA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Indo-Rumanian Trade Agreement Extended

Talks between a Trade Delegation from the Rumanian People's Republic and officials of the Government of India concluded in New Delhi on February 13, 1962 with the signing of a Protocol extending the current Trade and Payments. Agreement up to December 31, 1962.

Mr. Dracea Vasile, leader of the Rumanian Trade Delegation, signed on behalf of his Government and Shri B. N. Adarkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India.

The commodities to be imported into India from Rumania in 1962 will continue to include machine tools, oil prospecting and drilling equipment, power transformers, electric motors (permissible types), water and electric meters, diesel generating sets, refrigerating compressors, petroleum products, petroleum coke, carbon black, caustic soda, dyes and intermediate bleached wood pulp, other chemicals and pharmaceuticals, printing paper etc.

Exports from India to Rumania will be rolled steel products, jute manufacturers, coir products, cotton textiles, woollen products, asbestos textiles, hides and skins (tanned and semi-tanned), tanning materials, fountain pens, plastic goods, including spectacle frames, animal casings, dry salted fish and tinned fish, sports goods, paper and pulp making machinery and equipment etc., apart from traditional goods like tea, coffee, pepper and spices, shellac, essential oils, iron ore, ferro manganese, mica, cashew kernel and seasum seed etc.

During the discussions, the two delegations reviewed last year's trade between their countries and considered the steps to be taken to develop trade to a higher level in 1962. The volume of trade during 1961 is expected to exceed Rs. 6 crores both ways.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Contract for Project Report Signed

An Indo-Soviet contract for the preparation of a project report and working drawings for a 2-million-ton refinery near Koyali, north of Baroda in Gujarat, was signed in New Delhi on February 12, 1962.

The contract was signed by Shri P. R. Nayak, Member, on behalf of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and Mr. A. E. Nikitin on behalf of "Tjazhpromexport", suppliers from the U.S.S.R.

Under the contract "Tjazhpromexport" will supply the project report for the proposed refinery within a period of about 8 1/2 months.

The refinery will be built in two stages, each

39

of one million ton capacity, and the Soviet organisation have offered to deliver during 1963-64 equipment and material for the first stage of completion which is expected during the second half of 1964. The second stage may be commissioned 6 to 9 months later.

The designing of a number of units within the refinery has been made the responsibility of the Indian side which will also, in due course, be responsible for preparing the working drawings for some of the units initially designed by the Soviet Organisation.

The contract further provides for the association of a team of Indian engineers-civil, electrical, mechanical and chemical, with the design to be prepared in the U.S.S.R.

Provision is also being made in the contract for the use of Indian equipment and material to the maximum possible extent to enable the Indian engineers to undertake increasing responsibility for the designing and execution of refinery projects in the future.

There is provision of Rs. 30 crores in the

Third Five-Year Plan- for the 'Gujarat refinery. Rs. 10 crores out of the Soviet credits available have also been earmarked for the purpose.

The Koyali refinery is the third to be set up in the public sector. The first refinery at Gauhati set up with Rumanian aid was commissioned by the Prime Minister on January 1 this year. The second refinery under construction at Barauni in Bihar with the Soviet aid will be commissioned next year.

INDIA ITALY USA **Date** : Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Culture : Letters Exchanged

The Indo-Soviet Joint Committee constituted under the Cultural Agreement signed in February, 1960, has been meeting in New Delhi to review the working of the Agreement on Cultural, Scientific and Educational Cooperation between the two Governments.

The Committee recorded that the cultural exchanges between the two countries were progressing very well. The Committee also considered the programme for 1962 and 1963.

The final decisions taken about the cultural programmes for the two years were approved on February 3, 1962 in Calcutta by a formal exchange of letters between Shri Humayun Kabir, Union Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, and H. E. Mr. G. A. Zhukov, Chairman of the Committee of the Council of Ministers, U.S.S.R. for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. Both the sides have agreed to take all steps for the fulfilment of the Programme. The Programme is a comprehensive one covering the fields of Arts, Literature, Science, Secondary and Higher Education, Public Health and Sports, Radio and Television. Among the items which are likely to attract the general public are visits of a Soviet Circus in 1962 and a Ballet, preferably from the Bolshoi Theatre, in 1963.

It was decided that the next meeting of the Indo-Soviet Joint Committee should be held in Moscow not later than December 31, 1962.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Trade : Protocol Signed

Talks between a Trade Delegation from the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the officials of the Government of India concluded in New Delhi on February 6, 1962 with the signing of Protocol.

Mr. V. Krunic, Deputy Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Trade and Leader of the Yugoslav Trade Delegation, signed on behalf of his country, while Shri B. N. Adarkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of India.

The Protocol extends the validity of the current Trade and Payment Agreement up to January 1964. A fresh schedule of goods avail-40 able for export and import between the two

countries far the calendar year 1962 is also attached to the Protocol.

The Yugoslav Trade Delegation, which arrived in India in the second week of January, held a

series of discussions with the officials of the Government of India. Both the Delegations reviewed the progress of last year's trade and also discussed the steps to be taken to develop trade to a higher level in 1962. The total volume of trade between the two countries during 1961 is expected to be of the order of Rs. 13 crores.

The commodities to be imported into India from Yugoslavia during 1962 will continue to include machine tools, cranes, marine and diesel engines, rails and railway equipment, textile machinery, telephone and railway signalling cables, metals and metal products, refractories, mineral lubricating oil, explosives and accessories, bleached wood pulp and printing paper.

Exports from India to Yugoslavia on the other hand will be rolled steel products, machine tools, textile machinery and accessories, railway materials, cotton and woollen fabrics, leather footwear, tinned fruits and juices, coir products, wood screws, diesel engines, precision and scientific instruments, industrial pumps, air compressors, zip fasteners, vacuum bottles, bicycle parts, spectacle frames, fountain pens, cosmetics and toiletries, rubber goods, plastic goods, asbestos manufactures, coke-oven bye-products, plywood and veneers, jute manufactures, linoleum, sports goods, handicrafts, chemicals, drugs and medicines, tanned and semi-tanned hides and skins etc., apart from other traditional goods, namely, tea, coffee, spices, tobacco, cashew kernels, essential and vegetable oils, mica, shellac, iron ore, mining products etc.

41

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Feb 01, 1962

March

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. VIII MARCH	Mar 01, 1962 No. 3	3
CONTENTS		
FOREIGN AND HOME A	FFAIRS	
President's Farewell Address to Parliament		43
GENEVA DISARMAMEN	NT CONFERENCE	
Shri Krishna Menon's S	tatement	47
GOA Prime Minister's Statem	ent in Lok Sabha	57
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha introducing Goa, Daman and Diu (Administration) Bill 59		
Prime Minister's Statem Amendment Bill	ent in Lok Sabha introducing C 59	Constitution
Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Constitution Amend- ment Bill 62		
Prime Minister's Statem Amendment Bill	ent in Rajya Sabha introducing 64	Constitution
Prime Minister's Reply Amendment Bill	to Rajya Sabha Debate on Con 67	stitution
GREECE		
Indo-Greek Trade Arrar	ngement Extended,	68
INDIA IN THE UNITED I	NATIONS	
Shri C. S. Jha's Stateme	nt on Peaceful Uses of Outer S	pace 68
Shri Bhadkamkar's State	ement on Southern Rhodesia	73

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on President's Address 83

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on President's Address 87

ITALY

Indo-Italian Air Services Agreement Ratified 90

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement Signed

90

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SWITZERLAND GREECE INDIA USA ITALY

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Farewell Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad delivered the following address to Parliament on March 12, 1962:

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT,

This is the last occasion that I shall be addressing you in this Parliament.

Members of the Lok Sabha, you are about to end your five year tenure of membership of your House. A new Lok Sabha will meet very shortly after the conclusion of your present labours. Many of you have been returned by the people to serve the country again. Some of you will cease to be Members of Parliament consequent on the dissolution of the Lok Sabha and the elections. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of you and to convey to you the gratitude of the nation for your dedicated service as Members of Parliament. I have also no doubt that wherever your field of work may be hereafter you will remain dedicated to the great task of nationbuilding and that your wisdom and experience will continue to be engaged in the service of our country and people.

Members of Parliament! When I addressed you last, our Third Five Year Plan with its larger perspectives and higher targets was under preparation. The Plan has now been well launched. The experience of previous plans, the momentum that they have generated, and the greater nation-wide understanding and appreciation. of planned effort in nation-building augur well for the success of this Plan and will take us nearer our goal-a self-sustaining economy capable of increasing and generating resources for larger and further development.

In spite of the heavy damage inflicted by floods in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, Madras and Kerala, the agricultural yield for 1961-62 is encouraging. The development of agriculture has been accorded a high priority in the Third Five Year Plan. The aim has been not merely to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains but to step up the production of commercial crops as well as to ensure adequate supplies of raw material for our growing industries and to help export to earn foreign exchange. The overall index number of agricultural production rose to 139.1 in 1960-61, compared to 128.7 in 1959-60, thereby showing an increase of 8.1 per cent. This increase was shared both by foodgrains and commercial crops. Compared to the index for 1955-56, the base year of the Second Five Year Plan, the overall index of production for 1960-61 was higher by about 19.1 per cent.

By soil conservation measures and dry farming practices some 33 million acres of land will be brought under improvement. Minor irrigation schemes will bring 12.8 million acres of additional land under cultivation during the Third Plan. My Government have decided to set up an Improved Seed Corporation to organise on a nation-wide scale the production, distribution and marketing of seeds of higher yield and disease-resisting quality. The demand for fertilisers far exceeds supply. More fertiliser factories are therefore being set up to meet partly the increased needs. Local manure resources and the use of green manure are also being promoted.

An extensive Agricultural Disrtict Programme has been put into operation in selected districts in seven States. Crop production campaigns have been launched in all States during the year. Panchayats, Co-operatives and other institutions in the village are closely associated in these campaigns. Four new Agricultural Colleges and two new Veterinary Colleges and more Agricultural Universities are to be established during the Third Plan.

Industrial production has registered considerable increase in volume and a greater diversity in categories of projects. The out-put in iron and steel, machinery, electrical goods and fertilisers has been significantly higher than last year. The attainment of targets and the increase in our national income in 1961-62 are expected to accord with those set out in the Plan.

43

There is, however, no room for complacency or any slackening in effort. There are considerable strains and stresses, as for example, in regard to transport and supplies of coal. These are no doubt due to the sharp rise in economic development.

A determined effort to implement the physical programmes as set out in the Plan would require care in regard to economy and efficiency and the endeavour to keep to time schedules and priorities, all of which are the continuing concern of my Government, will alone help the country to overcome these obstacles.

My Government have decided to expand the steel plants at Bhilai, Rourkela and Durgapur and to establish a new integrated iron and steel plant at Bokaro, and a new alloy steel plant at Durgapur. The augmented target for coal production of 97 million tons in the Third Plan calls for plans of development in this industry. Major schemes are being launched in the public sector with assistance from the U.S.A., France, Poland, West Germany and the U.S.S.R. The private sector in coal will be able to utilise a 35 million dollar loan from the World Bank to meet its foreign exchange requirements.

At Neyveli, the lignite bed was exposed in the August of last year. The first thermal power station using lignite is expected to be commissioned soon.

In Gujarat at Ankleshwar, appreciable and gainfully exploitable sources of oil have been found. In addition to the refinery at Nunmati which went on stream in January 1962, it is also proposed to establish a refinery of two million ton capacity in Gujarat.

Our trade deficits show a welcome decline from 364* crores to 218 crores as compared with the previous twelve-month due to the fall in imports and a slight rise in exports. My Government by their continuous and strenuous endeavours to promote exports have added new items of export and newer markets, and established new incentives to augment export trade. While the increase in export is a moderate Rs. 34 crores worth in the year past we may justifiably feel encouraged than a favourable, trend in our trade balance can now be a feature of our economy.

The Code of Discipline in industrial relations evolved in May 1958 on a voluntary basis is being increasingly observed and has resulted in the settlement of a large number of disputes which might otherwise have led to direct action by one side or the other. Joint Management Councils in industrial undertakings set up on a voluntary basis have shown that the effective consultation which they promote has led to improved industrial relations and increased productivity.

The development and growth of Panchayati Raj and co-operation are integral to progressive agricultural and rural development. The efforts of my Government in this direction have already resulted in large scale extension of village self-government in eight States and it is estimated that this covers 65 per cent. of the country's population.

My Government have made provision for education for all children in the age group of 6-11 during the Third Plan which will enable 90 per cent. of the boys and about 62 per cent. of the girls to be at school making a total of 76 per cent. of the total population of all children in the age group 6-11. Legislation to make, attendance of children compulsory will be recommended to various State Governments.

The study of Sanskrit is expected to make considerable advance in the next few years by the establishment of a Central Sanskrit Institute at Tirupati which will also conduct research in specialised branches of Sanskrit learning.

The demand for trained personnel in the fields of Engineering and Technology continues to grow. To meet this demand, apart from strengthening the existing institutions, more institutes were set up in different parts of the country.

To assist poor but meritorious students a large number of scholarships have been instituted.

The policy of my Government accords priority in promoting measures for the eradication of communicable diseases. Ibis has resulted in the near eradication of malaria and the widespread control of tuberculosis and venereal diseases. My Government have recently initiated a programme for the eradication of smallpox in the country.

To overcome the scarcity of pure drinking water which exists in the majority of our villages, assistance will now be made available to the extent of 50 per cent. on a grant-in-aid basis on approved rural schemes and on a 100 per cent. loan basis in regard to urban schemes.

44

Irrigation has made significant advances.

The 43 crore Narmada Project inaugurated in April 1961 will irrigate one million acres of land and yield an effective half a million kilowatts of power.

The first channel of the Rajasthan canal system was opened by the Vice-President in October last. This canal when completed and operated will convert the deserts of Rajasthan into the largest grain bowl of India.

The new broad-gauge line to Siliguri via Malda has re established a broad-gauge rail connection between Calcutta and North Bengal, which had ken severed by the Partition. Over 700 route kilometers of railway lines serving the industrial East have been electrified.

Two important centenaries were celebrated during the year and nationally observed. The Tagore Centenary attracted distinguished writers from all over the world to its International Literary Seminar. The Centenary programme includes the erection of a Tagore Theatre in every State Capital.

The Archaeological Survey of-India also celebrated its centenary which attracted to its International Conference of Asian Archaeology savants from different parts of the world. The exhibition in Delhi made live to our people in graphic form the historic continuity of our civilisation and made the past not a story of ruins and fossils, but a source of national pride and inspiration.

India's uneasy relations with China remain unsolved. The Officials' Report, which was placed by my Government before Parliament in 1961, has not yet been published in China.

The Indo-Tibetan Agreement of 1954 is due to expire on the 2nd of June 1962. The Government of the People's Republic of China have offered to negotiate a new Agreement to replace the 1954 Agreement. My Government responding by way of reply, have asked for a reversal of the aggressive policies pursued by our neighbour and for the restoration of a climate of peace on the basis of the strict observance of the Five Principls.

In the Congo, as Parliament is aware, my

Government at a critical period took a crucial decision to send adequate armed forces to assist the United Nations, although it was and continues to be a great strain upon us to do so. Our men and officers have behaved with remarkable bravery discipline and restraint and above all, with understanding. They have received the plaudits of nationals of all countries not to speak of the United Nations authorities. While we would like to bring these troops home in view of our own necessities, my Government feel that the essential tasks for which India sent troops remain unfulfilled and, therefore, have agreed to continue the assistance which was given, even though our men are working in difficult conditions, and have taken the necessary steps for the relief of personnel that have been too long in Africa My Government are also gratified that in this matter there are some indications of a co-operative United Nations outlook between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union

My Government note with great relief and gratification the moves towards reconciliation on the basis of the independence of Algeria. They are deeply distressed at the continued violence which is taking a heavy toll of life, and they await with expectation the successful outcome of the present Algerian-de Gaulle efforts. My Government have repeatedly proclaimed their position that the only firm basis for a peaceful settlement is the independence of the Algerian people, and enduring peace is best brought about by peaceful methods.

India has been elected to the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee. My Government have accepted this onerous role in the hope that the policies to be pursued and the contribution which we have made in the past may help healthy developments, and that as a peaceminded country and with the growth of peace areas in the world India may be able to participate and assist the processes of reconciliation and peaceful settlement. Meanwhile my Government will use their best efforts in every direction to lower tensions in the world. My Government hope that the Disarmament negotiations will, in spite of difficulties, lead to a warless world which is our aim and policy.

My Government continue their participation

in the International Conference. on Laos at Geneva and the International Commission for Supervision and Control. We have adhered to the policy that the Laotian problem can only be solved on the basis of national independence and of the full freedom of the people and Government of Laos to maintain neutrality which should be assured by all concerned. Although the problem awaits solution the indications are that we may look forward to a Laotian Government wedded to these principles under the Premiership of that distinguished statesman, Prince Souvanna Phouma. We are

45

continuing to participate in the international Commissions for Supervision and Control in Vietnam and Cambodia in the interests of peace.

My Government also continue their participation in the U.N. Emergency Force in Gaza, to which India has contributed a contingent.

We welcome to the comity of independent nations several African States including many States in the former French Colonial Africa, Sierra Leone, formerly British, and Tanganyika, a former Mandated Territory under British Administration.

We have appointed diplomatic representatives to Syria, Senegal and Tanganyika, and established trade relations with Kuwait and with North and South Korea whose representatives also visited this country.

We welcome the emergence of Western Samoa as an independent country.

My Government have concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union on the peaceful uses of Atomic Energy.

The President of the Soviet Union, the King and Queen of Malaya, King Mahendra of Nepal, President Frondizi of Argentine, President Zawadski of Poland, the Vice-Presidents of the U.S.A. and the U.A.R., the Prime Ministers of Denmark, Hungary, Japan, Trinidad and Burma paid visits to India and had discussions with my Prime Minister on a variety of topics of mutual interest. The Foreign Minister of France and the Secretary of State of the United States also visited India and had discussions with my Prime Minister.

Indo-Pakistan relations have shown no signs of improvement. We have repeated our offer to the Pakistan Government to sign a "No War" Agreement. The Pakistan Government requested the Security Council recently to debate the Kashmir issue again although they had not in any way implemented or honoured the aggrements which they made with us and the United Nations in regard to withdrawal of forces, etc., or stopped aggressive activities across the ceasefire line or aiding subversion inside Kashmir. The Security Council has, however, deferred its consideration of the Pakistan request.

As Parliament is aware, after fourteen years of patient negotiations and waiting and giving an opportunity for the friends of Portugal to resolve the problem of the Portuguese colonialism on our mainland, the Government of India, in the interests of peace, the Unity of India and on account of the irresistible volume of public opinion in our country, had to take action to bring an end to Portuguese colonialism on the mainland. This issue was precipitated by acts of flagrant aggression by Portugal including firing upon our merchant shipping, the killing of our nationals and intrusion into our territory. While there has been ill-informed criticism from some countries, the rest of the world has applauded this action and indeed the populations of all counties appear to welcome die end of Portuguese colonialism in at least. a part of the world.

I am very happy, as you Members of Parliament are, that the operation in regard to Goa was practically bloodless and certainly entirely so in regard to civilian populations including our compatriots and all others. Goa is administered by a Military Governor under civil law and legislation will be introduced in the present Parliament to regularise the position of these territories as integral part of the Union of India. We have however repeatedly assured the peoples in Goa and the world that the personality that this area has acquired as a result of history would be respected, within the limits of the fundamentals of our Constitution, and that any changes would be constructive and smooth. The people of the former Portuguese colony have the protection of the fundamental rights and the basic principles of our Constitution. My Government propose to submit a bill to Parliament in this session on this matter.

My Government have agreed to help finance the first Five Year Plan for economic and social development in Bhutan to the tune of Rs. 17 crores. Communications in this area are receiving priority consideration by the Bhutanese Government itself and under the Border Roads Development programme. it is hoped that during this year it will be possible to establish motor traffic in Bhutan. My Government are happy that the initiative for all these developments has been taken by the Bhutanese Government, in which my Government are co-operating.

A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1962-63 will be laid before you for the purpose of passing votes on account authorising expenditure for a part of that year.

As this session of Parliament will be a very brief one, only essential legislation will be taken up during this session. Some Ordinances which

46

have been promulgated since the last session will be placed before Parliament.

General Elections are now complete. Members of Parliament, I would like to echo your sense of rejoicing that this vast democratic exercise has been peaceful, orderly and in accordance with our constitutional processes. We have set an example to ourselves and indirectly assisted the confidence in the world in the institution and the processes of Parliamentary Government.

As a result of the elections my Government have received a significant vote of confidence in their internal and external policies and a renewed mandate to strive strenuously and with speed for the establishment of a democratic socialist society and for the extension of the democratic institutions and processes on the basis of universal suffrage to the remotest of our villages, making democracy a reality. The policies of national integration and world peace through non-alignment, peaceful approach to problems, lowering of tensions and negotiated settlements have also received the endorsement of the nation. This renewed assurance and confidence placed by the great majority of our people in my Government and the avowal of their support for policies, internal and external, that have been repeatedly endorsed by Parliament and widely discussed by the country prior to the election, reinforce these policies and place on my Government a nationally mandated obligation and added strength to implement these. policies.

Members of Parliament, I now bid you farewell. I feel confident that those of you who do not return here as legislators, will pursue useful and constructive roles in various fields of national activity so essential for the advancement of our democracy and for the building of our socialist society and for the furtherance of peace in the world. Those of you who have received the mandate of the electorate to continue your legislative activity will join with others who will come here for the first time to continue the arduous but constructive and fruitful labours for nation-building.

In a short time a new Parliament will be inaugurated and as in years past, but with and they can strive for establishment and further renewed vigour and galvanised strength, you implementation of the principles of our Constitution, namely :_

Justice, social economic and political;

- Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;
- Equality of status and of opportunity-
- And to promote among all the citizens
- Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation.

These have been fully placed by my Government before our nation during the vast and educative process of our election and in its full implications. I wish you all success and good fortune wherever you may be.

USA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE POLAND GERMANY INDIA TOTO CHINA PERU CONGO ALGERIA LAOS SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA VIETNAM SIERRA LEONE SENEGAL SYRIA KUWAIT KOREA NEPAL DENMARK HUNGARY JAPAN BURMA PAKISTAN PORTUGAL BHUTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Chairman of the Indian Delegation to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, made the following statement in the Conference on March 20, 1962 :

I should like first of all to express the regret of my Government that our Prime Minister, who is also at present Minister of Foreign Affairs of India is unable to be here owing to heavy internal commitments and for other reasons. I am therefore placing the views of my Government before this Committee, not with any background of finality but by way of participating in our proceedings.

For well nigh thirty years meetings on disarmament, that is, on doing away with war, have been held in these buildings. In those thirty years more and more weapons have been added, including that spurt during the war against Germany and Japan, culminating in the inclusion of nuclear weapons for destructive purposes. Yet perhaps the most comforting feature in this regard is that we have not given up hope in spite

47

of all the failures and we still come here with the determination to find agreement on the banning of destructive weapons, on the elimination of all weapons of war, and ultimately on the outlawing of war as a method of settling disputes between nations.

In more recent times, until two or three years ago, the question was called "the limitation and balanced reduction of armaments". From there we made a departure two or three years ago-I shall not bore the Committee with dates and resolutions-when the United Nations unanimously approved of our purpose being general and complete disarmament. While this was a matter of debate some time ago, there are no nations now, great or small, which do not accept this proposition.

Therefore, by resolution 1378 (XIV) the General Assembly accepted general and complete disarmament as the goal. My Government agreed that this might be achieved either within the context of the organizational pyramid of the United Nations or outside it, and, like various other Members, subscribed to the appointment of the Ten Nation Committee, consisting of the nuclear powers and their allies. We patiently waited-, believing very much in these bilateral and direct negotiations, until that Committee reached a deadlock.

Then came a period when no progress was made. Thus, along with eleven other nations we submitted to the United Nations on 15 November 1960 a draft resolution, which is United Nations document A/C. I/L. 259.

I refer to this for two reasons. First of all, the Secretary of State of Her Britannic Majesty has referred to the communique on the meeting of the Prime Ministers of Commonwealth. My Prime Minister signed this communique, along with the other Prime Ministers-in the same way as the Soviet Union and the United States signed the eight principles.

But, having mentioned this, I must state-out of regard for our co-sponsors of the twelve-Powers resolution, and in order to place this question in its proper context-that the Prime Minister at that time, both publicly and privately, in conference and outside, clearly indicated that the position of India is as expressed in the twelve-Power draft resolution, which is still on the agenda of the United Nations. We are happy to note that the eight principles more or less conform to the foundations. in that draft resolution, and indeed both the United States and the Soviet Union have often mentioned this to us. But there are some differences between the two, differences which have been pointed out in United Nations meetings and which I need not go into at the present time.

Some time later, about 30 March 1961, the United States and the Soviet Union informed the United Nations that they were willing to undertake consultations in regard to the problem of full and complete disarmament. As a result, we have before us the eight principles on the basis of which we meet here today.

Later, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1722 (XVI), which is more or less our charter for meeting here. This resolution endorsed the agreement reached between the two great nations in regard to the composition of this committee. Although that was in form a bilateral agreement, resulting from a consultation, as everybody knows, it has now been sanctified in General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI). We meet here under instructions from the United Nations that :

"... the Committee, as a matter of the utmost urgency, should undertake negotiations with a view to reaching, on the basis of the joint statement of agreed principles and taking into account, inter alia, paragraph 8 of those principles, agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control".

(General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI).

I want first of all to say that my Government has at all times regarded control and disarmament as being inseparable; we do not think that one should follow the other or should obstruct the other.

In this context it must also be mentioned that about September 1960 the Soviet Union submitted a series of proposals which afterwards were resubmitted and which are now before us in what the Soviet Union calls a draft treaty, and, I presume, in the memorandum accompanying the draft treaty. Similarly, we have before us another document, submitted by the United States of America on 25 September 1961 (A/4891), following a statement by the President of the United States, and which was resubmitted to us on 16 March of this year (ENDC/6). There is authoritative reason to believe that the United States is likely to elaborate on this document. I say all this in order that it may be clear to us in this Committee that there are before us several manifestations of the way principles should be imple-

48

mented, the main ones being those submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States.

A number of speeches have been made in this committee, including so far eight from the socalled uncommitted nations. Of those eight, I believe four have said "We are already committed to such and such a plan", and the others have expressed their endorsement of the. other side. Brazil, whose statement we heard on Friday, and Sweden, whose statement we have heard today, are two amongst the new members of the committee who have spoken.

Reference has been made by the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom to the addition of these eight members. But it is not as though we come to the disarmament discussions out of the blue, as it were. We have been citizens of this world, Member States of the United Nations and participants in these arguments and expressions of views for a long time, and most of our nations, except perhaps the new ones, have been concerned in them. But what is most important is that both the two principal participants and their allies and the United Nations as a whole considered that a stage had been reached when this element of non-commitment in these confabulations would be necessary and perhaps useful. It is on that basis that we come here. We could be witnesses in the sense that one side or the other could not afterwards say : "This is what was said" or "That is what was said", and then argument would go on as before; or we could contribute in some way perhaps to finding solutions to differences which are not nearly so deep, or perhaps could find some method of suggesting that over and above these differences are certain agreements.

The three nuclear Powers alone account for five hundred million out of a world population of nearly three thousand million The allies of the nuclear countries, excluding the vast population of China, which is not a member of the United Nations as at present constituted, would be in the proportion of 2 to 1. But whether we are nuclear Powers or non-nuclear Powers, we are equally affected by the impact of the development of nuclear weapons, by their non-destruction, by the continuation of the advances made in them, and by the race in nuclear arms as in other armaments. The progress of science and technology has made war no longer a matter of dynasties or of countries or of nations, but one in which a country which is not actively participating can only submit to victimization.

Throughout these discussions there have been questions of motives, of difficulties, and other matters have been raised. It is the view of my Government, and my Prime Minister has specially asked us to proceed on this basis, that this Conference-differently perhaps from previous Conferences, and certainly more than previous Conferences-meets with a passionate desire on both sides to find ways of agreement. It has been so stated, and so far as my Government is concerned we accept those statements at their full and face value. That is, we are proceeding at this Conference in the belief that it there are difficulties in the way of reconciling position, these arise either from historic circumstances or from suspicions or fear or lack of acceptance of data of one kind or another.

We are not particularly wedded to any formula that is put forward, but at the same time we are wedded to certain conceptions which the Prime Minister put to Parliament in his last speech; namely, that disarmament must be full and complete-this is now, at any rate in words, commonly accepted-and this means a world without war, not a world which provides for nuclear weapons at the disposal of the United Nations, but in which, as has been proposed in the draft resolution of the twelve Powers, all these establishments would be demolished end we would have an entirely different situation.

It was interesting this morning that the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom hinted at the idea that we people are not accustomed to that sort of thing, that we cannot even mentally think of a world without, as they would say, the King's horses and the King's men, and we must be gradually accustomed to the idea that war is not glorious or necessary and so forth. But, as he himself said, many of the purposes and reasons for the existence of these large quantities of arms have disappeared. In the past the reason was colonial expansion, the desire to Capture markets, or perhaps to establish rival ideologies. All those reasons have fully and completely disappeared or are on the way out. It is inconceivable today that a country would try to conquer another by force of arras and subjugate it, or to advance commercial interests by forcible means, because this method defeats its end. Therefore, all that remains is security, and it is interesting that while considerations of national security must always prevail, my country at one time and for many years advanced the view that security comes through peace and not peace through security. It is not merely juxtaposition of words, because in the pursuit of security for the establishment of peace we seem to sow the seeds of war and of conflicts. We have today come by sheer pressure of circumstances to an

49

appreciation of the world in a more widespread way. We have the following statement of President Kennedy :

"Men now know"-I hope it is true in large measures--"that amassing of destructive power does not beget security"-if I myself had said that, it might have been the subject of comment in newspapers of a different character-"they know that polemics do not bring peace. Men's minds, men's hearts, and men's spiritual aspirations alike demand no less than a reversal of the course of recent history. " (ENDC/PV.2, page 23).

It I may say so respectfully, one could not have put it better.

The same proposition is put forward by the Soviet Union when it speaks about the sure and realistic way, lying in general and complete disarmament, of getting rid of the dangerous consequences with which the arms race is fraught.

The second aspect of our position in this mat-

ter, to which I shall refer later, is the speed with which disarmament must be accomplished. There are many reasons, the weight of armaments, the increasing disease that spreads over men's minds in the way of hatred, and the emergence of new causes, real or imagined, which divide nations. But apart from all that, we consider that either we disarm pretty quickly or the process of re-arming will go on, because in any very gradual procedure anything that would be accomplished would be subject to suspicions and difficulties of various kinds and new causes would emerge. That is, if very violent disagreement between two people is going to be adjusted over a very long time, having regard to the background of animosity and the suspicion which exists, they themselves would be worse off during that period in which a small improvement might be brought about. For that, if for no other reason, we have always advocated the speedy accomplishment of disarmament, so much so that my Prime Minister when speaking to the United Nations. two years ago said that it is a question of trying to achieve it not all in one fine morning or in one piece, but as one pices with so many stages within it for the accomplishment of the whole thing in a short period of four or five years. As far as we are concerned, this is not borrowed from the Soviet treaty, it is the view of our Government.

Therefroe, before leaving this point, I would say that this is really the main obstacle to us, that while there must be institutions for bringing about disarmament-as Lord Home said, there must be physical disarmament in many waysall this must be accompanied by the creation of confidence and the assumption that if there are going to be evasions this must be considered to be inevitable and methods must be found for avoiding them. None of us should take the view that only one side, and not the other, would evade. If evasions are going to arise from fear, then fear is common to all concerned. Therefore it is largely a crisis of confidence, which should not be dismissed as a mere phrase; it is something that exists in the world today. The more powerful a nation is the more powerfully armed, the more afraid it is. Therefore the security that is sought has today to be found in the sealing down of arms rather than in increasing them, because we have now reached the stage where any further addition to armaments could not produce any greater destruction than can be produced by what we already have. In other words, if you can destroy the world once with the arms that exist, there is no case for destroying it twice.

Therefore the fallacy that security is built up in this way is gradually being exploded by facts, and even in the past twelve months, in publications and in speeches from all sides, there has been greater recognition of this fact.

Let us now look at the balance sheet of the proposals and the approaches and the objectives of different nations. It is quite easy, in a public meeting or a meeting where everybody is trying to be friendly to everybody else, to say : they are all saying the same thing, the differences. are very slight. I believe that in plenary sitting one should perhaps lay greater stress on agreement and on common ground, only referring to the differences and difficulties, and that in private sitting, one should deal more with the difficulties and impediments in the way. One can therefore quite understand why the representative of Canada yesterday set out the similarities. If one read that alone, and wanted to believe it, one would think that disarmament could come tomorrow. Of course, this common ground has increased in recent years and, side by side with it, the difficulties in implementing what is intended have increased.

For example, we have today a common objective-the common objective of general and complete disarmament. But when one gets down to examining it, the question arises : Is this a common objective to be reached if the first stage is successful and the second stage is successful and other stages are successful, and so on, so that we ultimately get there : or is it to be accepted as something for which the plans are

50

made from the very beginning and then the picture filled in little by little? These are two approaches to this Problem about which there has been juxtaposition of minds and views. It is gradually getting narrowed down, but still the problem is there, and it is one of the problems we shall have to solve.

Now comes the question of inspection and con-

trol. Earlier I read out two paragraphs, one from Mr. Dean Rusk's speech and one from Mr. Gromyko's, which if viewed outside the context of this meeting might make People wonder what they were quarrelling about. Said Mr. Rusk :

"We do, not ask a degree of inspection out of line with the amount and kind of disarmament actually undertaken." (ENDC/PV.2, page 37).

And in the Soviet Memorandum we read:

". . at each stage the extent of control should strictly conform to the extent and nature of the disarmament measures carried out in each stage." (ENDC/3, page 8).

There is no doubt a slight difference of emphasis in these sentences, but the fact remains that looking through the documents before us we see that the United States has made proposals in regard to inspection at railway stations and in regard to physical inspection at various stages, and we thought at one time that this was a difficulty that could not be overcome.

The Secretary of State of the United States referred to

"Advance notification of military movements, such as major transfer of forces...

"Establishment of observation posts

"Establishment of an international commission on measures to reduce the risk of war... (ENDC/PV.2, Page 36).

I do not want to quote those things at length in a meeting of this kind as my advisers tell me that. it has all been said in the last two days and everybody remembers it.

Then I look at the Memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union on 27 September 1961, in which it is also said that :

"The most practical steps which might be taken at an early date include the setting up of land control posts at railway junctions and major ports and on motor roads, the function of which would be to ensure that dangerous concentrations of armed forces oft military equipment did not take place.

"The Soviet Government is of the opinion that the establishment of such land control posts might constitute an effective means of lessening the danger of surprise attack. No one is likely to dispute the fact that, even in this age of nuclear weapons, preparations for a largescale modern war inevitably call for the concentration of large military units with large qualities of armaments and equipment ... (A/4892, page 10).

Paragraphs which refer to this are also contain. ed in the draft treaty which has been submitted. One refers more to the Soviet treaty in this connexion not in order to introduce any imbalance in this argument but because it is generally assumed that the resistance is more on that side. For example, in that draft treaty we read :

"Inspectors of the International Disarmament Organization shall verify the implementation of the measures. . . " (ENDC/2, page 7). But later we read :

"Proportionately to the reduction of armed forces, as provided for in article I 1 of the present treaty, the production of conventional armaments and munitious not coming under articles 5-8 of the present treaty, shall be reduced." (ENDC/2, page 10). And then it goes on in paragraph 2

"Inspectors of the International Disarmament Organization shall exercise control over the measures referred to in paragraph I of this article." (Ibid.).

As I have said, I will not burden the Committee by reading all this, but there are many such references. For instance :

"The production of nuclear weapons, and of fissionable materials for weapons purposes shall be completely discontinued. All plants, installations and laboratories specially designed for the production of nuclear weapons or their components shall be eliminated or converted to production for peaceful purposes. All workshops, installations and laboratories for the production of the components of nuclear weapons at plants that are partially engaged in the production of such weapons, shall be destroyed or converted to production for peaceful purposes

"The International Disarmament Organization shall have the right to inspect all enterprises which extract raw materials for atomic

51

production or which produce or use fissionable materials or atomic energy." (ENDC/2, page 15).

I am not for a moment saying that each of these paragraphs can be taken separately and framed and said to be the whole idea of the proposal, but we are trying to point out that we have moved far away from the time when even such words created inhibitions and obstruction, and that we can perhaps now speak about themthat may indeed be the purpose of this Conference.

Then we come to the negative or minus aspects, those with regard to time. Here we find ourselves on the side which wants to shorten the time. We were glad to hear the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom refer to this matter this morning. Two periods have been mentioned-one of four years and one of nine yearsand even if it takes two years to talk about it, once it does begin we think it ought to be concluded very quickly if it is to be concluded at all, because otherwise there will be too long a period of engagement during which difficulties may arise.

There have also been some difficulties in the negotiations on the twelve-Power draft resolution before the United Nations-with the United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other-in regard to what are spoken of as stages and phases. Those also are matters for us to consider here.

In the submission of my Government, all this discussion is conditioned by the tensions that exist in the world. In plenary sittings of this Conference it is neither necessary nor appropriate to refer to these, but it is quite obvious that if a number of parties are negotiating on a difficult problem difficulties in other spheres only add to their problems. Thus, the lowering of tension in those other matters is of concern to all of us; and while we may not be directly involved as States in those particular disputes, the elimination of any one of them, whether it be in Europe or in south-east Asia, would certainly contribute towards the lessening of suspicion and the elimination or reduction of points of conflict.

We welcome from both the United States and the Soviet Union the various degrees of stress laid upon flexibility. If we can, as a result of this Conference, lay some stress on the climate that is required for negotiations, we shall make some progress. Equally, it would be helpful if the sides concerned would take into account the concern of those nations, representing the majority of the peoples of the world, which really cannot put a brake on disarmament. we cannot throw away atomic bomb because, we have not got them; all that we can do is to commit ourselves not to make atomic weapons, to the extent we have any capacity to make them. It would therefore be preferable not to limit in any way the concept of full and comprehensive disarmament by saying, "We will do a little and then see how it works and then go on to something else."

It is quite true that unless agreements already entered into have been fulfilled, it will be very difficult to go on to the second part. But, in our submission, if we are honestly. committed to full and complete disarmament there must be an agreement by all States that what we are trying to do is to draw the blueprints, or the entire edifice --- or non-edifice--of disarmament. From there we could fill in the edifice piece by piecetaking into consideration all the difficulties to which Lord Home referred. To say that we will put up one brick and see whether it stands and then send for another brick will not get us anywhere. That is where our previous attempts failed.

As early as 1955, my Government submitted to the United Nations the' idea that the Secretariat of the United Nations should produce a draft disarmament treaty. The climate and conditions having changed, such an idea could not be put forward now.

Now, the question arises what we have to do in this matter. Here I can 'do no better than quote Mr. De San Thiago Dantas, the Foreign Minister of Brazil, who said :

"The othre method, which unfortunately is used far more infrequently, consists of exploring the extreme limits of compromise solutions consistent with the maintenance of present levels of security and conducting negotiations to those extreme limits. Naturally this method is the only one which can lead to effective progress in the field of disarmament and paradoxical as this may seem, it is not those nations which possess nuclear weapons but those which do not, which can bring about conditions more conducive to the use of this method." (ENDC/PV.2, page 11).

While we would not like to be categorical about the last part of that statement, we believe we should not be here unless we can make a contribution, if called upon to do so or if we find we can do so, in this respect.

Therefore, we come to the more practical, the more immediate purposes which face' us. One is in regard to the treaty itself. We think that

52

either a treaty, or a draft of a treaty, or the protocols of a treaty, covering the whole of this picture must emerge from this Conference. It would be wrong to say that this must be in a book or on a piece of paper, or that it must be in this form on in that form or in the other form. We have from the Soviet Union what, in format, looks more like a treaty, and there is a proposal that we should discuss it paragraph by paragraph in plenary sittings. Of course, if it is the general view that this should be done, we would not object. But what we discuss in plenary sittings should be nearer the end than the beginning. Therefore, we would submit that for the purpose of this treaty there are three possible approaches.

The first is for the United States and the Soviet Union themselves, through bilateral consultations and with the help of their nuclear allies, to find a way to marry these two documents and submit something to us, even if it is imperfect. As I hinted a while ago, my country would never agree to the idea that there should be an international force which would use nuclear weapons in the future. But that is not a point of debate at the present time. As I have so often said in the United Nations, the United States and the Soviet Union sometimes speak a very similar language, that is, the language of power.

Hence, one way of approaching this matter would be for the Soviet Union and the United States to carry out direct negotiations and submit one document incorporating the various proposals now before as : the Memorandum of the Soviet Union, the outlines presented by the United States over a period of nearly a year now which we understand will be elaborated-and so forth. Even if we could not agree with some parts of such a document, that would be one approach. But realistically speaking and having in mind all that has happened, this may not be a feasible method. At any rate, there is no reason why one methods should be exclusive of the other. That is why we have said from the very beginning that there, should be considerable room for bilateral, trilateral, public, private or informal talks.

Another method would be for this Committee itself to appoint a smaller body to do the really technical work of putting these things together and to tell us, "We find in these two documents these ways and means of getting together." Having regard to the prejudices that exist, we ourselves think-and this was the idea that we originally intended to put- forward, but in order to be flexible we have put the others forward alsothat it should be possible for a committee of this body, under the auspices of the two co-Chairmen, to take the two documents as a basis and produce what might be called a "skeleton" treaty into which the various ideas could. be fitted.

In any case, I believe that ten of the delegations here have now spoken, and one may well hope that the plenary sittings will soon be over so that we can get down to the formulation of something that can be submitted to the United Nations by June.

I do not think I am saying anything original when I say that there is considerable expectation in the world, in all our countries. I say to both the United States and the Soviet Union that if, in a country like ours, there is not a great deal of loud agitation about peace, it is because there is no difference of opinion about the matter and not because there is not a volume of feeling; it may be that there are not so many visible demonstrations as in some other countries. If this Conference were simply to hear speeches and to say at the end "we agree to differ", that would not be satisfactory. We have to make a report to the Disarmament Committee by I June and, in our submission, that report should include the blueprints of a treaty or the agreement to make a treaty or any protocols to that effect. The closer it is to a complete document, a complete instrument that can be accepted by all sides, the nearer will be the day when disarmament itself starts.

Therefore, we put forward these three alternatives, with our own view that perhaps the preference is from the bottom upwards. That does not exclude all the talks that may go on in this way.

Then we come to the consideration of what have been called, not partial measures-an unfortunate word which creates controversy-but, shall we say, specific items which have been discussed here. On the general proposition I would like to communicate to this Committee what was said by my Prime Minister in Parliament only two days ago :

"In regard to foreign affairs or in regard to anything, the most important thing today is disarmament, looking at it from the world point of view, because if there is no disarmament the world will naturally drift more and more towards conflict, towards war, and undoubtedly if there is war it will be a nuclear war, and a possible war like that brought on without even a declaration of war."

"Today, therefore, disarmament has become a question not of reducing armament by 10.

53

per cent, 15 per cent, 20 per cent or 25 per cent. If this basic fear remains it does not matter how much you reduce it because it does not require, as figures are given, the thousands of nuclear bombs possessed by big nuclear Powers; a quarter of them are enough to wipe off the world or wipe off another country".

One can add to this that if in the context of

partial reduction there should be conflict, all the weapons that had been thrown away would come back in six months. So the only answer to armament is total disarmament. There is no way of mending this situation, but only of ending it. Our Prime Minister added :

"If this [Conference] fails then it will be no easy task to come back to it. Some, time or other the world will have to come to disarmament unless it destroys itself before-hand".

This is the submission we have to make on the general question.

On the special matters, we think they should be considered and implemented simultaneously with the others. There is no reason for us to wait for the conclusions of a disarmament treaty, or a draft of it, before we consider other things. I shall take these matters not in order of importance but in order of convenience.

The first is an idea which has been endorsed by the United Nations-it was originally proposed by the delegation of Ireland and is now being sponsored with great enthusiasm and a great deal of dedication by the delegation of Sweden-and which relates to what may be called the non-spread of these weapons. We have ourselves advocated for a long time that the spread of these weapons to other countries not only increases the area of danger but also places them-if one may say so without disrespect-in less responsible hands; therefore it creates more points of conflicts, more chances of either catalytic or accidental war. The spread of knowledge about these weapons would ultimately lead to the production of them. We would not be satisfiedand I hope this will not be regarded as too controversial-merely with the idea that the technique would not be transferred, because humanity today is sufficiently advanced for anyone who is given the weapons to find ways of using them. Therefore it would not be sufficient for countries which possess nuclear weapons to say "We will give bombs to others but we will not tell them how to use them". They will soon find out. Therefore it means a complete dedication not to allow these weapons to get away-a dedication to segregate them in the places where they now are. After all, if you have made them, you may keep them. Why give them to anybody

else ?

The next problem is with regard to nuclearfree zones. We have subscribed to this proposition, and I am glad to say that the demand for nuclear-free zones spreads each day. Today we have added the Balkans to them: tomorrow we may add Scandinavia, and then the Pacific Ocean, so that the whole world would be nuclear-free. To the extent that the idea is spreading we are happy about it, But if we agree Lot to explode, these bombs, ultimately to prohibit them, then of course the idea attains a different context. We are in support of these nuclear-free zones, but not on the basis that there are some places in the world that may be destroyed : that there are expendable portions and non-expendable portions. That would be unfortunate for some of us; therefore we cannot accept it. Lord Home seems to be philosophically satisfied with certain things happening-I do not want to go into this-but other nations will not take it that way.

There was a suggestion-originally made, I believe, by the former Secretary of State of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden, as he then was-to create a free corridor in regard to war itself. There is the Polish plan and the resolution passed by the United Nations in regard to Africa; we cannot say a great deal about the latter because France is not here-and I should have said before that my Government very much regrets the absence of the French Government; we hope it is a purely temporary one; and we hope, especially in view. of the new developments which have taken place, that France will be able to come to our next meeting.

The next of these specific items relates to what my Government used to call, in discussions in the United Nations, an armament truce, an idea which was ridiculed at the time. We have no specific propositions to put forward in this respect, because at once we run up against the problem of the newer conception of mathematics in which "two" in one place does not mean "two" in another place, or something of that kind. That is to say that merely the quantum of weapons does not mean anything it depends upon who possesses them and where they are, and so on.

But we believe, on the whole, that if there were an agreement, particularly among the great

Powers, to put some financial limits or energy limits in regard to production of weapons a freeze. could be achieved, and the armaments race, while it might not be reversed, might be

54

arrested for a time. It is well known that the United States itself is carrying this year a heavier burden than in the past. The same must be true of the Soviet Union. Therefore we are in favour of any proposals that may lead in the direction of an armaments freeze.

Now I conic to the last of these specific items, namely nuclear explosions. I have spoken so much about this in the last twelve months, without much purpose, I am afraid. Our position is the same in this matter; we are in favour of a treaty as sacrosanct as it can be made; we are in favour of any type of arrangements that can be made; but, pending those treaties, we are even more concerned to see to it that even the prospect of a treaty is not jeopardised by explosions that may take place.

We have not the full report of the Prime Minister's speech in Parliament yesterday, but he makes there a very fervent appeal to all nations not to commit themselves to explosions while this Conference is sitting. He said "I would beg of the great Powers to consider not having any tests while the Geneva Conference is sitting."

Reference has been made by Lord Home to the resolution passed by the United Nations supporting the establishment of a treaty. Not much authority is required for that because everybody has been in favour of a treaty. The only trouble has been that three years of confabulation have not produced any results. It has been said that the treaty resolution, document A/RES/1649 (XVI), has had very considerable support-nearly seventy countries voted for it. Well, that is so, and we accept that. But I am sure the Secretary of State will not forget that resolution 1648 also was passed and that resolution :

".. Earnestly urges the States concerned to refrain from further explosions pending the conclusion of necessary internationally binding agreements in regard to test (A/ RES/1648(XVI).

and urgently calls upon everybody to establish agreement expeditiously.

Now if we were going to go by numbers, we would find that fewer people voted against suspension; that while fifteen people voted against the treaty resolution, only eight voted against the suspension resolution at that time. And, having regard to the general context of thinking in the world, public opinion would not be satisfied with all the excuses we would make. all the reasons we could find, and all the apprehensions, legitimate or otherwise, we might have. Our peoples are bound to ask "What, is the war purpose, what is the military purpose, of further explosions?" If countries say that they will not carry out any more explosions if there is a treaty, then obviously there is no urgent military purpose in such explosions.

Then comes the question of detection. It has been said in another place that it is not a question of detection : it is a question of creating confidence in peoples all over the world that testing is not taking place. We make the following suggestion.

We are not prepared to say at the present time whether every explosion is detectable or not detectable, but at the same time we submit that this is not an academic exercise; we are not trying to find out whether anything can be exploded in a laboratory or whether there could be an earthquake which could be mistaken for an explosion, By and large, is it possible to find out whether anybody is violating a treaty ?

Secondly, this Conference meets on the basis that agreements will be made and kept; otherwise why should we meet, why should we try to make agreements if we are sure beforehand that they will be broken? We can naturally make provision against the temptation on the part of people to get round them. Therefore we would say that any kind of agreement which by and large is feasible should be sufficient for the purpose-what Mr. Unden called a provisional agreement. Whatever we do, if there are more explosions, what will happen to the work of this Conference and the atmosphere of peace and confidence in the world? There is nothing so dangerous as turning people into cynics in this matter.

We welcome the statement made by the Soviet Union yesterday that it is prepared to enter into new discussions, here or elsewhere. We also welcome the response made by the United States and the United Kingdom. For three years the ingenuity of man. Anglo-Saxon and otherwise. has been found wanting with regard to reaching a settlement. These negotiations should go on while we are here, if possible. For years these tests have been regarded not only as dangerous to mankind in their immediate effects. but also as the engine of nuclear war. We have a right to see that every attempt is made to reach agreement. If the initial efforts do not lead at least to a temporary agreement for The cessation of nuclear tests, then I think it is the bounden duty of this Conference to put this matter before a special committee appointed for that purpose.

55

We would also suggest that if the idea is that one cannot take for granted the results of the detection efforts by any of the three countries involved in this matter-that is to say, if the United States is not prepared to accept the judgement on this score of- the United Kingdom or the Soviet Union, or the other way round-it may be worth considering whether scientific detection stations could be established by national efforts in other countries or could be internationally established. If it is possible to spread bases all round the world or to manufacture these weapons in large quantities, it should also be possible to establish these peace stations in various parts of the world, in countries that are partly committed or are uncommitted to the two blocs. Then, in the event of an explosion, the results would come in from everywhere-just as today we measure radiation, and the results are internationally communicated. Therefore, as a compromise measure, it could be agreed for the time being that we should have other monitoring stations from which results would be received. Of course, if all the data collected pointed to one result, there would be no difficulty; if there were differences of opinion, then it would be, for us to consider what could be done about them.

The main explosions we are worried about at the moment are explosions in the air and the

biosphere. These can be detected, and the committing of such explosions-there is no other' word for it-would be a violation of an international agreement. If there was a straight forward agreement between the nuclear Powers that there would be no more explosions, if any were detected that would be proof of the violation of the international treaty. That is all, in any case, that we could do. There is no way, except in a world State, of sending people from one place to another in order to enforce a treaty.

Thus, at the present moment, however difficult may be the problem, however much we may distrust anybody else, the very basis of this Conference is that there should be agreements. These agreements cannot just be left to trust. They must be on the basis of the undertaking of international obligations, and countries which violate international obligations must pay the consequences. That is the way of international life as we know it today.

We have no desire to exaggerate this problem of explosions, but it has got so much into the mental make-up and fears and apprehensions of people that it has almost come to be, regarded as the acid test of what the great countries are prepared to do. If they are not going even to stop tests, how will they abolish weapons ? How are we to explain this to our people?

The same applies to the means of carrying these nuclear weapons. A number of mathematical and other arguments have been put forward by the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom in regard to this weapon or that weapon. This can be discussed but, when the Soviet Union has such formidable weapons as long-range rockets, the destruction of these weapons cannot but be a factor of safety to the rest of the world. Therefore, while there may be holes in this, we may plug these holes; but we should not throw the baby out with the bath water, which would happen so far as nuclear tests are concerned if this Conference did not at least bring about the suspension of such tests. While we are sitting here, tests are being contemplated by one country. It is unfortunate that in the period of suspension the Soivet Union broke that suspension and there was an explosion, about which we all protested at that time. But in that period of fifteen or eighteen months

it was not a question of a lack of detection, it was not as though explosions had taken place clandestinely; what happened was that the suspension was disregarded, for whatever reasons, and there was the well-known explosion.

Therefore, it appears that the whole problem of detection is being put out of place and given too much precedence. It really is not a problem, but a conundrum. We suggest, that if there is an immediate agreement to make an agreement, and therefore a cessation of tests pending the treaty. this Conference should appoint some machinery to go into this, matter in order to reconcile the different positions. We make the suggestion for what it is worth-we do not make a proposalthat inspection stations on a scientific basis may exist and could be established on national or international initiative, in various parts of the world so that the network of detection would be closer. The more people who watch, the less avoidance there will be.

It seems that most of these questions. at the present moment, at any rate, are concerned with explosions in the air and above the air. With regard to the air, looking from the ground will not help. The Soviet Union wants people to go there, the United States wants people to come here; we are not against this; it is good for traffic and other things. But this should not be put as an impediment to what very much concerns the people of the world.

We also regret the general tendency to quote scientists as more or less sanctifying these explo-

56

sions. This was also brought out many years ago at the United Nations, when we were asked to agree to a limited number of explosions. We then said that that was more or less licensing vice, which we could not do. We have no doubt that these explosions are a threat to humanity in more ways than one. While we may not agree with one school of scientists against another, these explosions, even though the radiation emitted may not pass the "safe limits", as they are called-and these safe limits are not like the laws of the Meeds and Persians, they change from time to time-have effects upon humanity, biologically, genetically, psychologically and otherwise, which constitute a grave danger. What is more, they create a kind of lack of respect for certain nations. The nuclear nations, instead of appearing to come to a compromise under pressures, have, we submit, a responsibility for initiative in this matter.

Whatever happens in this Conference our first step, and one of the steps we must inevitably take, whether by informal meeting or by bilateral or multilateral negotiations, is to do our best to get a concession-what is usually called "face-saving", which I hope will not be the case here-whereby the system of detection need not necessarily be unilaterally national, but may be otherwise. Of course, if as the result of agreement other more binding, acceptable methods are found, we would be pleased.

Therefore, I submit these proposals for what they are worth. We suggest, first, that committees should be set up now for the drafting of these treaties, or of whatever might take their place. Secondly, we suggest that we should agree without any further argument on the non-spread of these weapons, a matter on which Sweden has taken the initiative in the United Nations and one to which my Government has subscribed.

Thirdly, we believe that we are all in agreement with respect to nuclear-free zones, subject to the condition that it is not to be thought that there are some expendable areas of the world.

The cessation of nuclear explosions--one does not speak any more forcibly than necessary-is a question which must have a very high priority. I think it was Mr. Rusk who said that the highest priority must go to the prevention of nuclear war, or something of that kind-I do not remember the exact phrase now. We do not take the view that we have come here as onlookers, merely to bear witness to what has been said and what has not been said, because war and its consequences make no exemptions based on race or creed or geography, or anything of that kind. We have now come to a stage when people are not speaking about these weapons as deterrent weapons. There was a time when it was even said that nuclear weapons were deterrents. Now we hear it said here and there, and everywhere, "if it comes, it comes and we shall meet it". We heard that said this morning. The more humanity gets conditioned to this idea, the greater will be the difficulty of preventing war.

SWITZERLAND INDIA JAPAN USA BRAZIL SWEDEN CHINA CANADA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU IRELAND FRANCE RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No 1995 GOA Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Lok Sabha on March 30, 1962, on a motion calling attention to the reported deficiencies in administration and unemployment in Goa. He said:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to employment, them were about 2,000 Portuguese soldiers who were. naturally, unemployed. Then there were some other organisations--two banks which, for the moment, were closed--one of them has been opened since-at a number of other places which led to some immediate unemployment. Many of these people, quite a number of them have been engaged again. An employment office has been opened there. I do not know if there are a very large number of officials there-about 6,000 officials to look after a population of 600,000 to 700,000. As the machinery of Government is being streamlined to some extent and pruned, it is inevitable that some people are redundant. But, every effort is made to find some other posts for them. A large number of officials went there from India, police and civil officials. They have nearly all been sent back. Only about, I think, 3 or 4 senior officials remain there. There are such a multitude of problems there: land reforms, administrative reforms and so many other things. We are pulled in two directions. One is our desire to bring about these reforms. Another is not to hurry through

these, because the people of Goa had been used to some methods which may not be very good. Nevertheless, they have been used to them. We do not wish to upset their lives completely.

57

One difficulty we have is the Church there. The patriarch is it Portuguese gentleman who has not taken very kindly to the change. He is the head of the Church and his influence goes a long way with the other members of the Church there. Normally speaking, the appointment of the Patriarch should not be made by the Portuguese Government. But, for the moment, he is still there.

Replying to a question whether Government and the Prime Minister in particular are contemplating to take steps to associate, in some way possible that Government can think of, the representatives of the Goan people with the administration, and whether the resignation of Mr. Noronha, or rather not resignation but the departure of the civil administrator, Mr. Noronha. and Mr. Nagu, two officers Who won the good will of the people, has anything to do with their differences with the Military Governor, and whether the two are linked up, the Prime Minister said: I have just said that it has nothing to do with the differences with the Military Governor.

There was, perhaps, too great an abundance of officers who were sent there, to begin with. For instance, there Were, I think, about seven senior police officers for an area which is about the size of a tehsil; there were seven people, namely one Inspector-General of Police and six Superintendents of Police. They were treading on each other's toes all the time. There were far too many, and we had to reduce these numbers. So, they were called back. I do not think that there was any question of any difference. There may have been pretty differences, but that is not the reason why they were called back, or they have left; we have an adequate number of officers there; now, there are only three or four senior ones

An Hon. Member: In regard to ventilating of grievances, may I know whether Government are contemplating to associate the representatives of Goan public opinion with the Administrator. There is a total absence and a vacuum at present to ventilate grievances in Goa, and no democratic body is available.

The Prime Minister: That is inevitable. Only, it must be remembered that there is no particular vacuum there. If you call it vacuum, it has been a permanent vacuum because the Portuguese Government did not associate anybody. We wanted a certain measure of normality to come even while continuing on the old style of Government, to some extent, and then bring in improvements.

One thing that I wanted to do immediately was to get the Portuguese detenus there away, to send them beck to Portugal. That has been held up because of the attitude of the Portuguese Government. They put all manner of difficulties. Now, we have decided to remove them at least from Goa and put them in some barracks or camps so that they may not interfere with the return of normality to Goa. If they go away, then the remaining part of the Army there which went there to look after them would also go. All these will coduce to the return of normality there. Of course, ultimately, there will be some measure of autonomy. I cannot say how much; there is bound to be.

There was one question that was asked the other day, and I do not know whether any answer was given to it, as to why a number of judges were resigning from there, the Portuguese judges or the Goan judges; and complaints were made of the executive interferring with the judiciary.

What happened was that on the 13th December, 1961, one Mr. Gopinath Musrurkar was killed by some persons. This was just before the action taken by the Government of India to liberate Goa. Subsequently, two persons were arrested on warrants issued by a judge of the tribunal. Representations were then made to the Military Governor that the arrested persons were innocent and that, in any case, the murder committed before liberation was a political crime. Some political workers also resorted to a hungerstrike in the premises of the court-building, demanding the immediate release of the arrested persons. The matter was then investigated by the administration, and it was found that the deceased was a spy of the Portuguese authorities and was murdered by some workers of the Azad Gomantak Dal. It was also found that there was no evidence to prove that the arrested persons were responsible for the murder.

In view of all this and in view of the lack of evidence, the Military Governor directed that the arrested persons should be released in accordance with the general amnesty declared by the Administration on the 26th January for all political prisoners in Goa, Daman and Diu. The arrested persons were accordingly released. The judges of the court concerned then sent a telegram to the President and others protesting against this order. It is understood since then that the Military Governor met the judges and explained the background of the case. The judges have, therefore, withdrawn their protest and another telegram has been sent to the President stating that the matter has been settled.

58

The House will appreciate that there are many people, or some people, at any rate, in Goa, who wore intimately connected with the old Portuguese Administration and who profited by it, and these people are interested in spreading stories and rumours of the deficiencies of the Indian Administration there, of the special officers and all that. Sometimes, they may be correct in some of the things. We are investigating every story that reaches us, and taking steps to correct any mistake made. But there are these people who are just bent on trying to show that the Portuguese period was not so bad as is painted, and for the first time, they have got the liberty to say what they like, and so, they say it. And some people are perhaps taken in by all that they say. But the main thing is that we have to put it on a new basis, the Government there on an autonomous basis, and at the same time, to begin with, we are not to change all their laws too much; some have to be changed, of course; gradually, the processes of change will come. For instance, there are judicial laws; in our view, they are rather peculiar. If we suddenly change them, the people there do not know the new legal system and they probably think that we are interfering too much with their ordinary lives.

INDIA USA MALI PORTUGAL OMAN

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GOA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha introducing Goa, Daman and Diu (Administration) Bill

Introducing a bill to provide for the administration of the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu in Lok Sabha on Wednesday, the 14th March, 1962, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

I beg to move

"That the Bill to provide for the administration of the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu and for matters connected therewith, be-taken into consideration".

This Bill is to replace the Ordinance that was issued some little time ago and it is meant to deal with the many problems that arose after this territory was taken over by the Union Government.

I do not think I need take the time of this House explaining all the various measures. It is almost exactly on the lines of the Dadra and Nagar Haveli Bill. It can be seen that it provides for the representation of Goa, Daman and Diu in Parliament. The jurisdiction of the Bombay High Court has been extended to Goa, Daman and Diu. I should like to make it clear again that this extension of the Bombay High Court is not meant as a precursor to Goa being absorbed into any other State nearby. It remains separate, but it is obvious that some High Court has to deal with it. We could not have a High Court in Goa itself.

For the rest, this has given some authority for

certain actions to be taken and the existing laws to continue.

There is an amendment to this which says, "provided any- such law is not absolutely repugnant to the spirit of the Indian Constitution." That amendment is completely unnecessary, because we cannot possibly pass a law which is repugnant to the Indian Constitution. The Supreme Court would come in the way if we ourselves manage to forget that fact.

I move therefore that this Bill be taken into consideration.

USA INDIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GOA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha Introducing Constitution

Amend ment Bill

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in Lok Sabha on March 14, 1962, while introducing a Bill to amend the Constitution of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

This Bill, as the House well knows, relates to Goa, Daman and Diu, and it is a very short Bill, a simple Bill, and I take it, a completely noncontroversial Bill.

Although it is short and simple, it is a Bill of considerable importance, and in placing this before this House, the whole history of 400-451, to be accurate-years comes up before me, and I suppose before many Members of this House, the whole history which started when Vasco da Gama landed in India in 1498, I think, subsequently, the fierce inquisition that took place there and subsequently so many other things that have happened in Goa during these years--I am not going to take up the time of the House in regard to that, but the House will remember that repeatedly during these 450 years there have been revolts against Portuguese rule in Goa,

59

suppressed in a rather bloody manner. This rule came in later when the Moghul Empire was gradually disintegrating and there was no strong central authority in India to take steps against any foreign incursion. Later, the British came here and occupied India, a very large part of India. That process itself was a fairly lengthy one, and the Portuguese remained in India, parts of India, under the cover of British rule, because the British authorities thought it fit to allow them to remain. They did not remain there because of their own strength but under the shadow of British rule they remained there.

When we long, long ago started our movement for independence, obviously we thought that independence meant the independence of the whole of India, including the enclaves that were possessed at that time by the French and the Portuguese, but the enclaves were so small that our main movement for independence was directed against British rule, and we took it for granted that when British rule ceased in India, the other enclaves would also be freed. We never thought that there would be any difficulty about that. And so, when independence came, our thoughts went to these enclaves, French and Portuguese.

We had repeated discussions with the French, and it took a few years to settle this question with them. 'Mere were discussions based on our own Constitution, legal matters and the rest, but there were discussions as between two different countries. Ultimately they agreed and the physical possession of the French territories in India was made over to the Union Government.

I said just now that there were discussions as between two Governments. We agreed with something, we did not agree with something, we discussed them. With the Portuguese we tried to do the same thing. We appointed a special Minister in Lisbon to discuss these matters and sent them a note, but they refused to take the note. Subsequently we made various attempts to raise this question, before them and they did not even discuss the question. Ultimately we had to withdraw our Minister in Lisbon.

That had been the situation for the last so many years But in India there was naturally very great frustration and disappointment at this, what shall I say, difficulty of moving onwards in regard to Goa. In Goa itself there was trouble, and though there had been numerous revolts against the Portuguese Government in the past, there was no such revolt now because conditions were different and people in India and in Goa naturally thought in terms of some kind of nonviolent or peaceful approach, accustomed as they were to our own methods in achieving our independence. This was attempted unofficially by large numbers of people, and this was suppressed in a very cruel manner by the Portuguese. and many people were killed. Now, this went on, and all of us in India felt that our independence was not complete till Goa was free.

Now, during this period, that is, since the independence of India, the Portuguese decided to declare that Goa was one of the overseas provinces of Portugal, that Goa was Portugal in fact, which was an extraordinary proposition, and certainly we could not accept it, nor could anyone else, although, unfortunately, in the course of the last few years, some countries did give some approval to that position. Now, at any rate, that is absolutely clear because the United Nations last year declared that Goa was a colony, which it was.

Then came recent events, and among the recent events were not only those that happened in Goa, but also what was happening in other Portuguese colonies like Angola. Although Angola has nothing to do with India, a great deal of feeling was roused in, India-and it still exists-about Angola; first of all, about colonialism in general and, secondly, more especially, about Angola and the way the Portuguese were suppressing that movement in an extraordinary cruel manner.

I mention all this-although it has nothing to do with Goa-because it did affect people's minds in India very much--all our minds. Then, about 7 months back, I ventured to state in this House, I think, that we could not rule out any other measures, any sterner measures, even military measures in regard to Goa. I gave them notice; I gave them and other countries notice. And even so as I stated then, we hoped to settle this matter peacefully.

There is another unfortunate aspect of this question which encouraged Portugal to hold on to Goa and to refuse to talk to us even. That was the active or passive approval by certain powers, allies of Portugal, to the then existing position in Goa. I feel-I cannot say I feel sure-it might have been easier to settle this peacefully if those other powers had exerted their efforts to this end.

60

Ultimately, and rather suddenly, if I may say so, although our minds had been prepared for all this, our hands were forced by what took place in and just outside Goa. There was, the House will remember, some firing on Indian shipping carrying on in the normal way, not entering Goa, and some actual incursions from outside the Goanese territory into India proper. That made it difficult for us not to take any steps to prevent this kind of thing happening. And. we thereafter took steps and sent some military forces there. The fact is that these military forces functioned-they hardly functioned in a military manner there-and within a few hours-it may be called 24 hours or 36 hours; it depends upon the measure of timethe whole thing was over. We could not have done so if there had been any real resistance; it Could not have been done so if the people of Goa themselves were opposed to it. In fact, the people of Goa welcomed the Indian forces to conic there.

Ever since we took possession of Goa, it was our advice-we consulted our legal advisersthat under Article 1 of the Constitution, Goa became part of the Indian Union and all that was necessary for us was to declare, in Schedule I, I think, that Goa is part of the Union. It was decided to do so by making Goa one of the Union Territories. I think that is the right thin- because within that Union territory any amount of economy or self-government can be given. It does not come in the way of autonomy.

There has been, recently, a proposal that Goa should be a separate State, in the normal sense that States are. We have been unable to agree to that. But, quite apart from that fact, it would be quite impossible to constitute it as a State at the present moment because things are not wholly settled. We would require all kinds of State apparatus there. At present there is military governorship functioning with the civil laws to help it. And, the second Bill that I hope to place before this House a little later refers to our accepting the legal system there, not changing the laws except what we want to. We feel that this is the simplest way of changing the Constitution and giving it a certain authority and permanence to what has happened.

The Bill, as placed before the House, is a very very simple Bill. It simply says that in Schedule I, Goa, Diu and Daman be added to the other places there. That is all.

That gives us plenty of opportunity to think and put before this House, ultimately, the exact measures to be taken within Goa to grant it an autonomous position. We have made it clear that we want Goa to maintain its separate indentity, separate individuality, call it what you will, because in the course of more than 400 years Goa hits had a separate indentity and the course of history had imparted it some. We have no intention of changing that or suppressing that indentity. In fact, some people have advised us to make another change in the Constitution and to recognise the Konkani language as one of the official languages of India.

There are many languages in India which we recognise for purposes of administration, education etc. which are not mentioned in the Schedule about languages attached to the Constitution. But, in any event, I want to make it clear that we want to give full place to the Konkani language in Goa and not to ignore it or to suppress it in any way. That is the main language of Goa. May be, there are very few persons who know the Portuguese language, a number of people know Marathi and a smaller number, probably, know Kannada. But Konkani is the principal language and we propose to give it full recognition in that matter. So, the position is that this principle will apply to Goa, Daman and Diu-Daman and Diu-Daman and Diu are slightly different. But, broadly this principle will apply to them; they will be Union territories and they will have a good deal of autonomy; their individuality, their language and their customs etc., will be completely preserved.

Therefore I place this Bill before this House. Although, as I said, it is a small Bill, a simple one, it does mean the end of an epoch and the beginning of another for Goa and for India. Therefore, to some extent, this Bill has something of history attached to it and I feel that for this House, which has thought so much and thought so much passionately. about Goa in these many years, it is a matter of great satisfaction that this question has been settled; this anachronism, can I call it of history, has been removed and the independence of India has become complete.

I feel proud to be able to place this matter before this House and I must say the House will appreciate that this simple bill ends a part of history which is not pleasant for us to remember and starts a new historical epoch in India.

61

INDIA USA PORTUGAL ANGOLA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GOA

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Constitution

Amend ment Bill

The following is the reply of Prime Minister Nehru to the Lok Sabha debate on a Bill to amend the Constitution, on March 14, 1962 : Sir, I have little to answer. Some criticisms have been made not on this Bill, but rather on events preceding this Bill, of our embassies not having properly informed the people of the countries to which they are accredited on the Goan situation. I am not going to deal with that matter. To some extent perhaps the criticism may be justified. But, on the other hand, I do not think that Hon. Members who have criticised our embassies know all the facts and perhaps could not know all the facts.

Normally ambassadors do not deliver public speeches. There is an exception in the case of the United States where apparently they do; all of them do. But in other countries they do not publicly do what might be called some kind of publicity or propaganda. They make diplomatic approaches and of course circulate some publications which explain their countries' attitude.

In regard to United States especially, it was said that the Indian Embassy got cold feet. I should say that there have been few better statements on the Goan case than that put out by our Ambassador in Washington. It was at a speech he delivered after the Goan action, certainly a little after, but at some public gathering--I forget what it was. It was a very clear, emphatic and convincing case. The difficulty has been that people often criticise our lack of propaganda. I do not know what kind of propaganda Hon. Members expect us to do. AR the propaganda in the world does not affect a closed mind, or a mind that is made up.

In Delhi there are a large number of foreign correspondents. What they say from Delhi has a greater effect than what our embassies might say, because our embassies are supposed to repeat official propaganda. Delhi is not a place cut off from the rest of the world. There are plenty of foreign correspondents who send their own opinions and views about conditions here.

Apart from this, Goa was viewed in the West from the point of view of the cold war, because Portugal was an ally of certain powers and they did not wish to say anything against Portgual. In fact, they often said something which was in favour of Portugal. The result was that there was a closed mind to it. They would not accept the things we said. It is quite possible that something more could have been done on our behalf, but to say that nothing was done is not correct. A great deal was done in the course of fourteen years-it was not done continuously.

Then again Mr. Nath Pai referred to in his speech that I should have said something to Mr. Khrusclicv, Mr. Macmillan and President Kennedy. He specially referred to President Kennedy. It is true that I did not discuss Goa with him, but I spoke to him about, it, that is to say, I referred to Goa. I must confess that I am rather hesitant, or I have too much of conceit to appeal to people. I put across an idea. It is up to them to, accept it or not. I do not go on my knees to anybody, whoever lie may be.

The day I arrived in New York, that very day, there was a big television interview. At the television interview I was asked a question if the masses of India felt excited about the Berlin situation. I said : "Certainly not." I said, "the masses of India do not know anything about it, or very little-, of course, many of us, so-called politicians and people interested in public affairs know about it and do think it is highly important, it may lead to war; but to say that the masses of India feel excited is not correct."

Then I added, "but the masses of India do feel terribly excited about the Goan situation, about Goa." I said, "I know that the Berlin situation is far more important than the Goan situation from the point of view of the world, war and peace and all that; but, nevertheless, to the average Indian, Goa is a much more important issue than even Berlin, important as that is.

I thought that that way of putting it by me might help in the American public realising the importance that we attached to Goa. And when I spoke to President Kennedy I referred to this television interview of mine, to say how much importance we attached to Goa. I did not, I confess, go any further to discuss it with him. But I told him how much importance we attached to it. I thought it was up to him to consider this aspect of the case. At that time, I should like to add, we had not taken any decision about taking any action in Goa. I was in the United States in November, in the early part of November. This decision was taken in December, sometime after I came back. And it was rather speeded up by the events that happened round about Goa, the firing on our steamers and all that. These things by themselves were not, of high

62

importance; but coming at a critical moment, coming when we were highly worked up on this question of Goa they had that effect. Immediately we thought that if they fired at our ordinary Ocean-going liners and we cannot protect our passengers and crew, it is a bad thing, we must protect them. We decided to protect them.

That led to other questions : If we protect them, what will be the next step? Are we going to remain just protecting them on the sea when somebody is firing from the coast? And, step by step, logically we came to the conclusion that we cannot protect them from the sea without taking action on land.

All this occurred in December. I had no notion--although vaguely I had said previously that we might have to take other measures--I had no notion that we would take this action when I was in America. I say this because some people in America said, "Why didn't you say so here?" Well, previously I had no notion of that.

Secondly, when we had decided to take this action, we felt and our military advisers felt strongly that this action should not be broadcast to the world before it took place. Because, it might lead to complications. One does not take such action. The whole essence of that action was swift and effective action. If it loses that swiftness and effectiveness by previous declarations, we might get entangled. Of course, there is no doubt that we would have won, but we would have won in a different way. We might have got entangled in all manner of things, military and other. So we were not able to say much.

As a matter of fact, the mere fact of the special trains going and others led people to believe that something was going to happen. Rightly, they thought so. And, other countries, including the United States of America asked us about it. Our answer was that we were forced into taking action. We did not mention the date or what kind of action we intended to take but that we were forced to take action. And it was pretty clear that we were going to take action. They knew about it.

It was not only argued, but our case was put before them, that is before the foreign officers of the countries concerned, as well as some other friendly countries in Asia and elsewhere before.

And then, of course, when we took action, attain, it was fully explained. But I beg of the House to remember that publicity in any country of Europe almost, or America, is not governed by the number of leaflets or pamphlets that one issues. Of course, they should be issued. It is not easy for a man even to get an opportunity to speak in public there. That is, there won't be many persons to listen to him. And when he speaks there will be no publicity in the newspapers; they will not publish what he says. I am not complaining about that. That does not apply to us alone, it applies to various other countries too. They will pick and choose what they publish. If they are not interested in a subject they do not publish it. It is often happening. Therefore, it is not so easy as in India to go to the Ramlila Maidan, make a speech and get a fairly good report in the press. You don't get a hall to address; and, if you do, there may be a dozen persons coming and sitting there. Probably the dozen persons are either converts or loafers who want to come and see what is happening !

The main point is, it is very difficult to put across to people in the West the strong feeling on this subject in India. It may be that unlike a neighbour country of ours we do not shout so much about what we feel. We feel it is rather undignified to function in that way. It may be perhaps that that is a very effective way of affecting the West. But, after all, our training and culture has been different. I think ultimately this pays; immediately, it might not occasionally.

But the fact is that Goa was to us, if I may use a word which is perhaps not happy, almost a complex, spiritually, ethnically, linguistically, in every way; it hurt us to see this continuing aggression of Portugal in Goa.

There was another aspect of it, which was the mere fact of a foreign European foot-bold in India. AU our history challenged that, all our

nationalism challenged that. We could not tolerate it. It is not a question of somebody possessing a bit of our territory; it was not just a territorial matter. Everything connected with our independence objected to it strongly. We felt that our struggle for independence will not be over till Goa came to us.

Those people thought of it, apart from this context, this emotional context, spiritual context, they thought of it as just grabbing at a territory, which is quite wrong. It is not a question of grabbing at territory. There was the other aspect that because of this foot-bold and because of Portugal being a part of the NATO alliance, nobody quite knew what part Goa might play if there was trouble, as a part of the NATO alliance. As a matter of fact, this House will remember that the question was raised, as to how far the NATO alliance would apply to help being given to Portugal in regard to Goa. And some

63

statements made, which were clear, said that it did not apply, while some other statements made were not so clear.

Apart from the spiritual or the emotional aspect-of course the political aspect comes in here-that fact that we may have to face a bridge-head in India belonging to one of the warring powers was a dangerous situation for us, in a big war. I had no doubt that if any such thing had happened, if a war had occurred, then our very first action in a military sense would have been to drive out the Portuguese. About that we were quite clear-within twenty-tour hours of the war, if a war had occurred, we would have had to. We could not possibly tolerate a bridge-head like this in India. Naturally, we wanted to deal with this long before a war occurred; we did not want a war to take place.

So, all these facts were very difficult to explain adequately; privately it may be done, but publicly to explain to these powers it was difficult; because they are full of their own view of international affairs. It is quite amazing how these great powers think great as they are not only in power but in ability and other ways-and we admire them and respect them and we want their friendship-but they all think from their own particular view-point. They are unable to put themselves in the position of another party, what that party may think. That, indeed, is the sadness of the cold war attitude. The cold war attitude puts blinkers in our eyes. We can only see one way and not in any other way.

I would like to say just one or two words more. Hon. Members have congratulated our Army. it was, indeed, a a very efficient piece of work. What is even more important, their behaviour subsequently and during this operation was very praiseworthy. Some complaints have come in afterwards about their behaviour. I think many of these complaints are exaggerated. Some of them are completely wrong. For instance, complaints came to us that a member of our Forces had misbehaved in regard to some woman. We enquired. On further enquiry we found that the man who had gone, who had apparently tried to molest some woman had gone with a false beard, pretending to be a Sikh, The beard came off actually. He pretended to be a Sikh and he put on a false beard. They reported that someone from Sikh regiment had come. But, the beard came off subsequently. Also it was reported that a man came and spoke in the Portuguese language to us. None of our Army, at least, of those that were sent, knew a word of Portuguese. On examination we found that many of these complaints were not true. There were one or two cases of misdemeanour which were. I think, remarkably few considering the circumstances and those people were punished. On the whole, the behaviour of our Army has been extraordinarily good there.

One thing I should add. Of course, presently, we shall have to make arrangements for representation of Goa, etc. in this Parliament. That will have to be done a little later.

As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, those people who were the first to come to India are the last to go and I hope and trust that there will be no others, not only in the near. future, but even in the distant future, who will come to India and will have to be ejected again.

USA INDIA PORTUGAL GERMANY OMAN UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GOA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha introducing

Const itution Amendment Bill

Introducing a Bill to amend the Constitution of India in Rajya Sabha on March 20, 1962, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement

Sir, I beg to move--

That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha. be taken into consideration.'

This Bill, Sir, is a very brief one and a very simple one but it has not only a great deal of importance but it really ends a certain phase of history, a long phase, an unfortunate phase : it ends the Portuguese occupation of a part of Indian territory which began 451 years ago. The wheels of the gods grind slowly but they do often grind, continue grinding and grind exceedingly small. All this long history of Portuguese occupation, their coming to Goa, what they did for hundreds of years, how they were protected by the British Government, how ultimately India became independent expecting naturally that this small colonial domain in the territory of India would also disappear and how we had no response from the Portuguese about it--they opposed the idea in fact; they did not discuss it--all this comes to our mind.

There has been a good deal of criticism of the action we took in Goa three months ago and I have seldom come across criticism which has

64

been so misplaced, mis-conceived and misdirected. For my part I think that the Goan episode from the moment of our independence right up to the day when we took possession of Goa does great credit to India. I have no regrets about it. It is true that when we decided to send armed forces to Goa I did so with a great deal of reluctance, not because it was not right in my opinion, not because it was not needed--that is why we sent it--but because we felt that this might be made an excuse by other countries and other people for military excursions even though they were not justified. People do not go into the long history, do not know all the facts; they only see a certain result. So in the case of Goa, people without taking the trouble even to find out what the position was, what had happened in the last many years, glibly criticised us. I think- that many of these who criticised us have gradually come to realise that they were not certainly right in the expressions they had made. The simple fact is that in our struggle for independence we never thought of British India and Portuguese India and French India. We thought of India and we wanted to free it and if any part of it remained unfree the struggle continued and, therefore, I say that our struggle for independence did not end till Goa became a part of India; a part of India it was but what I mean to say is, till the colonial domain over Goa was ended. But that fact has not been realised by many people. We did not go out of our country to another country. We took a part of our country which was a part of India, which had been, is, and will remain part of India and the fact of colonial occupation of it did not make it less a part of India, because early in the fifties the Portuguese Government passed some kind of legislation in their country making Goa a part of Portugal. This apparently led people with little knowledge of the facts to think that a part of Asia or a part of India had been transported bodily to Portugal and made a part of Portugal. It is a most extraordinary fantastic thing that the Portuguese Government did and has been doing in regard to Goa. What is still more surprising is that people who should know better have been misled by it. I can only imagine that they were misled-they could hardly have been misled about the facts-but because of the coming in of the NATO alliance they looked with a certain amount of fright on Portugal and did not wish to displease Portugal because Portugal was one of their allies, I imagine, though I cannot be sure, that it the members of the NATO alliance had clearly explained to Portugal that this was not right, this continuation of its dominion over Goa, it would have had considerable effect.

Instead, nothing was done and Portugal was patted on the back by great powers who ought to have known better. Well, retribution came ultimately and there had been an amount of irritation and even anger in these other countries because this had happened here. It did happen here because if it had not happened in the way it did, it would have happened in a much more bloody way. We wanted to avoid it. We wanted to avoid taking any military action at all, but then there was no other door open for us and the situation was becoming difficult in India not only because of Goa, but because of other developments in the Portuguese colonies, namely, in Angola. Great feelings had been roused here. Although we could not help Angola, still most people thought that we should not tolerate Portuguese colonialism any longer in Goa. I need not go into the reasons for what we did, because I am sure every Member of this House, as well as almost every Indian, understands them and thoroughly sympathises with them. One thing I should like to repeat, that is, our independence struggle was not confined to British India, It was meant for the whole of India. It was meant for the so-called Indian States as much as for British India. It was meant for French India and Portuguese India. We did not actively take any steps even in regard to the Indian States then. Our leader. Mahatma Gandhi. seemed to think that they were under the protection of the British and when the British rule receded from the rest of India, they would naturally revert to Indian India. Therefore, it was not necessary for us to take any steps there. Just as we did not take any steps in the Indian States-steps were taken by the people in the States, but the outside movement did not concern itself too much with that-so also we did not take any steps in regard to Portuguese India and French India. It is obvious that they continued in India under the umbrella of the British power, because otherwise they could not have continued there so long. Now, the British power went away. The natural consequence of that, therefore, was the removal of their umbrella. So, we thought that these colonies of Portugal and France should join the Union of India. We never thought that there would be any great difficulty about it. It seemed so obvious to us. Thereafter we appointed a Minister in Lisbon to discuss this matter, but the Portuguese Government refused

even to accept any memorandum from him about this. We had a Minister from Portugal in India with whom we wanted to discuss this matter, but even he was not in a position to discuss it. With the French Government it was different. Although difficulties arose, we could talk in a civilised manner. We came to a decision and physically the French territories in India were handed over to us. I regret that de jure

65

this has not yet been done, although I understand that the Bill for it, or whatever the procedure is, has been introduced in the French Parliament now or some little while ago. I hope that within a month or two it will be completed. Anyhow, the physical transfer was completed. But the Portuguese Government would not even talk to us about this. Not only with us. In the United Nations they laid stress on these places not being their colonies, on their being called upon to report to the United Nations, as all colonial powers had to do. Thereafter in the United Nations, they were condemned for it last year. It was made clear that they were colonies, and Portugal was called upon to report about Angola, Mozambique, Goa and other places. But so far as 1 know, they have ignored both the condemnation by the United Nations and the demand made by it.

So, the position was that there was no way open internationally or otherwise for this question of Goa to be settled. The House will remember that some years ago, about seven years ago, I think, or may be more, a fairly large number of Indians went there across the border, unarmed Indians, and they were shot down by the Portuguese. Now, one interesting feature of the criticism in this debate in the world has been the quite extraordinary passion for non-violence which other countries had shown. They have pointed out to us how we have not been completely non-violent. It is very pleasing that they think well of non-violence. For the first time they have given thought to it and discovered how we have been lacking in it. I hope this will make them realise and understand what nonviolence is and that it will perhaps affect their policies somewhat, their thinking at any rate. We do not pretend, as the House knows to be nonviolent in that sense. We do honour the idea of non-violence. We should like to act up to it.

But I doubt if any Government as at present constituted can do it. And it is not quite clear to me how the non-violent technique which we adopted in India in our freedom struggle, can easily be adopted against a foreign country or against foreign possessions. However, that may be a doubtful point. But the point is there was no way left open to us, as far as I can see, and the situation was getting worse when I declared, I think in this House, about six months before the Goa operation that we did not rule out any stronger steps, military steps. I said that because my mind struggled with the idea of finding some way, and I could find no other way. But I added even then that we earnestly hoped that it would be settled completely peacefully. We tried it and we had been trying it. Even as late as November last, it was not our intention to take action quickly. It was in the air, partly because of certain developments in Angola, Goa, etc. Early in December certain events took place which, though small in themselves, excited our people greatly, because they had been worked up to a pitch of excitement. The House will remember those events, the firing on certain Indian ships carrying on their normal coastal trade. They were not even coming to Goa. They were going along. Certain events happened on the borders of Goa. I repeat that they were not of great importance. But coming as they did in that atmosphere of great irritation, they created a crisis in the minds of Indians. We immediately thought of doing something to protect our ships. It wits not right that the Portuguese should sink our ships, fire on our ships, shooting down and killing our people, our fishermen, and our inability to protect them. So, we thought of protecting our ships. One think led to another.

We could not protect them by putting some soldiers on the ships who could fire back, and the more we discussed the more we came to the conclusion that there could be no proper protection unless some other steps were taken. All this happened in December last, early in December, and in any event we thought that if we took any steps even on the coast side, we had to be prepared for the consequences of those steps and the possibility of some kind of attack on the land side to us in a small way. In other words we were logically compelled to take up the position that we should prepare our action both on the sea side and on land, and we sent our troops there for the purpose. I am trying to explain how we were dragged in although in theory we had no objection to it. In practice we did hesitate to take any such measure. When we decided to take some small measure, we were immediately made to feel that a small measure might be ineffective, and that would have been bad. So, we had to prepare for a bigger operation. The operation itself, as the House very well knows, was remarkably successful, remarkably well done and on the whole remarkably peaceful. The casualties-they were 30 or 40 on either side, were largely due to certain Portuguese soldiers breaking the Flag of Truce, going against it. They showed a white flag and our people went there and they shot them down, and our people shot them down. Apart from two or three incidents like that, there was very little fighting--one or two bombs fell somewhere-and we had come to the conclusion that if we did not do this, the result would certainly be conflict; may be, large numbers of our nationals going into Goa being shot down and our being dragged into war anyhow under circumstances which would be much more liable to destruction

66

and heavy casualties. However, them it is. I have repeated this as I said before because this whole course of the Goan affair has been so clear in our minds, so justified, so much something which we could not avoid in the circumstances that it has surprised me greatly that other countries should have felt or should have given expression to a feeling of grievance and annovance at what we did. I should have imagined that that annoyance or grievance is partly due at least to their failure to take up this question and to their supporting the colonial administration of Goa, not Goa but the Portuguese colonial administration, in spite of the fact that it is known to be the worst in the world. Nevertheless they went on supporting it perhaps because Portugal was an ally of theirs in NATO.

Now the moment this operation was over within a few days we made it known to the Portuguese Government that they could take away their soldiers there who were under some kind of detention. We did not even call them prisoners of war. We called them detenus and we have been treating them very well, about 3,500 or so. We did not bargain about their going away. We asked for nothing from them although we had much to say about the way the Portuguese were treating our merchants and others in Mozambique and Angola thousands of whom had been put in detention camps. But we did not raise that question. We raised it separately. We said : "You take these people away just when you like; make arrangements and we shall deliver them to you, and you take them away." Unfortunately and most surprisingly they have been remarkably slow as if they did not want them back. There it is. We even went so far as to inform them that they can take them away themselves in their own steamer. We did not want to keep them here. We informed the Governor-General and the soldiers that they can all go away when they like, but obviously they cannot go away like this, something has to be done. I do not know when the Portuguese will send a proper reply to our last request. The newspapers have announced that they have sent, but we have not received it. It may be coming through various agencies like the Brazilian Embassy and the U.A.R. Embassy. Apart from keeping these people there because 3,500 detenus are kept, we have to keep our army there to look after them. We have withdrawn large numbers of our people both police and army, but some have been left, largely because these Portuguese detenus are there. If they are removed, the rest of our army also comes away and normality returns as soon as possible.

I have given this brief account for the information of the House. This Bill is a very simple one, and we felt that in this simple way it is best proceeded with rather than in a more complicated way. It will be noted that all that this Bill does is to add in the First Schedule to the Constitution under the head of Union Territories the territories of Goa, Daman and Diu, the territories which before the 20th day of December 1961 were comprised in Goa, Daman and Diu. Although we might treat this matter rather casualty as we do rightly, it is rather an exciting thing for the whole episode of history to be thus ended. It was pointed out the other day that the Portuguese were the first to come to India, yet they are the last to leave. I think we are justified in feeling a sense of satisfaction and gratification that the last trace of colonialism has disappeared from India.

INDIA USA PORTUGAL ANGOLA FRANCE MOZAMBIQUE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BRAZIL MALI

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GOA

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Constitution

Amend ment Bill

Replying to the debate on the Constitution Amendment Bill in Rajya Sabha on March 20, 1962, the Prime Minister said :

Sir, the amendment sought to be moved by Hon. Member Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I regret, is not accepted by me. He wants to make a definite provision that within six months, a Legislative Assembly will be created for this territory. As a matter of fact, it is our intention to give the greatest autonomy that is feasible to this territory and to maintain their traditions, culture, religion and languages--the language being the Konkani language--and to make no major changes in regard to any of these matters without the goodwill of the people concerned, but to lay down that this will only be applicable, that is, that Goa, Diu and Daman shall only be as Union Territories for six months will, I think, be completely wrong. Even as a Union Territory, we can give it as much autonomy as possible and it will be amenable for any change we wish to make more easily than amending the Constitution every time. It must be remembered that although Goa is a relatively small place, it is experiencing a new sensation of freedom and there are all kinds, of groups pulling in different directions. It is a good thing but it may be unfortunate if all these various pulls take place at the same time resulting in consequences which are not desirable. Of course the size of Goa, normally speaking, is not one which would make it a State in the Indian Union. I do not say that it is a complete bar to it but I feel that everything that the Goans.

67

require could be achieved by this amendment---I mean autonomy etc.--and for the rest, we shall see how the situation develops. So I commend that this amendment should not be accepted.

USA INDIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GREECE

Indo-Greek Trade-Arrangement Extended

Letters have been exchanged in New Delhi between Shri B. N. Adarkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and H. E. Mr. Nicolas Hadji Vassiliou, Ambassador, Royal Greek Embassy, New Delhi, extending the validity of the trade arrangement between India and Greece up to December 31, 1962.

Three items viz., aluminium and copper sheets, copper wires and exposed cinematograph films have been added to the list of commodities for export from Greece to India. The list of Indian commodities for export to Greece remains unchanged.

The Trade Arrangement between the two countries was first signed on February 14, 1958 and had been extended from time to time.

GREECE INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Shri C. S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space on March 20, 1962 :

Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity to offer to you and our Vice-President and Rapporteur our heartiest congratulations on your unanimous election. It was, indeed, a very good beginning for the work of this Committee, as we could not have chosen a Bureau of a better calibre, or one enjoying more universal acceptance.

Like other speakers, my delegation would also desire to extend its welcome to the delegations of Chad, Mongolia, Morocco and Sierra Leone. Their presence certainly makes this Committee more representative and especially welcome to us, as they come from the great continents of Asia and Africa. It is desirable and indeed imperative that any discussion, any consideration, of matters looking so far into the future should be with the co-operation and assistance of these countries from Asia and Africa which, if I may say so, are also the countries of the future and which will make a great impact upon the future history of the world.

At long last, the United Nations, through this Committee, is ready to launch international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. This Committee itself has come into being and convened for serious work after many vicissitudes. It is, however, a matter for great-satisfaction that the stage is now set for a large measure of international co-operation in this field with the essential element of co-operation and goodwill of the countries which are most advanced in space research. and exploration, namely, the Soviet Union and the United States.

Man is just beginning to probe the mysteries of the universe. As the universe is limitless, the potentiality of man's achievement in outer space knows no limit. As was succinctly stated by the representative of the United States, Mr. Stevenson, in his statement in the First Committee on 4 December 1961 :

"This is Year Five in the Age of Space. Already, in four short years, scientific instruments, then animals, then men, have been hurled into space and into orbit around the earth. Within a few more years satellites will bring vast developments in weather forecast and in radio and television communications. More than that : Rocket booster capacity will become sufficient to launch teams of men on journeys to the moon and to the nearest planets. And. after that, one can only speculate on what may come next." (A/C.1/PV. 1210, page 2).

68

Here is a field then which provides the greatest challenge, both to man's imagination and to his capacity for mutual co-operation.

This Committee is beginning its work under most favourable auspices. In the first place the achievements of the Soviet cosmonauts and the American astronauts have been hailed throughout the world and have spurred the desire for international co-operation in the conquest of outer space and in its use for the benefit of humanity. The achievements of Gagarin, Titov and Glenn are thought of, not in terms of their particular nationalities, but as symbols of the universal man; and their exploits symbolize man's ability to shake off the shackles of earthly gravity, and die capacity of the human spirit to soar above and beyond the narrow concepts and prejudices which unfortunately prevail on earth in plenty. Man on earth, physically speaking, is circumscribed by his environment. His horizon does not extend beyond the confines of his own country. Both physically and mentally, he is conscious--perhaps too conscious--of the barriers between States and nations. From a capsule in orbit, and from the farther reaches of outer space, however, he looks on earth as a whole. The frontiers set between State and State, the physical barriers, along with mental reservations and prejudices, melt away, and man has a vision of the earth as a whole. That is--or ought to be ---our vision of man in space and our understanding of the spirit in which international cooperation should begin in the conquest of outer space. But if that is not the case, the follies and madness of men and nations on earth are bound to be carried in outer space and magnified a million-fold.

Secondly, we have the assurance of the two greatest Powers of their great desire to cooperate with each other and with the international community, through the United- Nations and other international bodies.

The representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, in his statement in the First Committee, on 4 December 1961, made this remarkable statement

"...Allow me to give assurance to all members of this Committee that the Soviet Union will continue to bend every effort in order to set up the widest possible and most fruitful international co-operation on the basis of equality of rights in the field of the quest of outer space in the interest of peace and the whole of humanity." (A/C,1/PV.1210, Pages 43-45).

The representative of the United States in the First Committee, at the same time, also assured United States' co-operation toward international efforts directed at ensuring the peaceful uses of outer space.

Striking evidence of the desire of both these great countries to co-operate in the matter of space exploration and research has been provided in the exchange of letters between Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy that took place last month, Said Premier Khrushchev in his letter to President Kennedy :

"I should like to hope that the genius of man who penetrated the depth of the universe would be able to find a road to an enduring peace and to ensure prosperity to all peoples of our planet earth which, in the space age, though it does not seem so large, is still dear to all its inhabitants. If our countries pooled their efforts, scientific, technical and material, to explore outer space, they would be very beneficial to the advance of science and would be acclaimed by all peoples who would like to see scientific achievements benefit man, and not be used for cold war purposes and the arms race."

In his reply, President Kennedy said :

I welcome your statement that our countries should co-operate in the exploration of space. I have long held the same belief and, indeed, put it forward strongly in my first State of the Union message. We, of course, believe also in strong support of the work of the United Nations in this field, and we are co-operating directly with many other countries individually, but obviously, special opportunities and responsibilities fall to our two countries."

Further striking evidence of the desire for cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union is given in a series of concrete proposals made in President Kennedy's letter of 7 March to Premier Khrushchev. These developments and assurances of co-operation which, I may add, have been repeated More this Committee by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union before our Committee, and which have been so heart-warming to all of us and have put the subject of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space in the correct and proper perspective. Both the scope and opportunities for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space appear, even at this initial stage, to be limitless. Vast new possibilities are admitted to have opened up by the communication satellites. The development of communication satellites, international

69

co-operation in their launching and in the collection and processing of data transmitted by them will revolutionize the world-wide communication system.

Telephone and television services on a global basis are likely to benefit immensely from that exploration. In the field of weather, the development of weather satellites is expected to permit more precise short-range weather forecasts as well as world-wide reliable long-range prediction, and it is said that this could be done at least a season in advance. Studies in outer space are likely to provide the basis for understanding various factors that control the weather and add to the development of theories regarding weather. The improvement in weather forecasting, both short-range and long-term, is expected to revolutionize many aspects of life and economy, particularly agricultural economy, throughout the world. International co-operation provides the best assurance for rapid development in these fields and in many others, the outlines of which are only now beginning to emerge. There are others who are more qualified to speak on this subject, particularly the representatives of those States which have advanced for in this field and the scientific organizations whom we have the pleasure of having in our midst. But the very enumeration of the more important aspects of international co-operation that are provided to us is indeed an important part of the activities of the United Nations and it is one to which all of our energies should be directed.

Apart from the great Powers, many of us have realized the potentialities of the future. In India, an Indian Committee for Outer Space Research, INCOSPAR, has recently been constituted to advise the Government on the promotion, research and peaceful utilization of space exploration, to promote international activities in them fields and to provide liaison with COSPAR and with the ICSU and other similar national and international bodies. The services of this Committee are naturally available for co-operation with our Committee, the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and to other international organizations.

We must consider the organization of the work of this Committee. The basic resolutions of the General Assembly which, for our present purposes, are resolution 1472 (XIV) and resolution 1721 (XVI) are both live resolutions representing the United Nations approach to the question of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. The texts of both these resolutions must be borne in mind and our work should be arranged in such a manner as to bring about the highest and most practical fulfilment of our mandate embodied therein.

I would like to indicate the general approach of my delegation to the Committee's task. As the Committee is embarking on a most unusual work without any precedents to guide it, I might add that my delegation's approach at the present stage can only be regarded as tentative. Two basic assumptions govern our thinking on the scope of the task entrusted to the Committee and its execution. First, while co-operation between the two most advanced countries in the field of space exploration and research must form the cornerstone of the structure of international cooperation and is welcome in every way, bilateral co-operation between these two great countries does not constitute the totality of international cooperation envisaged by the United Nations. Such co-operation must be one in which there is active participation on the basis of mutual help by all Members of the United Nations, Even more important, other nations must have a sense of participation, and I am thinking in this connexion particularly of the less developed countries of Asia and Africa. We are glad to note that, broadly speaking, this is also the approach of the big Powers and this approach has been expressed in the statements which we have heard at our meetings today and the other day. It seems to us that overemphasis of one at the expense of the other will not serve the purposes of the United Nations, to which expression is given in the two resolutions before us. What we wish to see is that the Outer Space Committee be instrumental in bringing about international co-operation in the broadest sense. This means not merely exchange of information, registration of space launchings, fixation and determination of interrelationship between this Committee and the specialized agencies and scientific organizations connected with outer space research, although these are most welcome and necessary, but that this Committee itself become the spearhead and centre for the co-ordination of all activities in the sphere of international co-operation in outer space, more particularly co-operation between Government on behalf of the United Nations. It should, inter alia, serve as an instrument in facilitating the dissemination of knowledge and techniques in this new field of science and exploration. Secondly the keynote for our Committee should be peaceful international collaboration and co-operation in place of wasteful competition.

It is well to recall the words in the preamble of resolution 1472 (XIV):

"Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of States irrespective of the stage of their economic or scientific development,

"Desiring to avoid the extension of present national rivalries into this new field". (A/4354, p. 5)

These make it incumbent upon us to help secure the freedom of outer space from exploitation and use for purposes harmful and destructive to man. It seems to my delegation that our deliberations and conclusions must be imbued by these high principles.

Let us try to assess the nature of our task in the light of resolution 1721 (XVI). Part A of the resolution relates to the legal problems arising from the exploration and use of outer space and the application of international law to outer space and celestial bodies. At a later stage, I would wish to make some observations on this part of the resolution. Part B is, from our point of view, the most important part of the resolution, as requiring action to be taken by the United Nations towards effective international co-operation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. The preamble to this part of the resolution reads

"Believing that the United Nations should provide a focal point for international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space". (A/RES/1721 (XVI), p. 2).

This coincides with the views of my delegation, to which I have just given expression, namely, that this Committee should be the spearhead of international co-operation and of co-ordination in the field of peaceful exploration and use of outer space. I might say here parenthetically that we are very glad to note that this broad interpretation has also been given by the representatives of the United States, the USSR, France and the United Kingdom, who have spoken before me.

Part B of the resolution, however, having declared the over-all purposes of in its operative paragraphs, might appear to fall short of the broadest application of the preamble. It pro-

70

vides for the furnishing of information by States launching objects into orbit or beyond, requests the Secretary-General to maintain a register of information so furnished--and we are glad to see that the Secretary-General has already established a registry-requests the Committee to maintain close contact with governmental and non-governmental organizations to provide for the exchange of such information relating to outer space activities as Governments may supply on a voluntary basis, supplementing but not duplicating existing technical and scientific exchanges. and to assist in the study of measures for the promotion of international co-operation in outer space activities. These are the words of operative paragraph 3 and might well be taken as giving this Committee a somewhat auxiliary role. Fortunately, however, if this resolution is read in conjunction with resolution 1472 (XIV), the perspective is set right to a great extent. Paragraph 1(a) of Part A of resolution 1472 (XIV) asked the Committee to review as appropriate the area of international co-operation and to study practical and feasible means for giving effect to programmes in the peaceful uses of outer space which could properly be undertaken under United Nations auspices. Resolution 1721 (XVI), read with resolution 1472 (XIV), in our view makes it clear that the intention of the United Nations is to give this Committee a great deal of initiative in the task of bringing about the broadest possible co-operation in the organization and co-ordination of programmes. In this view, my delegation regards the enumeration of the functions of the Committee in the operative paragraphs of part B of resolution 1721 (XVI) as illustrative and not exhaustive.

My delegation also regards it as of great importance that among the functions of the Committee is the encouragement of national research programmes and the rendering of all possible assistance and help in that direction, which will have the supreme value of giving a sense of participation to the less-developed countries, and make the acquisition of knowledge and scientific and technical skill in the matter of space exploration and co-operation a truly international venture.

The Committee should attempt to organize its work in such a way as to give effect to the operative paragraphs of the part B of resolution 1721 (XVI), and the operative paragraphs of part A of resolution 1472 (XIV). It is obvious for this reason that close links should be established with governmental and non-governmental organizations concerning outer space matters, as envisaged in paragraph 3(a) of resolution 1721 (XVI).

Fortunately, over the past several years, a great many scientific organizations, such as the International Council of Scientific Unions, the Committee on Space Research, which was originally established by the International Council of Scientific Unions, and the International Geophysical Year, have done splendid work in the,

71

field of exchange of scientific information and data in the field of outer space. The International Astronomical Union and the International Astronautical Federation have also been greatly interested in developments in regard to outer space. It seems to us desirable that their representatives should be invited to attend the meetings of the Committee as observers--and I mean not merely these bodies that I have mentioned, but all such organizations that are in a position to help us-entitled to participate at their request in the deliberations of this Committee and/or its technical sub-committee. Likewise, specialized agencies including the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunications Union, who have already been invited to have representatives at meetings of the Committee, and others, should be with us in this Committee and in the appropriate sub-committees as Observers.

As I said, it is our pleasure to see representatives of the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunications Union and COSPAR with us. The Committee might find it useful also to invite other such organizations, and this is something which we might consider at a later stage of our work. Links need also to be established in a suitable manner with national governmental and non-governmental organizations engaged in space research or the peaceful exploration of outer space.

It should also be the aim of this Committee to either organize under United Nations auspices or stimulate the organization under the auspices of an appropriate specialized agency or an international scientific organization, joint programmes participated in by several countries, of research and of exploration of outer space.

We also believe that the proper function of this Committee would be to bring about the establishment through international co-operation of institutions for training-and I emphasize the word "training" in this connexion--and research in outer space, the facilities of which should be available to scientists and scholars from all over the world. An important part of the work of this Committee should be to work out arrangements for holding an international conference, as decided by the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1472 (XIV). Part B of that resolution decided to convene under the auspices of the United Nations an international scientific conference of interested members of the organizations and members of the specialized agencies for the exchange of experience in the peaceful uses of outer space. This decision was to be implemented in 1960 or 1961.

My delegation considers that maximum good can result from such a conference. We only regret the delay which has occurred in this matter, for reasons beyond control. We trust that this Committee will decide without delay to proceed to a consideration of the organization of such a conference as early as possible.

Parts C and D of resolution 1721 (XVI) asks the WMO and ITU in the fields respectively of international co-operation in weather research and analysis, and aspects of space communication through the use of communication satellites, in which international co-operation will be required, to submit appropriate reports. We a-re keenly aware that their reports will open up concrete avenues and means of co-operation and implementation of the resolutions before us.

Part A of resolution 1721 (XVI) appropriately invites the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to study and report on the legal problems which may arise from the exploration and use of outer space. Such a study will be among the most important and complicated tasks of our Committee. My delegation approves the idea of a legal sub-committee to be established for such study. We also consider it essential that the most extensive interpretation be given to the mandate of the Committee set out in Part A of resolution 1721 (XVI).

In other words, the study of legal problems should be a comprehensive one, the keynote of such a study being, as the preamble to part A of resolution 1472 (XIV) states : "...that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind;" and further "....to avoid the extension of present national rivalries into this new field".

Operative paragraph 1 of part A or resolution 1721 (XVI) commends to States for their guidance in the exploration and use of outer space the following principles :

"(a) International law, including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to outer space and celestial bodies;

"(b) Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all States in conformity with international law and are not subject to national appropriation".

In our view, this paragraph does not provide, and should not be regarded as providing, the totality of the framework of the study of the legal problems. The principles embodied in paragraph 1 are, no doubt, commendable. We entirely agree with the principles of the United Nations Char-

72

ter, which are the highest expression of moral principles and truths, are universally and should appropriately be applicable to outer space. But we are not sure that international law, as we know it on earth, can or ought, mutatis mutandis, to be extended to outer space. My delegation cannot contemplate any prospect other than that outer space should be a kind of warless world, where all military concepts of this earth should be totally inapplicable. The limitative connotations inherent in the imperfections of our presentday international law should not be transported into outer space. International law is based on the concept of the sovereignty of national States. From this, naturally, many consequences follow. Since national sovereignty is barred from any part of outer space or the celestial bodies, international law in large part becomes inapplicable, although its essence of peace and co-operation

must prevail in outer space.

A large part of international law is built around the concept of legitimacy of war in certain circumstances, such as, self-defence, collective defensive measures, and so on. If outer space is to be banned for all war-like purposes, surely this part of international law can and ought not to have application, particularly in the context of the very salutary principle enunciated in paragraph 1(b), namely that outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation.

It seems to us that many of our concepts of international law and those based on national considerations which have necessarily become a part of the mental make-up and attitudes of men and nations should be radically revised. When the day comes that men of various nations, through international co-operative efforts, journey into outer space and celestial bodies, many old concepts will have to be forgotten and will, indeed, be out of place in outer space. There should be only one governing concept, that of humanity and the sovereignty of mankind. My delegation feels strongly that there can be no other way in which outer space can be dealt with in so far as the problems of war and peace are concerned. A corollary to these considerations might be a declaration outlawing the use of outer space for direct or indirect military purposes. This is both desirable and possible.

These are the preliminary general observations on behalf of my delegation. As I said earlier, the nature of the task before the Committee is of tremendous importance. It needs to bring out the best in all of us, particularly the great Powers which have the resources and the capacity for exploration and use of outer space. We consider it necessary that the Committee should get down to its work earnestly and in a spirit of cooperation and harmony, which has already manifested itself in the statements of the representatives of the big Powers in this Committee, and I underline in this connexion the excellent statements of the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union. Our task will be best carried out through detailed examination of the scientific technical and legal problems respectively by appropriate sub-committees. We also consider it essential that this Committee itself, or through

a subsidiary body, should take up very soon the consideration of the organization of an international scientific conference on outer space in the very near future.

On other points raised so far and that might be raised in subsequent statements in the Committee, particularly on the question of the composition of the Scientific and Technical Committee and the timetable of the Committee's work, I reserve my right to ask for this Committee's indulgence to intervene again.

INDIA USA CHAD MONGOLIA MOROCCO SIERRA LEONE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Bhadkamkar's Statement on Southern Rhodesia

Shri A. B. Bhadkamkar, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Committee of Seventeen on Colonialism on March 9, 1962 on Southern Rhodesia

MR. CHAIRMAN,

Much has been said about the question of colonialism, both outside and inside the United Nations, and my delegation inside the United Nations and leaders and other spokesmen of my country outside the United Nations have been in the forefront of the world-wide movement which aims to bring about an early end to the era of colonialism. This Special Committee has, in fact, been specifically charged with the task of hastening implementation of the declaration on the independence of colonial peoples and territories contained in the General Assembly's resolution No. 1514 of the 15th Session. However, in order the better to organize and pursue our task, I believe, that members will do well to consider their objectives item by item, and accordingly I shall confine my observations today to the one specific item before us, namely the task entrusted to this Committee by the General Assembly resolution 1745(XVI) adopted on the 23rd

73

February 1962. In its operative paragraph I, we have been requested "to consider whether the territory of Southern Rhodesia has attained a full measure of self-government", and to report to the XVII Session of the General Assembly on this matter.

There is a noticeable dearth of UN information on the subject. There is, of course, a great deal of material available in official British Government publications and also in the records of the deliberations of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. We also thank the Secretariat for furnishing us with a background document. My distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom has himself furnished some information in his statement to this Committee the other day and I welcome it despite the reservations that lie made in this regard. I have also examined the observations made by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, at the 1304th meeting of the Fourth Committee on 23rd February 1962, contained in Doc. No. A/ C.4/548 of 2nd March 1962. Many of the crucial words used by the distinguished representative from the United Kingdom confuse us for in the sense in which we. have generally known them, they do not appear to fit the context. I shall explain myself a little later.

In his statement to this Committee on Wednesday, 7th March, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, referred to three specific points which seem to him to be of importance. First, he confirmed the view of his Government on what he called a question of basic principle-the view that this matter of the discussion of the status of Southern Rhodesia was outside the competence of the United Nations. Second, he referred to the question of the constitutional position in Southern Rhodesia. Finally, he referred to his explanation given in the Fourth Committee why information on Southern Rhodesia had never been submitted since the United Nations was established.

The tenacity of purpose apparent in this endeavour to hold on to a past which is rapidly slipping from the grasp of the present deserves in our view, the pursuit of a nobler ideal. Very occasionally one is enabled accidentally perhaps to share in the inner view of things. One might wonder why such great fuss is made over the colony of Southern Rhodesia. The answer lies, perhaps, in some interesting information furnished by Encyclopedia Americana which tells us, and I quote "the whole country is a platear varying in elevation from 3500 to 5000 feet above sea level. The area above 3000 feet in Southern Rhodesia, most of which is adapted for the residence of Europeans, is stated at 100,000 sq. miles and there are some 26,000 sq. miles of area above 4000 feet where European children can be reared". The cold logical appraisal which this subject appears to have been given is reminiscent of the best practices of sheep-raising or cattle breeding. It is these factors which strengthen the suspicion that the highlands of Africa have suffered aggrandisement at the hands of European colonialists for very practical material reasons.

I shall not go into details of the history of this region. Suffice it to say that upto about 10 or 15 years before the commencement of the present century the region was an African entity, living in peace minding its own business and having no designs on the wide-open spaces of Europe. However, the peace of the region was suddenly shattered in the 1880s by the great British Empire's commercial vanguards, using as a means of pursuasion for striking bargains, the newly invented maxim machine guns. The spear weilding Africans obviously had no chance and for a palty sum, Lobengula, King of the Matabele, is said to have been delighted to grant to British representatives a concession over the minerals in his kingdom. After that of course he was made short shrift of, and we then come to the period of the 1920s when in the year 1923 Southern Rhodesia was formally annexed to the Crown-I take these words from British constitutional papers--on 23rd September 1923, and was granted responsible government, on 1st October 1923. So here annexation, perhaps for the first time even in British constitutional history, becomes responsible government, later to be described as self-government for greater convenience !

I had referred earlier to the possibility of the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom having used words in a sense in which I was not able to understand them. I meant thereby such words as 'referendum', 'electors', 'selfgovernment' and so forth. My understanding of these words leads me to believe that a 'referendum' is a process involving the submission of an issue to the direct vote of all the people on the basis of direct universal suffrage. Anything less than that must be suitably qualified in description. Seeing that the ratio of the indigenous inhabitants to European settlers has gradually been reduced from 44 to 1 in 1901, to about 8 to 1 in 1960, one can only assume that the so-called referendum of 1922 must have been confined to the adult European population comprising no more than 2% of the total popula-

74

tion of the territory. A similar qualification must apply to the word 'electors' and to the word `elected' used by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom. He informed us the other day that under the constitution which came into force on 1st October 1923 all executive powers were transferred from officials of the British South Africa Company to elected Southern Rhodesian Ministers responsible to the Legislative Assembly. In having failed at the same time to detail the number of electors in relation to the total population. I think he has been less than fair to us here, and to African patriots like Joshua Nkomo and his compatriots in the Territory of Southern Rhodesia. The representative or elected character of the regime in Southern Rhodesia--or in the Federation for that matter-is well brought out in one of the many utterances of Sir Roy Wellensky.

According to the London Times of 13th February 1962, Sir Roy Wellensky, Prime Minister of the Federation, is reported to have commented upon the hostility of African independent States that was concentrating against "our South African and Portuguese neighbours". He went on to say that to a lesser degree it was directed against the Federation. The Federation had a political philosophy of its own distinct from that of others. At the same time the Federation wanted to cooperate with others in solving the problem of poverty, ignorance and disease in Africa, but in the process the Federation was not prepared to "run out on our Belgian friends and neighbours, the South Africans and Portuguese".

According to another report datelined Salisbury February 12, (in the London Times of February 13) we are informed that opening new session of the Federal Parliament Lord Dalhousie, Governor-General of the Federation, said in a speech from the throne that in the light of the "generally unsettled, conditions" prevailing in Africa, the Government have taken further steps to increase the effectiveness of the armed forces. Helicopters have been bought for the Royal Rhodesian Air Force, and negotiations had been concluded with the British Government for the purchase of Hunter Day Fighter-ground attack aircraft.

To return to a more peaceful and constitutional approach one should have thought that the non-self-governing status of Southern Rhodesia has been and is a self evident fact. The necessity for our examination of this question arises as the United Kingdom government has not, at any time since the adoption of the U.N. Charter at San Francisco, transmitted information under Article 73(e) on Southern Rhodesia, as it has been doing with respect to its numerous other Non-Self-Governing Territories.

I would not take issue with the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom for telling us that the British Government had never submitted information on Southern Rhodesia since the United Nations was established. Perhaps if information had been furnished we should not have appeared to be as inquisitive as we are accused of now being. However, unilateral actions in this respect by administering powers have not been accepted by the United Nations as adequate grounds for determining the political or constitutional status of a non-self-governing territory. The distinguished Ambassador of Ghana noted in the Fourth Committee the other day that even after his country had reached in 1954 a self-governing status comparable in constitutional terms to that of present day Southern Rhodesia the United Kingdom continued to submit to the United Nations information on his country under Article 73(e) of the Charter. He explained that in 1954 his government already

had a Parliament elected on the basis of a universal adult suffrage, its own Prime Minister and the Government handled everything except foreign affairs and defence. I may mention here, in passing so to say, that for the appointment of our Commissioners (and we have Commissioners in Kenya, Trinidad, Hong Kong etc. in the Federation of which Southern Rhodesia is but a part, our negotiations are always conducted through London.

The fact of the United Kingdom government not having transmitted information concerning Southern Rhodesia does not therefore make that Territory any more self-governing-than. some 8 or 10 Portuguese territories on which the Government of Portugal has adamantly refused to transmit information during these years. Similarly there are territories under French administration on which France has not transmitted information. They remain Non-Self-Governing Territories all the same, and the right vests in the Assembly to take up these cases for consideration as appropriate. There is no question as to the competence of the Assembly to do that, even though the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom in the Fourth Committee a few weeks ago and in this Committee the other day contested that competence. The question of competence has been raised in the Fourth Committee on several occasions over the years, by colonial powers, but if resolutions of the Assembly are a guide, as indeed they must

75

be our guide in our deliberations here, the question has been settled. The competence of the Assembly was established by a vote of its members on resolution 742 (VIII) setting out "factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." The third preambular paragraph of that resolution reads "Having regard to the competence of the General Assembly to consider the principles that should guide the United Nations and the member states in the implementations of obligations arising from Chapter XI of the Charter and to make recommendations in connection with them". In operative paragraph 4 of the same resolution, the Assembly "Reasserts that each concrete case should be considered and decided upon in the

light of the particular circumstances of that case and taking into account the right of self-determination of peoples." Several passages and paragraphs from many more recent resolutions of the Assembly can be quoted, but it does not seem necessary for me to do that at this stage. I shall leave the matter there in the hope that the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom will not consider it necessary to revert to it in our present debate.

In my examination of the question before us, I shall apply the test of factors listed in Resolution 742 (VIII) to determine the constitutional status of Southern Rhodesia. I shall also invoke the twelve principles which were adopted by the Assembly in 1960 in its Resolution 1541 (XV) on the recommendations of a Committee of Six Members, three administering and three nonadministering members, the United Kingdom being one among the former. But before I do that I should like to examine the constitutional position of Southern Rhodesia in the light of the statutory provisions made by the United Kingdom Parliament, and in the light of what the distinguished United Kingdom representative of the United Kingdom has himself stated. There are three principal stages to be considered :

1. Southern Rhodesia constitution of 1923;

2. The Federal Constitution introduced in 1953; and

3. Tie Southern Rhodesian constitution of November 1961.

I shall not go into the constitution of 1923 in great detail, but I should like to Place before the Committee an extract from a report by a Committee of officials presented to the British Parliament in October 1960, as this adequately shows that in 1923 and after, the true status of Southern Rhodesia was no more than that of a colony under the sovereignty of the British Crown. It says :

"Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing Colony (a contradiction in terms) within the British Commonwealth. It was formally annexed to the Crown on 23rd September 1923, and was granted responsible government on 1st October 1923. Before that date it had gained political experience under the administration of British South Africa Company and enjoyed a form of representative government, particularly from 1914 onwards when the number of elected members exceeded the number of official members".

I shall not take the Committee's time in commeriting again and again on the meaning of words such its "representative" and "elected". We all know what they mean in this context.

In his statement to the Committee on March 7, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom stated that "Southern Rhodesia is part of Her Majesty's Dominions". Lest a misunderstanding should arise that Southern Rhodesia is in any sense equal in status to other dominions such as Australia or New Zealand, I should like further to quote from the report of the Committee of officials to which I have referred. It reads:

"Immediately before federation, Southern Rhodhesia was, in fact, in the final stage through which the older dominions passed on their way to dominion status, or full membership of the Commonwealth as it is now called".

This brings out clearly the inequality of status between Southern Rhodesia on the one hand and full members of the Commonwealth on the other immediately before the federal constitution. And basically as the representative of United Kingdom has himself pointed out this status did not undergo a change with the promulgation of the federal constitution. If Southern Rhodesia or the Federation were self-governing as is claimed in some quarters, there would have been no occasion for the recent debates in the Parliament of the United Kingdom on the constitutional status of either or the qualifications of voters and representation in the legislature which are undoubtedly internal affairs of a government.

Furthermore under the Southern Rhodesian constitution, Letters Patent 1923, British Gov-

76

ernment with the full consent of the European

community of Southern Rhodesia reserved to itself very extensive powers, both for the protection of the interests of the native inhabitants and for purposes of general over-all control. For example :

(a) Section 28 provided

that any Bill, save in respect of the supply of arms, ammunition or liquor to natives, whereby natives might be subjected or made liable to any conditions, disabilities or restrictions to which persons of European descent are not also subject or made liable must be reserved for the signification of the pleasure of the Crown, unless the Governor, before its passing, has obtained instructions upon such proposed legislation through a Secretary of State or unless it contains a clause suspending its operation until such pleasure has been signified. In practice such a Bill is submitted informally to the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations before it is introduced in the House.

- (b) Section 40 provided that no such discriminatory conditions shall be Imposed, without the previous consent of a Secretary of State, by any proclamation, regulation or other instrument issued under the provisions of any law, unless they have been explicitly prescribed, defined and limited in such law.
- (c) Certain supervisory and other powers in regard to native administration were vested in the High Commissioner for South Africa, later High Commissioner for Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland. These powers were later transferred to a Secretary of State.

Limitations embodied in Section 26 prohibited the legislature from repealing or altering the provisions of the Constitution in regard to the reservation of bills, native administration and the Governor's salary. The Governor was required by Royal instructions to reserve for the significance of the pleasure of Crown :

- "(a) any law for divorce;
- (b) any law whereby any grant of land or money or other donation or gratuity may be made to himself;
- (c) any law affecting the currency of the Colony;
- (d) any law imposing differential duties;
- (e) any law the provisions of which shall appear inconsistent with obligations imposed on the United Kingdom by treaty;
- (f) any law of an extraordinary nature and importance whereby the Royal prerogative or the rights and property of British subjects not residing in the Colony or the trade and shipping of the United Kingdom and its dependencies may be prejudiced;
- (g) any law containing provisions which have once failed to receive the Royal Assent or have been disallowed by the United Kingdom Government."

Other, limitations on the authority of the Colony's government are enumerated in Sections 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 41 and 61 of the Letters Patent of 1923. These should indicate beyond doubt that the constitution of 1923 did not confer upon Southern Rhodesia what is described in Chapter XVI of the Charter as a full measure of self-government--and I wish to stress the importance of the words "a full measure of selfgovernment".

We then come to the organization of the Colony and the two Protectorates into a Federation under the Constitution of 1953. The preamble to the Constitution of August 1953 reads:

"Whereas the Colony of Southern Rhodesia"--this is revealing phraseology--"is part of Her Majesty's dominions and Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland are territories under Her Majesty's protection; And whereas the said Colony and territories are the rightful home of all lawful inhabitants thereof, whatever their origin;

And whereas the Colony of Southern Rhodesia should continue to enjoy responsible government in accordance with its constitution;

And whereas Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland should continue, under the special protection of Her Majesty, to enjoy separate Governments remaining responsible (subject to the ultimate authority of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom) for, in particular, the control of land in those terri-

77

tories, and for the local and territorial political advancement of the peoples thereof;

And whereas the association of the Colony and territories aforesaid in a Federation under Her Majesty's sovereignty, enjoying responsible government in accordance with this Constitution, would conduce to the security, advancement and welfare of all their inhabitants. and in particular would foster partnership and cooperation between their inhabitants and enable the Federation, when those inhabitants so desire, to go forward with confidence towards the attainment of full membership of the Commonwealth...."

These words reaffirm the colonial status of Southern Rhodesia, and the fact that the sovereignty over this Territory continued to vest in Her Britannic Majesty. The Colony, and by a stretch of imagination the two protectorates, might be considered as enjoying "responsible government" in certain matters of government and administration, but that is not to be confused with selfgovernment as the two are entirely different. It will be recalled that this very question received detailed examination some time ago in the Trusteeship Council where when discussing the case of Western Samoa the Council members clearly expressed their view that self-government could not be said to exist unless legislative powers were derived on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

Another question we have to consider at this stage is whether the Federal Constitution advanc-

es Southern Rhodesia towards self-government. The answer to that question must be in the negative, and here instead of setting forth my views in detail, I should again be content to quote a passage from the report presented by the U.K. Prime Minister to the British Parliament in October 1960. It reads in part :

"Since federation the power of the Legislature to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Colony, subject to the provisions of the Southern Rhodesia Constitution, must now be read as subject also to the limitations on legislative powers imposed by the Federal Constitution. Moreover, Southern Rhodesia no longer deals directly with other countries, the Federal Government having assumed responsibility for external affairs. External affairs do not include matters between the Colony and the United Kingdom, in regard to which Southcm Rhodesia still enjoys direct relations. But in such matters as the negotiation of agreements for the avoidance of double taxation and a cements in relation to death duties Southern Rhodesia no longer negotiates, as hitherto, directly with, for example, the Union of South Africa but through the Federal Ministry of External Affairs."

The elements of subordination of the federation to the administering authority are set out in paragraph 17 of Chapter 2 of the said report, and I reproduce that in full :

- (a) Unlike the full members of the Commonwealth the Federation is not free to adopt a separate form of Royal Style and Titles.
- (b) The Governor-General is appointed on the advice of Her Majesty's Ministers in the United Kingdom and not on the advice of the Federal Government, although the Federal Prime Minister is, as a matter of courtesy, consulted.
- (c) Article 25 of the Constitution provides for the disallowance by Her Majesty through a Secretary of State of any law of the Federal Legislature. Article 77 provides that a Secretary of State may disapprove subordinate legislation to which the African Affairs Board have

objected, and that such legislation shall be annulled.

- (d) In addition to discretionary reservation under Article 24 of the Constitution and certain provision in the Royal Instructions the Governor-General is required to reserve :
- (i) Bills with respect to certain electoral matters;
- (ii) Bills of which the African Affairs Board request reservation;
- (iii) Bills to amend the Constitution.

The Royal assent to Bills so reserved is granted or withheld on the advice of United Kingdom Ministers.

- (e) The Federal Legislature lacks general power to pass legislation with extraterritorial effect. An undertaking has been given by the United Kingdom Government to remove this element of subordination.
- (f) In so far as legislation by the United Kingdom Parliament is concerned, the convention recognised in 1957 has in practice placed the Federal Legislature in a position broadly similar to that of the full Commonwealth members. The Federal Legislative power, however, is
- 78

still limited by the repugnancy rule flowing from the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865. Accordingly, any Federal Law which is in any respect repugnant to the provisions of any Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom extending to the Federation or repugnant to any Order or Regulation made under the authority of such Act or having in the Federation the force and effect of such Act, must be read subject to such Act, Order or Regulation and is, to the extent of such repugnancy absolutely void and inoperative.

(g) The Federal Legislature has no power

to abolish appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by special leave.

(h) In the field of external affairs the authority of the Federation must in all cases be supported by an authorisation or entrustment by the United Kingdom Government."

In speaking before the Fourth Committee, a few days ago, the representative of the United Kingdom said that "the autonomous status of Southern Rhodesia has been repeatedly recognized internationally". He was referring, I presume, to the entrustment to the Government of the Colony by Her Majesty's Government, of the powers to make certain arrangements, such as the authority to negotiate trade agreements relating to the treatment of goods, local agreemens with neighbouring territories such as the, Union of South Africa and foreign colonial territories, the participation in GATT and certain international technical organizations such as the I.T.U., W.M.O., W.H.O., African Postal Union, African Tele-Communications. Union and African Migratory Locust Control Service. It should be noted that participation in the World Metallurgical Organization, and the World Health Organization was without vote. Participation to the activities of the I.L.O., F.A.O. and I.C.A.O. was to be through the United Kingdom Government. This delegation of authority from the United Kingdom to Southern Rhodesia involved no change in the constitutional status of the former, and prior consultation between the Government of Southern Rhodesia and Her Majesty's Govern ment was called for before Southern Rhodesia entered into any commitments with respect even to participation in GATT and the conclusion of trade agreements etc. Since the promulgation of the Federal Constitution, the delgeation of authority to Southern. Rhodesia ceased in favour of the Federation itself, and to that extent a further limitation was placed on the Territory's Government. Therefore, this argument of international recognition of the, autonomous status of Southern Rhodesia has little validity today. Even if one were to revert to the position before the promulgation of the federal constitution, the fact remains that Southern Rhodesia's participation in the work of any of the international

bodies flowed from and was subject to the authority of the United Kingdom government. That does not constitute recognition and in fact a number of non-self-governing Territories do participate in the activities of these international organizations, without prejudice to or augmentation of their true constitutional status.

From all points of view, therefore, Southern Rhodesia before and after the promulgation of the Federal Constitution in 1953 remained a Non-Self-Governing Territory, on which information should have been transmitted by the Administering Authority under Article 73(e). That this information was not transmitted is a matter of profound regret especially in the fight of the conscientious discharge by the United Kingdom of her obligations under the United Nations Charter with respect to her other dependencies. It might well be argued, as the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom did indeed argue in the Fourth Committee, that "the United Kingdom Government could not and cannot give what it does not have and had no right to demand that Government of Southern Rhodesia report to it on economic, social and educational matters." "This plain fact", he added, precluded the United Kingdom from transmitting such information to the United Nations. We are not here concerned, at this stage, primarily with the transmission of information concerning Southern Rhodesia or the constitutional limitations which would or would not prevent the United Kingdom Government from, in the first instance, requesting information from the Colony's government, and then transmitting it to the United Nations in discharge of its international obligations. Though, in passing, I should like to note what the latter part of Principle XI of the Principles appended to Resolution 1541 states : It reads :

"The responsibility for transmitting information under Article 73(e) continues unless constitutional relations (of the Territory with the Administering Member) preclude the Government or Parliament of the Administering Member from receiving statistical and other information of technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory."

79

it is not without significance that on this principle the representative of the United Kingdom in the Committee of Six Members or in the Fourth Committee made no reservation: and I should like to point out that so far as I am aware neither in the Constitution of 1923 nor in the Federal Constitution of 1953, is the Government or Parliament of United Kingdom precluded from receiving statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory. In fact there is evidence that several Committees and Commissions appointed by the United Kingdom Parliament or Government have gone to Southern Rhodesia since 1923 in order to undertake extensive investigations which cover the areas of economic, social and educational activity as well as, and to a larger degree, the political problems of the Territory. However, the question of the transmission of information and the ability or inability of the United Kingdom Government to send information to the United Nations concerning Southern Rhodesia is a separate one, and will no doubt be taken up at an appropriate stage. At the moment we are concerned with the establishment of whether or not Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter and as I have shown in the light of the various constitutional provisions between 1923 and 1954 and later the conclusion emerges that Southern Rhodesia is such a territory.

We come, then, to the next stage in the constitutional evolution of Southern Rhodesia with the promulgation in December 1961 of a new constitution. In the words of the introductory chapter of Part I of CMND 1399, the new constitution reproduces many of the provisions of the existing constitution. This constitution eliminates, it is stated, all the reserved powers formerly vested in the United Kingdom Government. It does something else as well of great significance. While under this constitution, Southern Rhodesia will be free to make amendments to any sections of the constitution, it will not be so free to do with respect to certain matters. These are the :

- (a) position of the sovereign and the governor;
- (b) right of the United Kingdom Govenment to safeguard the position regarding international obligations.

That is what basically concerns us i.e. the international obligations of the United Kingdom with respect to its Territory as a whole and with respect to the indigenous elements of the population. The obligations with respect to the latter are well established as they are embodied in certain treaties made by the United Kingdom Government with local chiefs and rulers in the late 19th century; their fulfilment cannot be surrendered to the government of Southern Rhodesia, which, to the knowledge of the British Government one presumes, has adopted attitudes and policies prejudicial to those obligations. Under Chapter XI of the Charter, the British Government, is committed to the principle of paramountcy of the rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia and this commitment we trust that government will honourably discharge to the satisfaction not only of the people of the Territroy, but also of the United Nations.

With respect to the amending powers of the Southern Rhodesian Government, exceptions are also made with respect to certain provisions of the constitution, namely, the declaration of rights of the constitutional council and the, security of civil service pensions etc., but of these I shall not speak at length at this stage.

It is also significant that none of the provisions of the new constitution describe Southern Rhodesia and this commitment we trust that the contrary Article 5 of the new constitution describes Southern Rhodesia as a "Colony". I will not at this stage go into the examination of the merits or demerits of the declaration of rights or the charter of the constitutional council appended to this constitution which are meant to substitute for the safeguards provided in the reserved powers enumerated in the earlier constitution. I cannot help remarking however that both provisions seem utterly inadequate to safeguard the paramount interests of the vast majority of the indigenous inhabitants who are placed at the mercy of a minority government

of European settlers.

In the light of all this, the claim cannot be advanced with any sense of responsibility towards the nearly 3 million indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia or in response to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations that because of the constitution promulgated in 1961, Southern Rhodesia has become fully self-governing. The phrase used in the Charter "a full measure of self-government" in the context of today or in the sense originally intended by the framers of the Charter can only be construed to mean independence. Southern Rhodesia's present status even if one were to overlook the unrepresentative character of the minority regime established in the Territory

80

seems to be no different from that of the transitional status, of self-government of Ghana or Nigeria before independence. If the Administering Authority found it possible to transmit information on these two Territory for the period before independence, it is hard to understand why Southern Rhodesia should be treated differently even if it were to be understood to have reached the same status as Ghana or Nigeria before independence.

The constitution of 1961 is the gift to Southern Rhodesia of the Government of the United Kingdom--a gift, which one presumes can be withdrawn or revoked, as the constitution of Malta for example was revoked by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The precedent of Malta is a relevant one to remember in the examination of this case, as in that case also the Government of the United Kingdom had not transmitted information under Article 73(e) on the same ground' that under a constitution granted by the United Kingdom Parliament, Malta had become self-governing. That did not, however, establish Malta's self-government in the sense of Chapter XI of the Charter and in 1959 transmission of information was resumed. Self-government which is subject to revocation is not self-government at all. The context in Southern Rhodesia is, perhaps, somewhat different in the sense that whatever measure of self-government or responsible government exists in the Territory its incidence falls largely, if not on that section of the population which is

of alien extraction.

I should like briefly to refer here to the Declaration of Rights enclosed to the 1961 constitution of Southern Rhodesia as the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom spoke extensively about it in the Fourth Committee and hem. This Declaration of Rights does not confer on the people of Southern. Rhodesia all the basic fundamental human rights enshrined in the Declaration of Human Rights. "The fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual" in this Declaration are qualified and restricted in the words of the Declaration itself to "the right, whatever his race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, colour or creed, but subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest, to each and all of the following namely-

- (a) life, liberty, security of the person, the enjoyment of property and the proteotion of the law;
- (b) freedom of conscience, of expression, and of assembly and association; and
- (c) respect for his private and family life :"

Perhaps it is a question of interpretation, but as we see it here again words and phrases are employed in a sense and in meaning other than that understood in the United Nations or in the world at large. But what is more important is the fact that the political rights of the African individual ate not guaranteed here. It appears that the Declaration, in fact denies to the African citizen the right of vote. Free political activity is not ensured; on the other hand the denial of it is evident from the fact that one of the largest political parties and its leaders have been placed under bans and restrictions of all kinds. Sub paragraph 3 of Article I of the Declaration of Human Rights enjoins that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of Government".

The will of the African people in Southern Rhodesia is denied expression. Universal and equal suffrage is denied, and the elections which take place in Southern Rhodesia cannot be regarded as genuine because the mass of the African population can have no part in them. How can it be construed that the right of property of the African is ensured, when a vast area of Southern Rhodesia has already been excluded from their possession in favour of alien settlers. A declaration annexed to the constitution, far from ensuring the equal rights of the Africans with others seems to us to perpetuate exclusive and over-riding rights of alien settlers, rights at best could be described as acquired in the dim past through devious practices. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights speaks of the dignity and worth of the human person, and in the equal rights of men and women. In Southern Rhodesia, this dignity and this equal rights are undermined by the fact that even for the matter of elections such as they are, populace is sought to be divided in electors of the 'A' category and electors of the 'B' category. It is obvious that these distinctios and this inequality of treatment is utterly and completely unacceptable to the African population of Southern Rhodesia.

The declaration of rights contained in the 1961 Constitution, unlike the Constitutions of many of the newly independent countries of Africa has chosen to exclude from its list one of the most important articles contained in the universal declaration of human rights. Its Article 21, which alone can guarantee to all peoples equality of political action and I should here like to quote the text of the article, more prominently thereby to show how far the Southern Rhodesian situation i-- from the

81

attainment of what it has been claimed they have already attained. I quote Article 21 :

- Clause (1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country directly or through freely chosen representatives.
- Clause (2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.
- Clause (3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of the, Government; this will shall be expressed in periodical and genuine elections which shall be

by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Having quoted this, Mr. Chairman, need I say more!

I think it is relevant here to make a brief reference once again to principles enumerated in the General Assembly's Resolution 1541 of the XV Session. Principle 6 thereof states very clearly that a Non-Self-Governing Territory can be said to have reached a full measure of selfgovernment by :

- (a) emergence as a sovereign independent state;
- (b) free association with an independent state; or
- (c) integration with an independent state.

It is quite obvious that Southern Rhodesia has not at any time emerged as a sovereign State. As regards the question of free association with an independent State, that is not applicable; nor are we aware of integration with an independent State having taken place. Moreover, were we at any time to consider any of these alternatives, we are bound to be guided by the detailed explanations contained in principles 7. 8 and 9 of the resolution already referred to which tell us what the United Nations understand by the terms "free association" or "integration". The firm base on which the meaning of these expressions is founded, finds its support on the basic principles of free political institutions involving free and voluntary choice by all the peoples concerned and existence of informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage. As will be clear, on none of these pegs can we hang the fiction of Southern Rhodesian self-government.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of over-riding importtance however is that the new constitution of Southern Rhodesia has not received the approval of the masses of Southern Rhodesia. The referendum to which it was submitted was more or less a purely white referendum. The African population of Southern Rhodesia had no part in it barring a few hundred African electors. In fact this constitution was overwhelmingly rejected in the popular consultations organized by the African political parties in the Territory one of them led by Mr. Joshua Nkomo.

Before concluding Sir, I should like to go back briefly to the Assembly's resolution on factors, resolution 742 of the 8th Session. It is evident that Southern Rhodesia has not attained independence, and therefore, factors of the 1st part of the list of factors annexed to that resolution would not be relevant. Nor is Southern Rhodesia freely associated with the metropolitan country on equal basis in the sense of the criteria laid down in the third part of the list of factors. I would imagine that the statement of the representative of United Kingdom that Southern Rhodesia is part of Her Majesty's dominions does not represent a claim in the sense the Portuguese claim the, the colony is an integral part of the motherland. Therefore, the question of Southern Rhodesia need not be considered by us in the same way or on the same basis as. the question of Angola for example. The factors listed in the second part of the list of factors would appear to be relevant. And none of these, applied to the situation in Souhtren Rhodesia, go to show that that territory has attained some separate system of selfgovernment. For instance the opinion of the population--and in the population one must necessarily include the nearly 3 million Africans, and not merely five or fifty thousand electors so designated on the basis of inaccessible property qualifications utterly irrelevant in the context of Africa-has not been freely expressed by informed and democratic processes, as to the status or change in status of the Territory. For this reason alone the 1961 constitution which is supposed to reinforce the selfgovernment status of Southern Rhodesia would come into serious question.

Lastly, I should like very clearly to emphasise the viewpoint of my delegation that we have come here not to criticise or to find fault but primarily to make a constructive contribution in the affairs of this Committee. It is in that sprit that we have spoken and more than many others perhaps my delegation is fully conscious of the forward looking approach in these matters of the United Kingdom Government. If we have sounded critical it is not towards the policies of the Government of the United Kingbut more against the present situation in Southern Rhodesia in the development of which the United Kingdom Government have played a role more passive than what reality warranted.

Politically speaking, in the modern sense, the territory is extremely backward in that its indigenous population has little or no voice in the establishment and working of its government. Considerations of geography, ethnology, culture, race and language set it apart from the United Kingdom. As regards international status, the degree or extent to which the Territory exercises the power to enter freely into direct relations of any kind with other governments is extremely limited and what is more, the people of the territory other than white settlers have no or precious little say in the matter. The Territory would cerainly not be eligible for membership in the United Nations. The legislature of the Territory does not appear to be "lawfully constituted in a manner receiving the free consent of the population" to use the language of the resolution, Nor is the election of members of the executive branch subject to the consent of the indigenous population. The participation of the population in the Government of the Territory is extremely limited and utterly ineffective. The electoral and representation systems are thoroughly inadequate and inappropriate in that 280,000 whites rule the roost in complete disregard of the rights and wishes of some 3 million Africans. The Territory may be regarded to possess a degree of restrictive autonomy in economic, social and cultural affairs, but the degree of freedom from pressure by a minority group which has acquired privileged economic status prejudicial to the general economic interest of the people of the Territory is extremely restricted. The claim that Southern Rhodesia possesses a full measure of selfgovernment does not therefore, stand the test of these factors.

In the light of these considerations, my delegation therefore firmly believes that Southern Rhodesia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory and our answer to the request of the General

82

Assembly should be in that sense.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA UNITED KINGDOM GHANA HONG KONG KENYA PORTUGAL FRANCE AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND SWAZILAND WESTERN SAMOA NIGER NIGERIA MALTA ANGOLA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply To Lok Sabha Debate On President's Address

Replying to the debate on the President's address, in the Lok Sabha on March 19, 1962 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following reference to foreign affairs

ALGERIA

....Before I proceed further, I should like to refer to a piece of news which came in this morning's papers, and which announced the long hoped for agreement between the leaders of the Algerian people and the French Government for a cease-fire. I doubt if we can easily find in the records of history even, such an intensive struggle as the Algerian people have lived through during the past seven years and more, such intense suffering, such large numbers of casualties, and killings, almost a substantial portion of the population of Algeria suffering because of this. Surely, no one can deny that if a price has to be paid for freedom, the Algerian people have paid much more than any price that could have been laid down. And apart from the principle involved of freedom and independence, they deserve it, because of this price that they have paid.

We should like to send our greetings and good wishes to them on this occasion. May I add that I should like to congratulate the other party, that is, the French Government under President De Gaulle also, because while we may disagree with much that has happened, done by the French Government, there, we must recognise that all kinds of difficulties and extraordinary conditions came in his way, but he adhered to his resolve to grant, or to agree to the independence of Algeria, and, therefore, he deserves credit for it. In coming to this agreement, there have undoubtedly been a number of compromises in which both parties have given up something to which they attached importance. But whatever has been given up does not come in the way of independence. That is the important thing.

Although this tremendous hurdle has been crossed, there still remain grave difficulties in Algeria and in France, because as Hon. Members might know, a secret Army organisation has grown up in the past, which has given a great deal of trouble, and which is functioning--I do not know how to describe it--in a typically cruel, callous and Fascist manner All I can

83

hope is that this will cease now, and if it does not cease, that would be dealt with adequately. I hope that the Algerian people, after having paid such a heavy price for their independence, and been conditioned by it--because it is the price, that they pay in suffering and sacrifices that conditions the people--will grow, rapidly grow and progress and become a bulwark of peace and co-operation in the world.

I shall not refer to Goa, because we had recently some debate on the Goa Bills. All I would say is, and I report what I said then, that we can now say that we have completed the independence of India. That is an aspect of this question which many people outside India do not realise fully, namely that this is a part of our independence struggle, that our independence was not complete till this was done with. Naturally, our independence struggle was directed chiefly towards the British, because the British Dominion was a great part of India but it included in its scope any colonies that any foreign Power might have in India; there were the French, and there were the Portuguese.

The House may remember that in the course of our independence struggle, Mahatma

Gandhi did not particularly want us even to carry on agitations in what were called then the Indian States. Even then, nobody imagined that the Indian States would be outside India, outside independent India. But he felt that we must concentrate on the major obstruction: that was the British Dominion in India; and in the Indian States, he felt that our struggle against the Rulers there, justified as it well might be, was a rather false struggle, because behind them was the British Government, and the British Government could take shelter, because we shall have to fight others and not the real trouble-maker there. So, he advised us, and advised the Congress movement not to directly carry on agitation in the States. Of course, the people of the States could do so. It does not matter whether that was the right policy or the wrong policy. I am merely mentioning it to show how our attitude towards Goa and the French colonies was determined by the fact that we concentrated on the so-called British India as it was, feeling that the rest would inevitably follow.

FORMER FRENCH COLONIES

We never forgot either the French colonies or the Portuguese colonies; we never forgot them. But we did realise that they existed here because of the fact that the British Power had agreed to their coming back. So far as the French were concerned, they came back after the Napoleonic wars; during the Napoleonic wars, they had to give them up. The British agreed to that. So they cam back. So far as the Portuguese were concerned, it is patent that they could not have held those colonies but for the protection of the British Power. That was obvious. And so we thought that when the British Power went from India, these would automatically revert to India. We tried to get this done, peacefully.

We talked to the French Government. The French Government at first raised many legal and other points, but at any rate, they talked. We talked and they talked, both in a civilised manner about a question, and ultimately we came to a decision, an agreement. With the Portuguese, the facts of history were not admitted.. The present context was not understood by them. They still lived in the 16th or 17th century. It was difficult to talk. Indeed, they did, not talk to us. They refused to talk to us about the future of Goa, except in terms of our admitting that they would exist there, which we could never do. We sent a Minister to Lisbon, opened a Legation there and presented Notes etc., which they would not accept. So we withdrew our Minister. The House knows what has happened since then.

So that what I want to lay stress on is this, that Goa was a part of our struggle for independence as much as any other part. Our concern was that foreign countries held parts of India. Whether they were the British or the Portuguese or the French or any other was a matter of detail. The main thing was that India must be free of any foreign control. And we have had that.

Most people in the West seem to imagine that by some right or other, right of conquest, if you like, Goa was part of Portugal, and we did wrong in taking any steps, any forcible steps, to acquire it. I did not particularly like even those steps. Not because I thought at any time that those steps were wrong; I think we were completely justified in law, under the United Nations Charter and everything, in taking those steps, taking into consideration the fact that Goa was part of India, that Goa was a colony. So I think we were right in that. Nevertheless, I hesitated to do that, because this kind of thing has effects and consequences in other places; this might be made a precedent for some other country to apply violence in the wrong place at the wrong time, But, as the House knows, we were compelled by circumstances to do so. However, that is over.

84

PORTUGUESE SOLDIERS IN GOA

Unfortunately, we have still to look after a fairly large number of Portuguese soldiery-about 3,500 or so. Of course, they are being treated well. They live in their old barracks where they used to live before-and have everything. Indeed, immediately, after the Goa operation, we offered to the Portuguese Government to take them away. We made no bargain. We did not want anything in exchange. We said, 'Take them away'. Some people suggested that we could have bargained with them about the future of the Indian residents of Mozambique and Angola. We are much interested in the future of these residents, but we refused to bargain. We thought that would be dealt with separately.

So we have told them repeatedly, 'We shall hand them over to you; take them away'. But the matter has not yet been apparently decided. I said this on the last occasion here. A day or two later, a message appeared in the Press apparently emanating from the Portuguese Government saying that they had made a suggestion to us and they have received no answer. But we have received no suggestion at all, unless it be that it is on the way via the Brazilian Government, via the Egyptian Government and various Governments. That might take some time. Even then it has been several days since this happened and no suggestion has come. We have even gone so far as to tell the Portuguese soldiery that they can go themselves; anybody can shift for himself and go and make his own arrangements, and we would facilitate his going from there.

This, unfortunately, creates a situation in Goa which comes in the way of normality returning, when 3,500 soldiers are there under detention. They are not treated as prisoners of war in detention. Our Army is there to look after them. We have, as a matter of fact, removed a great part of our Army and civil police that went there. We would have removed the rest except for a very small number, if these soldiers had not been there.

However, these matters will no doubt be settled soon. It is unfortunate that it takes a little time, for a simple thing like this. Other matters too in Goa are gradually being resolved, and I hope that Goa will settle down and make progress.

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Now the most important thing at present happening on the world scene is the Disarma-

ment Conference that is taking place in Geneva, to which we have sent a strong and able delegation. We feel strongly about disarmament. Our whole attitude has been, as it often is in foreign affairs, not to push ourselves forward too much but to help others. It is obvious that disarmament, although it concerns every country in the world, can only be brought about if the big nuclear powers agree. In the ultimate analysis, it is not merely a question of votes, it is a question of agreement by those powers. We have, therefore, tried to help in this agreement being achieved.

So far as we are concerned, in the course of the past few years, we have made repeated proposals in regard to disarmament in the United Nations. It is interesting to note that a number of our proposals when made were fiercely criticised; a year or two later, they were quietly adopted or some other country put forward these very proposals and they were adopted.

The whole approach to this question is so full of suspicion, lest something might happen which might cause this country or that country some harm or injury, that every proposal is hardly considered on the merits but with that suspicious outlook. I do not blame anybody for it, because it does involve grave problems. Disarmament does; although it has appeared today in the context of nuclear weapons, which makes it vital, disarmament is, after all, something which has never happened in the world. It is a new phase of the world's existence that we are gradually groping after. The weapons may have been bows and arrows, may have been breech-loading guns, may have been anything, but nobody has ever talked of disarmament or at least effected it previously-some people have talked about it.

After the First World War, the old League of Nations had a Disarmament Conference or some such thing. They appointed a Preparatory Commission for disarmament. I happened to be in Geneva then, and they went on talking, the preparatory commission went on talking, for years. They produced reports, fat ones, a number of them, pointing out the difficulties of disarmament-and that was a time. when there were no nuclear arms. So, you can imagine how much more difficult it has become when nuclear weapons have come on the scene, with the choice offered to humanity of either disarmament or no survival at all. So, it is no good criticising anybody or condemning anybody, because it involves grave issues of national safety, and every Government has to be careful about its own safety. The only difficulty is that each person considers his safety in the context of being much superior to the other, to make sure, and you cannot have every-

85

body being superior to everybody else : it is impossible for even two.

At the present moment not much progress has been made in this committee on disarmament at Geneva. Various proposals have been put forward, they are being discussed, and I believe they have agreed lastly, at our response, to meet informally and secretly and not in public all the time. They might have some public sessions, but most of the work will be done privately, because it is impossible in these conferences to discuss anything very seriously in public. I do not think that we need be very much alarmed at the fact that during these few days not much progress has been made. That is natural because the countries are putting forward their own viewpoints without yielding to anything else, but I hope the next development will be more accommodation to the other's viewpoints.

The literature 'on the subject is tremendous now. Hon. Members may think that one is either for or against disarmament, but it is not so simple as that. It really is extraordinarily intricate, and some of us who have had to study it to a little extent have been amazed at the complexity of the problem, but there it is. The fact is that if we do not solve it on this occasion, conditions are likely to grow worse; there will be more and more arms, always of a later pattern, more dangerous pattern, and it nay go completely out of hand once the nuclear weapons and their progeny spread to a number of more countries.

COMPLETE AND WHOLESALE DISARMAMENT

One thing appears to me to be clear. Every-

body has agreed in theory-by everybody I me-an that the United Nations has said so and even the Great Powers like the Soviet Union, the United States Government and I think the United Kingdom Government have agreed-on complete and wholesale disarmament. What more can you have ? But it is in translating that that all the difficulties. occur. Still, it is well to remember that the agreement is on a very wide field' The disagreement is highly important because it comes in the way, but really the basic things have been agreed upon.

Now, even if you start with this idea of agreement on this complete and wholesale disarmament, naturally it does not appear overnight; you have to do it by phase. Then the difficulty comes as to what should be the first phase, what should be the second. Thereafter it was agreed that in any phase or any step that was taken, nothing should be done that made one Great Power weaker than the other rival Power, that is, the relative proportion of strength should be maintained in partial disarmament etc. That is also agreed to, but however much it may be phased, it seems to me that the first phase must be a substantial one, must be a striking one, must be such as to strike the imagination of the world. There is no good saying : all right, let us reduce our arms by ten per cent or five per cent. That will not affect anybody, it will be a joking matter. So, while it has to be phased, the first phase has to be a striking one.

NUCLEAR TESTS

One thing else I should like to say in this connection. It was unfortunate, I venture to say, that last year the Soviet Government started a new series of atomic tests, nuclear tests. I do not know the reasons. I mean the military reasons, because military people always want these tests, and I know for a fact that military people in all these countries having nuclear arms are constantly pressing their Governments for more tests so as to improve their weapons. But one thing leads to another. Soon after it led to the United States Government having some tests, they had underground tests at that time, and so the way was opened for this kind of thing unfortunately.

Recently it was announced by the United States Government that they would start a series of new tests overground, atmospheric tests, within a month, I think, or some such period, unless a treaty banning all tests was evolved before then. If I may say so with all respect., it is very unfortunate that that was said just then, just on the eve of the disarmament conference, because in a sense it came in the way of the success of that conference to some extent. It may have been thought that it would expedite matters in the conference, but it is hardly likely that the conference will produce firm treaties within a month or so; and it would be very unfortunate, I think, if the United States Government started these tests while the conference is meeting, because there is no doubt that the moment the United States Government started, the Soviet Government-it has said so --will start it also. Then this disarmament conference will progressively lose all significance while the real thing is happening outside, while the tests are taking place. Therefore, I would beg the Great Powers concerned to consider, not to have any tests while the conference is sitting, while they are making every effort to reach a Settlement on these matters. The subject of disarmament is complex as I said, very complex, and the more-one tries to understand it, the more one realised the com-

86

plexity of the problem, but behind all this physical complexity lies the fear and hatred of one country against another; and fear and hatred are bad companions and lead one to wrong results. Now, that is why I have been anxious that we should not be driven into fear and hatred too much in regard to our own problems.

CHINESE AGGRESSION

Our problem of the border aggression by the Chinese, is a serious matter for us, serious for the present of course, but serious for the future. No country with any self-respect' can ignore such a problem. Nobody has suggested that it should be ignored, but I am merely saying that. find it is a serious problem, because, to imagine Mat it can be solved easily by war is a misapprehension of the facts of the situation or of the effects of a war in dealing with such matters If one is driven into a war, well, one is driven into it, and one does one's utmost to win it, but normally speaking, and looking at it even in the context of disarmament and all that is happening in the world, it would be an utter absence of prudence to rush in into some step, the end of which we cannot see.

NEED FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Therefore, I have often stated that while we adhere to our position firmly--and the House only two days ago may have seen the recent correspondence on this subject with China we should still make every effort to solve this question by settlement and peacefully. If unfortunately, that is not possible, then, we may have to think of other means. But, there should be no jumping in into methods which close the door and bar any approach to peaceful settlement because we are dealing not only with the present evil but the future relations of the two greatest countries in Asia which geography has placed side by side for ages past and which neither of them can ignore; and neither of them can with the greatest power in the world, with the greatest effort in die world defeat the other and conquer it, The result is, it will be a continuing struggle, tussle, war etc. It is not an easy matter for any responsible person to see this kind of long-term hostility with a permanent neighbour. And, at the same time, one cannot be complacent about it. Therefore, we have to create conditions in which such a settlement is possible.

Among those conditions is general opinion in the world. In a sense, you might say that world opinion is with us. I do not say that world opinion makes a finality to anybody, but it does make some difference. And, in this matter, it may well be said that world opinion has been strongly in our favour and has not appreciated the Chinese attitude. And, the second part, of course, is, that we should strengthen ourselves and prepare for all consequences.

ALGERIA USA FRANCE INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PORTUGAL MOZAMBIQUE ANGOLA BRAZIL EGYPT MALI SWITZERLAND CHINA

Date : Mar 01, 1962

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on President's Address

Replying to the debate on the President's Address in the Rajya Sabha on March 15, 1962 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following reference to international affairs

DISARMAMENT

....In regard to foreign affairs or in regard to anything, the most important thing today, I have no doubt, is disarmament looking at it from a world point of view, because if there is no disarmament, the world will naturally drift more and more towards conflict, towards war, and undoubtedly if there is war, it will be a nuclear war, and possibly a war like that brought on without even a declaration of war. Today the major fear of big countries--small countries are also afraid of it, but they have no choice anyway-is a surprise nuclear attack. AR their policies are based on preventing a nuclear attack or even a surprise attack and, if it takes place, to survive adequately to be able to give, to return that attack and to wipe off the other country. These are the basic policies when they consider the problem of disarmament. Today, therefore, disarmament has become a question-not of reducing armament by 10 per cent or 15 per cent or 20 or 25 per cent. If this basic fear remains, it does not matter how much you reduce it, because it does not require, as the figures are given, thousands of nuclear bombs possessed by the big nuclear powers; a quarter of them are enough to wipe off the world or wipe off another country. So one has to deal with this disarmament question always keeping in view this tremendous fear of the other party attacking, giving a surprise attack, and if it does give a surprise attack, it should

not succeed in wiping off this country so that it can retaliate in a bigger way. It is a rather inhuman way of looking at things when the calculations are made quite calmly, even putting down that a hundred million people will die in the first twenty-four hours but after the hundred

87

million another hundred million will remain and how can they so function as to destroy two hundred million of the other side.

This type of calculation goes on, It really is amazing how very able persons devoted to the progress of the world can think quietly in terms of one hundred million people dying and this leading to the destruction of two hundred million people on the other side. It is obvious that in a war like this, guite apart from the tremendous destruction involved, the world will be quite different afterwards. Nobody can say who will win or who will lose. It is totally immaterial as to who is supposed to win or who is supposed to lose. But everybody is supposed to lose. The world will lose, and the world will be completey different. If you iniagine several hundred millions of people being liquidated or destroyed with practically all the centres of civilisation destroyed, well, the world will be very different. It will neither be a capitalist world nor a communist world nor anything, it will be something entirely different. May be it may go back to thousands or hundreds of years and lead some kind of a primitive existence.

For all these reasons, disarmament has become a very vital and urgent problem, and this conference that is being held in Geneva, the 18member conference, is of the highest importance. It is important not only because the subject is important but the manner of holding it. I mean to say, the succession of events which has led to it has invested a great importance to it. If this fails, then it will not be easy to come back to it. Some time or the other the world will have to come to disarmament-there is no doubt-unless it destroys itself beforehand. But failure in this conference will be, well, very harmful for the future of the world, and the immediate result will be those major powers trying their best not to disarm but to arm themselves further to experiment with nuclear weapons to find out, to have greater information about them, so as to meet the perils which they consider will come from the other party. And it is not much good blaming either party because I am qaite convinced that the major countries--and, of course, the minor ones also -want disarmament, want peace. It is not that they object to it. But the fear that any steps taken by them may put the other party in an advantageous position prevents them from taking those steps.

On the whole. I think that we need not lose hope. We need not be too optimistic because too much of optimism makes one complacent, and the, position is not one which leads to complacency. But the fact remains that there is some reason for hope because all the people-the Governments and the people--are beginning to realise more and more the consequences of this kind of war. If I may say so, the worst possible approach to this question, as to every other question, is the approach of the cold war. Fear and hatred are the necessary results of that approach. It is not through that approach that any successful result will be found out. But you cannot put an end to it because the cold 'war itself is a result of that, Risks have to be taken. And the greatest risk of all is not to have disarmament, not to come to an agreement about these matters. But naturally, the risks that are taken are to be calculated risks and I think that if once the corner is turned and there is progress towards disarmament, the pace might well be fairly rapid. Therefore, I attach the greatest importance to it, and it is for this reason that we have sent a very strong team to this conference. To begin with, it was proposed, as the House will remember, that this would begin with a meeting of the heads of the Governments or the States. I think there was a great deal in that suggestion, that is to say, to emphasise the importance of this, to draw the world's attention to it, and presuming that those people would be free, would have their authority to come to an agreement, it might have. facilitated an agreement. And I still think it is desirable for them to meet. But I am not guite sure if at this early stage, to begin with, it should take place or whether it is better for them to meet somewhat later. In any event, it was not at all possible for me to go because of these elections and this Parliament meeting. Today in fact, the conference is meeting. How

could I go during this situation in India when Parliament is meeting ? So, I expressed my inability to go. I saw the force of the argument which led to that proposal being made, and I suggested that perhaps I might be able to go at the end of April or in May.

GOA

Now, if by any chance the world can agree to disarmament, it will then colour our thinking in regard to all problems-the world's thinking --because this covers every problem. Take a simple problem like Goa. Of course, Goa is out of the picture as a problem. But the whole trouble about Goa has been that Portugal was a part of the NATO alliance, and Portugal had provided some important bases to the NATO Powers in the Atlantic Ocean and this no doubt governed their thinking. They could not take any steps against Portugal because they might lose those bases especially, and other considerations also came in. Now, if this question of always being prepared for war is not present

88

in the minds of nations, it will lead them to think of such colonial territories as remain differently. Today hardly any colony is valued as a colony because people know a large number of them have become free. But even those that are not free--excepting the Portuguese colonies which have to be put in a special category by themselves--are not important, so important, from the point of view of political or economic matters. They are always important from the economic point of view to some extent. But it is not enough. That would not induce people to hold on to them, but what does induce them is the consequence in a war as, to what will happen. If either has got a base there, or they intend, they are afraid that they will fall into the influence of the other party. and this results in some of these Powers sticking on to the remaining colonies.

So, all these matters become easier of solution if progress towards disarmament is made. I hope, therefore, that this conference in Geneva will lead to some progress. One cannot suddenly expect it to end with complete agreement. It may take a long time before it comes to that. But I think in the course of the next month or two, it might well indicate which way it is going. I should like the House to remember that in fact, the resolutions of the United Nations agreed to by the parties, chief parties, concerned, as well as the individual proposals made on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union are remarkably similar in many respects. It is remarkable that while we talk about these great conflicts and suspicion, the proposals--although they differ of course-have so much in common--one is surprised that after reading all this about the conflicts he finds so much in common. So there is some hope and I am sure every country will make every effort to make good there.

PAKISTAN AND CHINA

Now apart from that, in foreign affairs, the references in the Hon. Members' speeches have been to China, and to Pakistan especially-naturally they concern us very much more-and I am asked by some Hon. Members opposite to say definitely and precisely and rigidly what I shall do about Pakistan or China. Well, I beg to say that it would be the height of folly for any person in authority, or even for a person not in authority, to be exceedingly rigid about the approach to these difficult international problems.

I have said--and I shall repeat it--that it will be our endeavour all the time to settle such problems, as we have with Pakistan or such grave frontier problems that have arisen because of the Chinese incursions into Indian territory, peacefully. But even settling them peacefully may require, it does require, a certain strength. We have to build up that strength-we are building it up--and if we cannot settle them peacefully, we shall have to consider what we can do, because it is not at all wise for anyone to think in terms of a major war which might affect the whole world situation apart from our own. But we have to be prepared for everything, and at the same time we shall make every effort to settle these things peacefully.

As the House perhaps knows, I have again sent an invitation to the President of Pakistan, which I had originally made a year and a half ago when I went to Pakistan, which was subsequently repeated. I do not pretend to say that our invitation, or his accepting the invitation will suddenly put an end to all our disputes. But it helps, and every step taken will be helpful, because all these problems are not so much of territory here and there, but of a certain psychology that governs a nation's activities.

NEPAL

There is Nepal. We have been much distressed lately about the charges made by Nepalese papers and Nepalese Ministers against India. We have, as a matter of fact, gone a good long way not to interfere in any way in Nepal. We have continued our help to Nepal--our economic help, etc.,--fully, as we used to. But the fact remains that there is discontent in Nepal-I cannot say in what measure it is. The fact that it should be so is not surprising having regard to what has happened there, and that discontent has given rise to internal trouble in Nepal-again I cannot say in what measure that is.

Now to accuse us of fomenting that trouble is really, it seems to me, very extraordinary. We have said clearly, right from the beginning, that we are not going to interfere, that we will not allow any arms traffic between India and Nepal --any arms to be taken in--that we will not allow India to be made a base for any kind of armed attack, but subject to all that, the people, that is the Nepalese in India, can function, under the law, under our Constitution, as they like. But if they offend against the law, we shall take steps against them.

It is a little difficult for other countries, which have not got the rule of law to understand this, just like the Chinese who seem to imagine that we can issue orders to all our newspapers to do this or that--which is ridiculous--because they can do so. So the Nepalese Ministers seem to

89

imagine that we can spirit away, we can arrest anybody, pass orders against him, whether we any factual proof or not. So we have written to the Nepalese Government that if they send us any proof of any incident, we can catch hold of the person, we will take action. But they have not sent us anything except vague allegations which, on enquiry, we find to be baseless or grossly exaggerated.

Here also the original idea came from the Nepalese Government that the King of Nepal might come here. I welcomed that; I was glad of that and I issued an invitation to him to come. But I have not had a definite reply except vaguely stating that he would like to come-he did not know when. And if he comes, we shall be glad to have talks, because we attach importance to our relations with Nepal being good. We as individuals or as a Government, as both, would like Nepal to progress, and to progress well according to the way that they think best, But we are not going to interfere--it is for the Nepalese to do what they like.

USA SWITZERLAND INDIA PORTUGAL CHINA PAKISTAN NEPAL

Date : Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

ITALY

[Indo-Italian Air Services Agreement Ratified]

An Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Italy, relating to air services, which was signed at Rome on July 16, 1959, has come into force from March 12, 1962 as a result of the Exchange of Instruments of Ratification between Shri M. M. Philip, Union Communications Secretary, and Dr. Justo Giusti del Giardino, the Italian Ambassador in India.

An Agreement relating to the air services between the Government of India and the Government of Italy was signed in Rome on July 16, 1959 by Shri Khub Chand, Ambassador of India, on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. Alberto Folchi, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Rome, on behalf of the Government of Italy. Air India International have been operating air services through Rome since December, 1949, while the Italian airline, "Alitalia", have been operating air services through India since March, 1959. These services have hitherto been operated under temporary authorisation, granted by the Governments of the two countries and would now be placed on a formal basis, with the ratification by the two countries of the Agreement,

Air India International is, at present, operating three passenger services, and one freighter service (in one direction only) through Rome, while Alitalia. are operating only one service per week through Bombay, in either direction. They are planning to step it up to two.

ITALY INDIA USA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement Signed]

The Governments of India and U.S.A. concluded in New Delhi on March 26, 1962 an agreement covering a loan of Rs. 256.8 crores to India from the sale proceeds of agricultural commodities supplied to this country under the fifth U.S. Public Law 480 agreement which was concluded on May. 4, 1960.

The loan agreement was signed by Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Mr. John Kenneth Galbraith, U. S. Ambassador to India.

The loan of Rs. 256.8 crores will be utilized by India to meet the local currency costs of many economic development projects including hydroelectric and thermal power stations such as Sharavathi, Cambay, Bandel, Amlai and Talcher.

The fifth U.S. PL 480 agreement with India was the largest agricultural commodity agreement ever signed by the United States. Together with its supplements, the agreement provided for the sale of food and fibre valued at \$1,370 million (Rs. 652 crores). The four previous U.S. PL 480 agreements covered commodities worth \$ 967.5 million (Rs. 461 crores). India pays for these supplies in rupees.

The United States will give India grants equivalent to 42 1/2% of the We proceeds of commodities supplied under the fifth agreement to finance social, educational, health and other development projects. Five per cent of the sale proceeds is reserved for loans to private enterprises under the Cooley Fund and 10 per cent for the expenses of the U.S. Embassy in India. The 1960 agreement stipulated that a loan agreement, the one signed today, would be effected later covering the remaining 42 1/2 per cent of the sale proceeds.

90

USA INDIA **Date :** Mar 01, 1962

April

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs	Record	Apr 01, 1962
Vol. VIII	APRIL	No.4

CONTENTS

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament 91

GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri M. J. Desai's Statement 93

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement on Nucler Tests 95

NEPAL

President's Speech at Banquet in honour of Their Majesties The King and The Queen of Nepal-Reply by His Majesty King Mahendra-King Mahendra's Speech at Banquet in honour of President Prasad--Reply by President of India-Nehru-Mahendra Joint Communique 96-99 PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Malda Incidents 99

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SWITZERLAND NEPAL INDIA PAKISTAN

Date : Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad delivered the following address to Parliament on April 18, 1962 :

Members of Parliament

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you, Members of the Third Parliament of our Republic, to its inaugural session. Amongst you are a large number who have been Members of Parliament in years past and who once again sought the suffrage of your respective electorates and received at their hands a renewal of confidence. There are others among you who, though not new to public life or perhaps even to legislatures, have been elected to Parliament for the first time.

I congratulate you all and welcome you to united endeavour in the service of our common motherland. Each one of you will find in your tenure as Members of Parliament, whether it be in the legislature itself or in your constituencies, vast and varied opportunities and compelling necessities, for sustained and constructive work in the service of our country. The task of nationbuilding for which Parliament has both the continuing and ultimate responsibility, calls for the full exercise of your capacities of deliberation, analysis, constructive criticism, vigilance and dedication.

About a month ago I addressed the last session of the Second Parliament and bade them farewell. I then surveyed briefly the progress that was being achieved in different fields of our national life and effort. The country has made progress in many fields even during the short period between that occasion and now when I have the privilege to welcome you.

Our planned economy is the basis of our material development and of the maintenance of a dynamic, social and economic equilibrium. The Third Five Year Plan is in its second year and has made a good start. It is envisaged as a large-scale effort to build up our national economy, to increase productivity and employment and to ensure the development of society on the basis of justice, social, economic and political, as enjoined by our Constitution. The Plan must increasingly bring within its scope of implementation larger numbers of our people as participants in production with both skills and understanding of the national objective.

Pilot projects for the utilisation of rural man-

power were initiated some time ago. This rural works programme is being expanded and now covers 200 development blocks. Pilot projects for the intensive development of village and small industries in selected rural areas are also being taken up, the ultimate aim being to bring about a diversified and balanced economy in all rural areas.

My Government have also taken steps for setting up an Institute of Applied Manpower Research in Delhi. A scheme for the establishment of unemployment relief and assistance as set out in the Third Five Year Plan has been drawn up. A Central Institute of Labour Research is to be set up at Bombay. A substantial portion of the working force is also expected to be covered during the Third Plan period under the scheme of workers' education. This is meant to promote the appreciation of our national objectives, as well as the understanding of the basic principles and the acquisition of the knowledge and skills which would help workers to organise themselves.

Agricultural production is steadily moving up and the food situation in general is quite satisfactory. Industrial production maintains an upward trend despite power shortages in some areas.

In the field of Atomic Energy, the production of Radio Isotopes for use in agriculture, biology, industry and medicine has registered an increase. Radio cobalt produced at Trombay is now made available to hospitals in the country. Agreements of collaboration and development in the use of atomic energy. for peaceful purposes were concluded last year with Hungary, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Panchayati Raj which has caught the imagination of our people, it being so well in accord

91

with our traditions and our way of thinking, is to be implemented in four more States, bringing the total number to twelve.

The work on a second refinery in the public sector at Barauni is in progress. it will process two million tons of crude oil per annum. The first one million ton unit is scheduled to be commissioned within the next twelve months.

It is proposed to have a chain of pipelines from Nunmati to Siliguri and from Calcutta to Delhi via Barauni. In the western part of the country pipelines will link the oil fields with the proposed refinery, and a product pipeline will run from the refinery to Ahmedabad; also small gas lines from the oil fields to different power stations for transporting petroleum products in the cast and crude oil, gas and finished products in the west. These pipelines are scheduled to be completed within the Third Five Year Plan period. They will afford considerable relief to our railway transport system.

India has been elected a member of the Disarmament Committee of eighteen Nations and also of the Committee for the implementation of the Resolutions of the United Nations. No appreciable progress has yet been effected in the deliberations on disarmament at Geneva. The Conference is continuing its efforts, pending achievement of general and complete disarmament, to deal with specific issues such as cessation of nuclear test explosions, avoidance of surprise attacks thereby increasing confidence among nations, agreement on nuclear-free zones, a halt in the armament race. The Conference is also engaged on reaching agreement on the draft of a Disarmament Treaty. Its preamble is now under consideration. My Government will use their best and dedicated endeavour for speedy progress and the successful outcome of the Conference. In particular and as a matter of most immediate concern, along with other Nations, our Delegation will help to initiate and support proposals for the cessation of nuclear tests.

An interim Budget for 1962-63 was presented in the last Parliament and votes on account authorising expenditure for a part of the year obtained. A Budget will be presented again to the new Parliament in this session, with such changes as may be considered necessary, and Parliament asked to approve funds for the whole year.

My Government propose to introduce the following Bills :

Bills to implement some of the recommenda-

tions of the Law Commission; The Constitution (Amendment) Bills; The Atomic Energy Bill; The Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bills; The Patents Bill; The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill; The Industries (Development and Regulation) Amendment Bill; The Port Trusts Bill; The Oil & Natural Gas Commission (Amendment) Bill; The Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill; The Factories (Amendment) Bill; The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill; The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill; The Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill; The Working Journalists (Amendment) Bill; The Employees' Provident Fund (Amendment) Bill; The Employees' State Insurance (Amendment) Bill; The Wealth Tax (Amendment) Bill; The Finance Bill (No. 2).

Members of Parliament : This is the last occasion on which I shall address you as the President of the Republic. It has been a great joy and privilege for me to serve our motherland as the elected head of the people for over twelve years. I have had my share of parliamentary life and duties prior to acceptance of this high office and cherish the highest regard for and confident hopes in our Parliamentary institutions and ways. I have no doubt that you will maintain the high traditions established by your predecessors.

It is also our good fortune that our Parliament enjoys the respect of our people and it has become rooted in our political sentiments. While it derived its basic norms and procedures from the British Parliament, it has developed its own dynamism and it continues to do so, establishing its own conventions and methods born in the context of our own experience and needs.

As I said in my last address it is the objective and purpose of my Government to follow steadfastly firm policies and to implement effective measures to establish in our land a democratic and socialist society. Thus alone will national progress and increase in productivity be synonymous with social justice, and dynamic progress will be peaceful and our country will march with firmness and speed.

I now bid you farewell and leave you to your labours, confident that with your experience, your patriotic fervour and your sense of dedication to duty, the imperative call of the urgent tasks that await us will always and in full measure command your skill and dedication

I wish you well. May all of you and our Parliamentary institutions progress in strength and stability, inspire our people to more and more democratic endeavour and assist in the process of the growth of peace and international cooperation.

92

USA INDIA HUNGARY SWEDEN SWITZERLAND **Date** : Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri M. J. Desai's Statement

Shri M. J. Desai, Foreign Secretary, who was a Member of the Indian Delegation to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, made the following statement at the Conference on April 18, 1962 :

I would like to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for ceding his place on the list of speakers to the so that I may have the opportunity to speak before I leave this afternoon.

We have heard the presentation of the position of the United States, the earnestness with which the United States delegation has been attempting to arrive at an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests, and the various aspects of the draft treaty submitted by the United States and United Kingdom delegations.

Although I shall not be here during the later part of this morning to listen to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, we in our Foreign Office at home will naturally pay earnest attention and care to all the statements made here, and will study them very closely with a view to giving such instructions to our delegation here as will be necessary to help our general objective.

This morning we heard the impassioned appeal made by our colleagues from Burma, Ethiopia and Italy to the members of the nuclear Sub-Committee to continue their discussions and arrive at agreed arrangements for the ending of nuclear tests.

I would like to mention that at an earlier, informal session of the Committee, on 23 March, when we discussed the first interim report of the Sub-Committee, several delegations expressed their disappointment and concern at the failure of the Sub-Committee to report any progress towards arriving at a treaty. Speaking at that time on behalf of my delegation, I referred to a statement made by my Prime Minister that, so far as the Government of India is concerned, it is opposed to nuclear explosions by anyone, anywhere, at any time, and that we do not share the belief that it does not very much matter whether we arrive at a test ban treaty or not and that our main business is simply to go ahead with the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

I also stressed in the informal meeting of the Committee that in our view it would be very difficult to make any progress towards our major objective of reaching an agreement on a treaty for general and complete disarmament if a climate of peace was not maintained and nuclear test explosions were re-started.

Since then we have received various documents which we have carefully studied, and also the latest record of the Sub-Committee (ENDC/ SC.I/PV.4/Rev. 1), circulated on 28 March.

On behalf of my delegation I must frankly state that we are seriously disappointed and concerned at the continuing rigidity of the positions of both sides and the complete absence of any sign of negotiation based on mutual appreciation of the position of each other. What disappoints us most is the "Take-it-or-leave-it" attitude operative in the negotiations of the Sub-Committee, which is in striking contrast with the flexible and conciliatory attitude professed by all sides and actually adopted in the negotiations and discussions on other matters before the Eighteen-Nation Committee on General and Complete Disarmament.

From a perusal of the proceedings of the Sub-Committee it appears that the Soviet Union wants a simple agreement in terms of the draft on page 7 of its document (ENDC/11) basing the compliance with the treaty on national control systems and on trusting the States concerned to honour their obligations under the treaty. Mr. Tsarapkin put the Soviet position in the following terms:

"The epoch, or era, of international control has gone by, and we no longer demand that you should rely on us for control over compliance with the agreement by the Soviet Union, because we do not wish to rely on the United States for control over compliance with this agreement by the United States, should we succeed in reaching an agreement. On the contrary, we proceed from the opposite premise, namely, that we shall verify United States compliance with the agreement, while the United States and the United Kingdom will themselves verify, through their own systems, the Soviet Union's compliance with the agreement." (ENDC/SC. I/PV. 4/Rev. 1, page 37).

This position has been taken up by the Soviet delegation, although as late as 4 June 1961 the Soviet authorities, as the representative of the United States said this morning, stated in an

93

aide memoire to the United States Government that like the US Government the Soviet Government considered that strict international control must be established over the cessation of tests. Also, Mr. Zorin, speaking on 28 March in the Committee of the Whole, stated that the question of an agreement on the banning of nuclear weapon tests was a matter connected with the plan of disarmament. If that view were accepted, it would follow that, as in the case of other disarmament measures, the agreement must provide for detailed verification and control measures. The position of the United Kingdom and of the United States is that the agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests should provide for detailed verification and international controls, as given in their draft (ENDC/9). At the same time, President. Kennedy, in his message to Secretary of State, Rusk--which the Secretary of State quoted in his speech on 15 Marchrefers to the question of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests as a specific matter of high priority to be taken up as an initial measure. He said :

"As a third specific objective you should seek to isolate and identify initial measures of disarmament which could, if put into effect without delay, materially improve international security and the prospects for further disarmament progress, In this category you should seek as a matter of the highest priority agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban. At this juncture in history no single measure in the field of disarmament would be more productive of concrete benefit in the alleviation of tensions and the enhancement of prospects for greater progress". (ENDC/PV.2, page 16). No body could put it better. Also, in his statement on 27 March, Secretary Rusk said :

"Organizational arrangements must be worked out to put disarmament and verification measures into effect.

"Isolated mitial measures might be undertaken without such arrangements". (ENDC/ PV.10, page 21).

I have quoted the position of both sides and have given the various rather conflicting angles, as we see them, which confuse, at least, my delegation. I am not doing this in a spirit of legal casuistry or to emphasize the inner contradictions Of these positions, but to show that there are elements of basic common approaches despite apparent differences between the two sides, and that provided an earnest effort is made to arrive at an agreement, it should be possible to reach an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

It appears to us that there is on one side a fear of espionage which may involve a threat to the security of the State, and there is also the suspicion on the other side of secret violations of any agreement which would involve a similar threat to the security of the States concernedhence the insistence on one side on a national control system and on the other on an international control system. These fears and suspicions may, in the individual view of particular delegations be genuine or not genuine. They may not be genuine in the absolute sense, but they do exist and no negotiations can succeed unless a serious attempt ill, made at removing these fears and suspicions. This could only be done by one side offering a national control system--"plus", to remove the suspicion of secret violations involving risk to national security, and the other side offering international controls "minus", to remove the fear of espionage involving a similar risk to national security. It is sad to note that no such attempt at serious negotiations has so far been made by either side in the Sub-Committee. Surely, practical measures can be found to remove these fears and suspicions if there is a determination on both sides to reach agreement. The Defence Minister of India, in his statement on 20 March, threw out some suggestions for consideration-these were referred to by the representative of Ethiopia this morning, so I shall not quote them. "(reference is reproduced in the annexure to this text)". "Leaders of several other delegations have in the initial debate hinted at similar suggestions which would give the necessary basis for a compromise satisfactory to both sides. Suggestions have also been made this morning by the representative of Burma and the representative of Ethiopia. We understand that a number of delegations are prepared to make concrete suggestions for the consideration of both sides, in an informal manner, to bridge the gap between the two extreme positions, provided that members of the Sub-Committee are inclined to consider these suggestions and negotiate in a conciliatory and positive spirit. We feel that the opportunity should be given to the various delegations to assist the Sub-Committee of three with the necessary suggestions so that an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests may be arrived at fairly soon.

The importance of arriving at such an agreement has been specifically stressed in President Kennedy's message that I quoted earlier. A day or two before the beginning of the Conference, my Prime Minister referred to the importance of avoiding nuclear tests during the commencement and continuance of this Conference. The Defence Minister of India in his statement here

94

on 2 March, also stressed the importance of arriving at an agreement on this vital question to reassure public opinion that disarmament negotiations were being undertaken in earnest in this Committee. He said :

"We have no desire to exaggerate this problem of explosions, but it has got so much into the mental make-up and fears and apprehensions of people and nations that it has almost come to be regarded as the acid test of what the great countries are prepared to do. People ask themselves : if they are not going even to stop tests, how will they abolish weapons?" (ENDC/PV, 5).

The same point was stressed this morning by my colleagues from Burma, Ethiopia and Italy.

I would therefore, on behalf of my delegation, appeal, to the members of the Sub-Committee of three to approach this question, which is of high priority in our disarmament talks, in a conciliatory and constructive spirit, and to make a determined effort to reach an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

SWITZERLAND INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BURMA ETHIOPIA ITALY PERU **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement on Nuclear Tests

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in Lok Sabha on April 24, 1962 on the proposed resumption of nuclear tests by the United States of America.

The following is the text of his statement

I have received notice from the Lok Sabha Secretariat--calling attention notice-to make a statement about the situation arising out of resumption of nuclear tests by the United States of America and India coming under the fall-out pattern of these nuclear tests. I was asked to make a statement on this tomorrow. As I may not be here tomorrow, I seek your permission to say something briefly in regard to these matters.

First of all, if these unfortunate tests take place, there is likelihood always of the fall-out going in any direction. It depends on the prevailing winds; if there are large scale tests the likelihood is all the greater. But apart from that it is a matter of great concern to us that any such tests should take place. Unfortunately, last year, the prevailing-not a ban, but-agreement that tests should not take place was ended by the Soviet Union starting a series of tests and since then there have been some other tests by other countries. This almost mutual rivalry in having tests is, I submit most unfortunate, more especially when in Geneva a conference is taking place to consider, this whole question of disarmament, and particularly and separately the question of tests, while the conference is being carried on. When these matters are being discussed, if any tests are held, surely it will have a very bad effect on the conference and make any agreement exceedingly unlikely at least in the near future.

In fact, sonic of the unaligned countries represented in the Geneva Conference have put forward sonic proposals for the consideration of the nuclear powers and the nuclear powers have agreed to consider them. There is some gain. At least they have not rejected them outright. I would have imagined that as they are considering these matters any test taken before this consideration is completed would surely come in the way of that consideration.

I am not referring to the far-reaching consequences of these tests. It is said that every test has some harm following it. Hon. Members put questions as to the amount of fall-out and the radio-activity increasing. But possibly the radioactivity does not increase as much as the X-ray photographs taken show. But the point is, it is increasing gradually by all these tests and the time may come when it reaches a rather dangerous level. But a much more important point is this : that these tests may lead to a progressive deterioration in the atmosphere and a possibility of actual conflict, actual war. That is why the disarmament conference is meeting in Geneva and these tests lessen the chances of agreement and increase the chances of failure of the disarmament conference. Therefore, it is a matter of great importance and I am sure every Member of this House, and Parliament, will desire that these tests should not be conducted at least when this conference in Geneva is meeting. That is the very least that can be said. Personally I would say that they should not be conducted. Why are they conducted? Presumably for military reasons; presumably because each party thinks that by these tests it will discover some more powerful weapons and some more powerful way of

95

using the weapons that they have. It may be a military justification. But I would submit with all humility that there are other factors which are even more important than these military justifications. I am no military expert; I cannot say anything, more especially about the nuclear tests, but it seems to me common sense that if this rivalry continues, both parties may get more and more adequate weapons to destroy not only the other party but themselves and the world in that process. It does not lead to any satisfactory result.

I think I may say on behalf of this Kouse that we are greatly concerned about the prospect of the resumption of these tests, because there can be no doubt that if the United States resumes them, undoubtedly the Soviet Union will do the same. It is not a question of one party being more to blame than the other. I am not here to blame, but to beg and to appeal to the nuclear powers to refrain from having these tests, giving full chance to the Geneva conference to come to an agreement,

USA INDIA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Apr 01, 1962

1995

NEPAL

President's Speech at Banquet in honour of Their Majesties The King and the Queen of Nepal

Speaking at a banquet given in honour of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal, the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, said :

It is a matter of great pleasure and privilege to me to welcome in our midst tonight Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal, Her Royal Highness the Princess and members of the Royal delegation to India. The visit of the King of Nepal to India is, as always, of special significance to us. He is not merely the sovereign of a neighbouring State; he is also the ruling Head of a country which has age-old ties of friendly relations with India. As I said this afternoon, bonds of geography, history, culture and tradition have gone irrevocably to knit the two peoples together.

Both in political and economic spheres India and Nepal have common aims and ideals. The policy of the Government of India is to maintain friendly relations with all countries, and to pursue a policy of non-alignment with Power blocs. We have f-- doubt that the policy of the Government of Nepal is similar. Economically we share the common objective of building a social structure in which the ordinary man gets a fair deal and the welfare of the people is fully assured.

In this changing world, social and economic development programmes may require modification of old traditional ways of life and call for adjustments. We feel that mutual co-operation and goodwill will help us. to achieve our respective economic and social objectives quickly and without undue strains and stresses.

We consider it of utmost importance, in mutual interest, that existing friendliness between

our two countries should not only continue but that it should be placed on a secure and lasting basis, and we hope that the talks between His Majesty and our Prime Minister will lead to this desired result. It is only through frank exchanges of views that nations and peoples can come closer and mutual misunderstandings, if any, can be removed. On behalf of the Government of India, I would like to say that we have not the slightest wish to interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal. We attach great importance to the maintenance of close and cordial relations with the Government and the people of Nepal. It is our wish that Nepal should progress according to its own genius and traditions.

If nations today have come closer than they were ever before, it is also true that the concept of international relationship has undergone certain changes tending to make it an elaborate, if complicated, affair. At times nations may be faced with minor difficulties and irritants in their relations. In the very nature of things these are temporary difficulties. Any such difficulties between Nepal and India cannot possibly be different. They can be attributed only to the great social and economic changes taking place in both of our countries. These difficulties should not be allowed to make us oblivious of the fact that our common basic interests are identical and that the security, independence, and territorial integrity of each is of vital interest to the other.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I would now ask you to join me in drinking a Toast to the health of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal, to the abiding friendship between our two countries and to the happiness and prosperity of the Nepalese people.

96

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

NEPAL

Reply by His Majesty King Mahendra

Replying to President Prasad, His Majesty the King of Nepal said :

Your Excellency the President, Your Excellency Prime Minister Mr. Nehru and distinguished ladies and gentlemen,

We are very happy to get this opportunity to convey to the people and Government of India as well as to all the friends assembled here cordial greetings on behalf of the Kingdom of Nepal.

Our relations with India are not of recent origin, our relations with India are not just formal relations between two sovereign nations, our relations with India are historic. It is the common duty of both Nepal and India to advance them still further. Hence, it is but natural that the statements, propaganda and activities indulged in by certain irresponsible elements, designed as they are to promote their own narrow self-interest at the cost of the friendship long subsisting between the two countries, should inject alertness and vigilance into all those who are interested in maintaining the friendly relations between the two countries on a permanent basis.

Today, when the Kingdom of Nepal is taking strides along the path of progress in response to the demand of the times through the medium of the system of Panchayat Democracy conceived, advised and decided upon by the Popular will in accordance with the genius and traditions of our country, she looks forward to appropriate cooperation from all co-operative, friendly countries. The Kingdom of Nepal would also like to request all friendly nations not to give expression to comments on Nepalese affairs in an unfriendly tone and language without properly understanding them. Especially from countries that believe in the equal rights and respectability of all nations, big and small, and that have the honour of being the propounders and champions of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation and its principles as well as of the fundamental principles of Panclisheel and peaceful co-existence it is not unnatural to hope for such friendly, co-operative demeanour.

As is in every way becoming to neighbouring friendly nations with similar cultural and religious traditions. India and Nepal are animated by one and the same objective and guided by common principles and the governments and people of both have not failed to render help and co-operation to each other from time to time. We are, therefore, confident that the prospective or imaginary wedge sought to be driven by some elements, lacking in understanding and a sense of responsibility, between the two countries can be easily dislodged by means of mutually affectionate, sympathetic and open-hearted conversations. Let us all make a habit of being blind to one another's shortcomings and kind to one another's excellences because this is the key to the realisation of international peace and cooperation.

In conclusion, I propose a toast to the health and long life of Your Excellency Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the first President of India and a lasting friend of Nepal as well as to the abiding friendship between Nepal and India.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

King Mahendra's Speech at Banquet in honour of President Prasad

Speaking at a banquet given in honour of the President of India, His Majesty the King of Nepal, said :

Your Excellency Mr. President, Your Excellency Mr. Vice-President,

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen

We are naturally very happy indeed to have this opportunity of meeting you in such a cordial and pleasant atmosphere. We have accepted the invitation extended to us by His Excellency Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, and we have come to India with the sacred intention of further strengthening the peaceful and friendly relations between Nepal and India.

It is our declared policy t-- cultivate friendly relations with all friendly countries on a peaceful and friendly basis. It is not our policy to be within any power blocs, big or small.

The people of Nepal have a tremendous goodwill for India and her people. It is necessary that constant efforts are made to further strengthen the good relations between our two countries. It is our firm belief that responsible persons in both the countries remain vigilant not only to maintain but also to strengthen the good relations between Nepal and India, and that it is necessary such elements as are engaged in undermining the relations of friendship between our two countries are rooted out with promptness.

97

During our present visit we have the opportunity of exchanging views on matters of mutual interest with the Prime Minister of India in a very cordial atmosphere. We are happy to note that His Excellency the Prime Minister of India has specially emphasized that the Government of India do-not encourage violent tendencies and actions and deplore all the acts of violence and lawlessness. We have also exchanged views on various international issues on the basis of recognition of each other's interest and as there is a large measure of agreement on almost all issues, we hope that there will be increasing cooperation between Nepal and India in the various international conferences.

I wish to extend my thanks to the Honourable Shri Nehru for expressing appropriate ready cooperation to Nepal for the success of the development projects, land reforms and the Panchayat System of democracy developed by Nepal according to her plan and which has the unqualified support of all the Nepalese, within and without.

I would like to thank you, on behalf of the people of Nepal, for the goodwill and warm welcome shown to us by you in your capital.

I am happy to hear about the multifarious works of development in India and I extend my good wishes for the happiness and prosperity of the people of India. After this mutual exchange of views in a cordial atmosphere, we are going back tomorrow to Kathmandu in happy circumstances with the hope and confidence, that the root cause of the uneasiness in the relations of the two countries which has appeared very recently will be removed and our bonds of traditional friendship will grow even stronger.

Finally, I propose a toast to the health and long life of His Excellency Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Reply by President of India

Replying to King Mahendra, President Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

Your Majesties, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I feel much honoured to be present here for tonight's Banquet in response to the kind invitation of His Majesty the King of Nepal. I have known something of the traditional hospitality of our great neighbour, and quite a bit of the generous scale of entertainment observed by Their Majestics, for I had once the honour of having been their guest in Kathmandu for about a week some 6 years ago.

The friendly ties that bind India and Nepal together are so o-vious, reinforced by geography and sanctified by history as they are, that our people often take them for granted. The slightest discordant note in the flow of these age-old harmonious relations cannot but make us feel uneasy, if not unhappy. If such a thing has happened, one can only explain it by ascribing it to the stresses and strains of modernisation. After all, both of our countries have their roots in a hoary past, For ages both of us looked back for inspiration. With the impact of modern ideas and present-day needs and requirements and with the dawn of freedom in our countryluckily you have always been your own masters in Nepal-new situations began to arise.

Nevertheless, it is our duty to be vigilant and to see to it that the relations between India and Nepal not only continue to remain friendly as. hithertofore, but these ties are further strengthened. With goodwill on both sides and with the welfare of our respective peoples at heart I do hope that it would certainly be possible to get over whatever difficulties might come in the way of achieving this objective.

The hope that I have just now expressed has found welcome confirmation in the talks that Your Majesty and our Prime Minister have had during the past few days in an atmosphere of goodwill and cordiality. I am confident that as a result of these talks, our two countries will come still closer and the existing cooperation between our two countries in various development programmes for the betterment of our peoples' lot, will continue to increase.

I am very glad to know that apart from strengthening our mutual friendly relations, these talks also augur well for enhancing collaboration between India and Nepal in the international sphere for the preservation of peace and for the progress of all peoples.

Excellencies, May I now propose a toast to the health of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal, the continued friendship and good neighbourly feeling between our two countries and the happiness and prosperity of the Government and the people of Nepal.

NEPAL INDIA USA **Date** : Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Nehru-Mahendra Joint Communique

At the conclusion of the talks between His, Majesty King Mahendra of Nepal and the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru a Joint Communique was issued in New Delhi on April 23, 1962.

Following is the text of the Joint Communique :

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Majesty the King of Nepal, accompanied by Her Majesty the Queen, Her Royal Highness Princess Sarada Rajya Lakshmi Devi Shah, His Excellency the Foreign Minister and senior officials of His Majesty's Government, visited New Delhi from April 18 to 23.

His Majesty took the opportunity of this visit to discuss with the Prime Minister and with other Ministers of the Government of India a wide range of subjects covering relations between their two countries. Because of the natural affinities and traditional ties between Nepal and India, these relations are so extensive and close that they affect many aspects of the life of the people of both countries.

His Majesty told the Prime Minister about the situation created by certain activities which handicapped the efforts of Ms Majesty's Government of Nepal to execute their plans of social and economic development and introduction of agrarian reforms and about the misunderstanding between India and Nepal created by interested Nepalese. The Prime Minister assured His Majesty that the Government and the people of India were vitally interested in the stability and prosperity of Nepal as a strong and prosperous Nepal was vital to the security and prosperity of India. While freedom of expression was permitted in India, the Government of India were against all violent or unlawful activities of any sort.

The Prime Minister told His Majesty that it was important to give the people a sense of participation in activities connected with the country's development and explained in this connection the measures taken in India to extend' the system of panchayat government. His Majesty explained that efforts are being made in Nepal for agrarian reforms and the development of the panchayat system. The Prime Minister assured His Majesty of the Government of India's continued readiness to assist Nepal in appropriate spheres in furtherance of His Majesty's plans for the social and economic development of Nepal. His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed that peaceful conditions and ever increasing public co-operation are necessary for the attainment of these objectives, and that acts of lawlessness and violence are to be deplored.

His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed that both India and Nepal have a vital interest in each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and reaffirmed their intention to consult together on appropriate measures of mutual assistance at the request of either party. In this connection, Ms Majesty and the Prime Minister recognised the value to both countries of the assistance each had been rendering to the other.

His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed that propagandistic publications led to misunderstandings. Such misunderstandings should be removed and differences of opinion between the two Governments concerning facts settled when necessary by joint informal inquiries carried out by senior officials designated by the two Governments.

His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed

that their frank exchange of views had further contributed towards cementing relations between their two Governments and peoples. They had no doubt that it was the earnest desire of the people of both countries to maintain relations of mutual confidence and affection, and that all responsible persons in both countries would continue to work towards that end. His Majesty and the Prime Minister agreed to keep in touch with each other on matters of mutual interest.

NEPAL USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Malda Incidents

Speaking on a calling-attention notice regarding events in Malda in Lok Sabha on April 30, 1962 Prime Minister Nehru made the following statements :

Events have happened in Malda, certain unfortunate events, and grossly exaggerated accounts about them have been published in the Pakistan news-papers and, indeed, in foreign papers too. I am afraid I cannot in a brief statement say what has happened in Malda. We are getting more facts, but the accounts given about the large-scale deaths and casualties and migration of large numbers of Muslims to Pakistan, I am quite sure, are very grossly exaggerated.

Then, in Dacca and Rajshahi also incidents have happened, resulting in killing and burning,

99

arson etc. It is very difficult to get exact figures about these because just as on the one side they are exaggerated, on the other side they are minimised in the Pakistan accounts.

We do not wish to exaggerate or minimise all the facts. Both these incidents, in Dacca and Rajshahi and Malda, have been unfortunate; and it is no use exaggerating them or minimising them. We are trying to get all the facts. I do not think whether it would help if I gave some odd fact here and there. I cannot give some plete set of facts until further information reaches us.

100

PAKISTAN USA BANGLADESH **Date :** Apr 01, 1962

May

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordMay 01, 1962Vol. VIIIMAYNo. 5

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on		
Foreign Affairs	101	
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on		
Pakistan-China Boundary Negotiations		105
Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate		
on President's Address	106	
Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha		
Debate on President's Address	108	

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on denial of facilities by Chinese Government to Celebrate Indian Republic Day

111

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CHINA PAKISTAN INDIA

Date : May 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement In Lok Sabha On Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on the Ministry of External Affairs' grants, the Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in Lok Sabha on Foreign Affairs on May 14, 1962

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

An Hon. Member talked about the European Common Market and this business that is going on and said that the dominant interests in the Commonwealth are doing this. I do not know what he considers dominant interests except, of course, United Kingdom, because all the other members-Canada, Australia, etc.--are very much against the European Common Market, against the United Kingdom coming into it.

The fact to be remembered is that the European common market may be good for those who are in it, and may be good-I do not know; it is not for me to judge-for United Kingdom. It is not good for us. It will do us some harm. More important than that, this is a first step in a particular direction, the direction being a certain measure of growing political solidarity between those countries. I do not know what this will lead to. But, I fear it will not lead to anything good. I am talking about political solidarity. That, of course, is for England to decide. It will have certain conesequences on the Commonwealth. I do not mean to say that the Commonwealth will break up. I do not like things breaking up. Anything which might do some good should continue. But, its influence will become less ultimately.

I did not quite understand when somebody said that we should have Government to Government approach to Pakistan. What does that mean unless he means Prime Minister-President approach? Government to Government approach we are always having. One Government deals with the other Government daily.

TIBET

An Hon. Member, in the course of his eloquent address, also referred to the grave mistake we made about Tibet. We thought about Tibet and discussed it many a time. I entirely fail to understand what else by an iota we could have done than what we did. I do not just understand that: as, if Tibet was something in our pocket which we handed over to China: I cannot understand it. There was nothing else that we could do. Practically or otherwise, even if we had foreknowledge of events and knew what China did subsequently in our border areas, what else could we have done?

An Hon. Member : Was it not pointed out during the debate when it took place that it was according to you or a publication published by your Ministry that there was a cipher mistake between the words sovereignty and suzerainty, whereas your instructions to your Ambassador Shri Panikkar were that he concede suzerainty and because of cipher mistake, sovereignty was conceded? It has been said. I produced this document in the House on the 7th of December. You did not say anything.

The Prime Minister : May be. There was no mistake unless it was a deliberate mistake of the Chinese Government. We certainly used the word suzerainty. I do not know if it is possible to translate suzerainty and sovereignty in the Chinese language separately: I do not know. They do not use the English language: they do not understand it. Anyhow, if we used it. how could we force that down them? They proceeded by sending armies to Tibet. Either conquest or fear of military action led the then Government of Tibet yielding to them and signing a treaty. Where do we come in? We went on saying, let us say, suzerainty and they did not accept. It is not a question of our conceding this or that. We, in our correspondence with them, talked about our acknowledging the fact that they had suzerainty over Tibet historically in the various periods. They did not accept that. Leave out what they said-in fact, they did not accept-what do we do about it? We go about in the world carrying on agitation that they say sovereignty and we say suzerainty?

PONDICHERRY

About Pondicherry, the latest information is that the French Government have introduced a measure in their--I do not know about their complicated Constitution-Foreign Affairs Com-

101

mittee or some such committee about the de jure transfer of sovereignty. A kind of Bill has been introduced, but I cannot say, having long experience of these matters in regard to Pondicherry, how long, it will take lo pass.

An lion. Member : The bill is pending there on the legislative anvil in France, with regard to the de jure transfer of Pondicherry. And this matter has been hanging fire for a long time. So we can take steps to extent] our Constitution, since the Bill has been introduced in the French Parliament already.

The Prime Minister : What steps can we take? It is completely in our possession. It is functioning under us. The only steps we can take are to bring forward a Bill here or in Parliament to make it a part of the Union of India and allow them representation here. That is the only thing that they do not have; otherwise, they are completely with us.

So far as the right of appeal is concerned, I think we have done that, or we are in the process of doing that. The only thing remaining almost is this representation in Parliament. And we would prefer to do it naturally with the good-will of France. If we cannot do it that way, it is a different matter, but we prefer to do that.

France, as Hon. Members will know, has passed through a very extraordinary period during the last seven or eight or ten years, with Governments changing so often. Now, the present regime of President De gaulle is a firmer Government, presumably, but it has had a great deal of trouble. And whenever we have approached them as we have approached them often enough, they have said, 'Yes, of course, we agree with you, but please wait a little; we have got our own troubles.' Take, Algeria, for instance. The question is we have to decide whether it is" worthwhile ignoring them altogether and taking some steps. it was not worthwhile. When we have Pondicherry, and we can do what we like, except for some constitutional measures, it 'is not worthwhile to irritate a great country like France for that purpose, especially when a short while ago we were told that they are going to ...

An Hon. Member: Some time ago, the French Government had given us very specific indications which were reported to Parliament that in the very near future-at that particular point of time-they were going to bring in legislation for the legal transfer of the territory to India. Have the French Government forgotten that promise or gone back on it? Is there any information on that in the Prime Minister's possession ?

The Prime Minister : 'Some time ago' refers, I think, to probably September or October last. It is in furtherance of that promise that they have put in this Bill now. That is what they say. This is a little later.

Algeria has been referred to, and Algeria has been a very difficult problem from the French point of view, and it was difficult for us to press very hard that ignornig all other difficulties they must go ahead, but we have been pressing it forward, and I hope that this will now be done.

ALGERIA

Now about Algeria, it was a possibility sometime ago, before the recent agreement between France and the Provisional Government of Algeria, that there was some value in recognising the Provisional Government of Algeria. It was purely a gesture it meant nothing else. It was a gesture, bringing some pressure on the French Government to recognise that Government, to deal with that Government and to come to an agreement. That was the whole point. Now to say that we must do it has no value at all; it has a great deal of the reverse of value.

Now certain processes have started. There is no question of bringing pressure on France. The present problem is to put an end to the violence, to the terrorism of the OAS. That is common ground between the French Government and the Algerian Nationalist Government. The only thing that can come in the way of the fulfilment of the process that have started is this extreme violence. For instance, there has already been a referendum in France. That is over. A referendum is to take place in Algeria early in July-in two or three months. But it is a possibility that the violence grows so much that it is difficult to hold a referendum. That will come in the way.

Today it is to the interest of both France and Algeria to put an end to this violence; otherwise, not only will the Algerian agreement not be implemented, but the French Government itself may fall. This is much against the French Government. It cannot possibly face the future; if it cannot do it, it will have no prestige left. In fact, the whole violence is aimed at making the French Government fall. Therefore that is the first objective of both these Governments. At the present moment, there is a Joint Executive in Algeria, party Algerian, party French, for this interval of two months or so.

Now, there is no particular value in recognising this Algerian Government. We are as a

102

matter of fact, for practical purposes, dealing with it. We deal with it directly, in so far as we have to deal with it.

We all agree about the tremendous sacrifices of Algeria. We are all with it, of course. But the point here is a technical point, of acknowledging a Government. Normally, one does not acknowledge a Government which does not exist in the soil of the country that it is governing. it is only acknowledged in war, when there is an emigre Government functioning to harass the enemy. De Gaulle's Government was an emgire Government and the British Government recognised it when the Germans were occupying France. But one recognises Governments which are functioning in the soil of the countries which they are presume to govern. That is the basic thing. You may recognise it as gesture, and if it is in the balance good you may do so.

At the present moment, what is functioning there is a joint executive government of the French and the Algerians. The Algerian representatives have been appointed by the provisional government. The provisional government has been acknowledged by the French Government. They deal with it; they came to an agreement with it and they are trying to implement that agreement. Now, to do something which may--it would not upset the agreement by itself--come in the way we deal with the french people, which may come in the way of that agreement will not be desirable.

I should like, very briefly to touch on two or three matters. An Hon. Member referred to the speech of Shrimati Indira Gandhi in Canada, which was reported. It is a manifestly incorrect report because one particular aspect of it was something about the massacre of the Portuguese. It is the other way about. She said that if people went there unarmed, the Portuguese would massacre them, as they had done previously in small numbers. There is no question of massacre of the Portuguese. Who is going to massacre the Portuguese, if unarmed people go there. So, you have to face the contingency of our own people going there unarmed in large numbers--several thousands beings massacred by the Portuguese. That would have created a situation which our Government could not tolerate.

DISARMAMENT

There are two matters which I should like to say something about. One is the Chinese border and then there is disarmament.

About disarmament it is difficult for me to go

into details now. because the matter is being discussed. So far as the nuclear tests are concerned, the 8 neutral countries presented a proposal which both the major parties said they would consider. They are considering that; they have not come to any decision. I think they will agree to something which stops these nuclear tests.

As for disarmament also, it is a complicated subject and I cannot discuss it in 5 minutes. But the presence of the so called neutral countries in this disarmament committee hits been undoubtedly of value. The value, first of all, is that the whole tone of the discussions in this committee has been different from the one on previous occassions. Now merely because of the presence of neutral countries, there has been very little strong language used by anybody. They have all spoken, more or less, gently to each other and there is a general spirit of accommodation, trying to find something. But there is a definite barrier, a gap which they cannot cross which they might cross any day. Till they cross it they will always take a strong line, about crossing it.

Secondly, the neutral countries' presence there --they have made various suggestions-has opened out various avenues of thought which has helped the committee. But it has not helped it sufficiently to cross that barrier which divides the two sides, the barrier ultimately being one of fear and dislike and distrust of each other.

In fact I may say that I believe they will sometime or the other come to an agreement because there is no other way but to come to an agreement. The other way is going gradually towards something like annihilation of each other.

Another important question which lies behind disarmament is the Berlin issue. In regard to the Berlin issue it is said that much progress has been made in talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two principal parties. Another important development is that the German Chancellor, Dr. Adenaur does not like this progress to be made and there has been some difference of opinion between him and the American Government. However it may be, if the Berlin issue is solved there is no doubt that a very big step will have been taken.

BORDER QUESTION

Now coming to the border question it is very easy for some Hon. Members to talk-some new

103

Members, I would say, lest the old Members might suspect I am referring to them-bravely of our border and say that we should do this and that As every one realises now, any war between India and China is going to be tremendously disastrous affair. What is more, it may well become interminable because I do not see any easy possibility of either party defeating the other. Warring what for? Well, for certain pieces of territory, important though they may be, but some pieces of mountain territory Therefore, one tries to avoid war because war would be disastrous both for India and China. it is our policy to avoid war unless it is thrust upon us but whether we avoid war or not, we have to be prepared for it and we prepare for it to defend these areas and to recover them. How to recover them short of war? If one is prepared to recover them and one is strong enough, other things also help in the process and it is possible that those things plus our preparation for any action may result in some kind of agreement for these areas to be liberated. Therefore to say that we will not talk to the Chinese Government is not right. But to talk to them we must talk to them on some basis and not just talk to them on the air. What basis can there he? We had suggested at one time that they should withdraw according to our maps and we should withdraw according to their maps leaving the area in between which is unadministered it does not very much matter because it is 'mountain area where very few people dwell. These are important and strategic areas but no administration existed there and none is necessary for the time being. I had suggested and I had further added something a little later that in regard to the northern Tibet-Aksai Chin where they built a road and which was used as a caravan route, they might use that road for civilian purposes for a temporary period till we discussed this matter and prosumably came to an agreement or not or whatever it might be. All this was for a temporary period. This was to enable as to talk to each

other and discuss the matter. So, I had said they should withdraw according to our maps, which meant withdrawal from the vast area which they have taken, and our withdrwal according to their maps. This applies, may I say, entirely to the Ladakh area and not the eastern area at all, because we are not going to withdraw in the east. In the Ladakh area, it meant a very small withdrawal for us--a few villages--and it meant a large withdrawal for them.

I had said that for civilian use, as they used to before, they could continue to use the Aksai Chin road for a temporary period. I think that was a very fair offer which they did not accept. I still think that is a fair offer. That would immediately give us a base for talks, because, without a base, one cannot talk merely repeating our respective claims. The only other basis was the basis of the officials' report. On that basis I was discussing it.

I do not know if it is worthwhile my putting before the House some general considerations. We live in a turbulent, dynamic and fast changing world, and one hesitates to take a step which might make it much more turbulent. We live in a world which is fast changing economically also. Our country is fast changing, and we would not like to do something which will stop that change or reduce the pace of that change. Much has happened in our country during the last few years. Much has happened in China. We have heard how a great leap forward was there in China. We have also heard of considerable going back in China. There is no doubt that, because, not only of bad harvests but for other internal reasons-economic and othewise --there has been a great setback in China.

What is very interesting is that the great attack that took place in the early days of this new regime there, on what might be called the ancient Chinese civilisation, the traditional Chinese culture, has largely ceased or anyhow there is a reappearance of the traditional culture. Even Confucius is talked about now. He was banned; and there is a certain feeling of disillusionment of youth. There has been no political reaction or political relaxation there at all. The tension is still there, but, nevertheless, there is a certain relaxation in life generally. It is a period of retreat from the extreme step taken previously and a certain craving among the youth for some of their older culture. This may change again, of course.

But I am merely pointing out that whatever happens in China-China being a very great country, very great not only in size but in background and in culture--is bound to have a powerful effect on the world, and these changes are being watched very closely. Our merely ignoring these facts and thinking of a quick military solution of this very difficult problem before us is perhaps not wise.

But it is wise and essential that we should think of military steps lest others fail. That is why we have been engaged in road-building building up our military apparatus, etc. Till that is done, our indulging in some adventure would not be wise.

104

USA AUSTRALIA CANADA PAKISTAN CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE INDIA ALGERIA GERMANY

Date : May 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lek Sabha on Pakistan-China Boundary Negotiations

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in Lok Sabha on May 7, 1962 on a calling attention notice regarding the reported decision of Pakistan and China to negotiate alignment of the boundary between Kashmir and Chinese Sinkiang :

On the 3rd or 4th May, that is, three days ago, simultaneous announcements were made by the Governments of Pakistan and China to the following effect. They said that the firm boundary between China's Sinkiang and the contiguous areas the defence of which is under the actual control of Pakistan had never been formally delimited and demarcated in history. With a view to ensuring tranquillity in the border and developing good-neighbourly relations between the countries. they say, the two sides have agreed to conduct negotiations so as to attain an agreed understanding on location and alignment of this boundary and to sign on this basis an agreement of a provisional nature. The two sides have, however, agreed that after settlement of the dispute over Kashmir between Pakistan and India, the sovereign authorities concerned shall reopen negotiations with Chinese Government regarding the boundary of Kashmir so as to sign a formal boundary treaty to replace the provisional agreement. This is what they have said.

Now, I need not tell the House that Kashmir State as a whole is an integral part of the Union of India and this announcement of the Chinese Government to deal with Pakistan in regard to that part of Kashmir State which is occupied by Pakistan, occupied unlawfully according to us, seems to us an interference on the part of China in India's sovereignty over Kashmir, legal sovereignty and the acceptance by the Government of Pakistan of the Chinese Government's view that this boundary has never been delimited and demarcated in history and their willingness to demarcate it now is -- I do not know-sounds rather an opportunist attempt to take advantage of a particular position, oven though this might involve changes in the well-known boundary which has been known to exist for a long time. Obviously in these high mountain ranges boundaries are not demarcated on the ground. There are some places which have not been reached by human beings, some mountain peaks; and others have been reached occasionally. Therefore, they are not demarcated. They are divided by various features and various understandings like watershed, etc. We have made it perfectly clear even in the past both to the Pakistan Government and the Chinese Government about those parts of the frontier now in possession of Pakistan that we would not recognise any arrangements arrived at between them and Pakistan. I have stated the other day in the other House that a little more than a year and a half ago when I was in Pakistan I discussed this question or I raised this question with President Ayub Khan with his

Foreign Ministers and others present in a friendly way, because China was encroaching upon us and part of that boundary was at present under occupation of Pakistan. I wanted to know exactly where the Chinese were on that part of the boundary, and if they had given any trouble to Pakistan, what steps Pakistan had taken to meet the situation. There was an area-Hunza areaand the Mir of Hunza claimed it; he had called upon the Pakistan Government-and protested to the Pakistan Government that the Chinese had occupied sonic grazing areas there belonging to his original State, Hunza, which is part of Kashmir territory.

This matter had come up before us too before and we had examined all the old papers and we had found that this was an old dispute between the then Tibet Government and the Government of India through the Kashmir Government. The British Government, after due enquiry, had not accepted the Mir of Hunza's claim to that particular grazing area, and therefore had refused to intervene in this matter. That refers to a particular spot, the grazing area, and not to the whole frontier.

I may point out to the House that this matter came up before us, and I wanted to know what Pakistan's attitude was in this matter. Therefore, I raised it with President Ayub Khan and told him of the old papers we had. He agreed with that-that particular area-the grazing area of Hunza. He said we cannot lay claim to that in the circumstances when the British Government had given it up.

Nevertheless, the major question remained about the border there--what the Chinese authorities were doing to it. It seemed to me that both sides were not fully cognizant of the facts of the situation. Such facts as we knew were a little more than they knew. We knew that area. We discussed it. I showed them our maps and later they sent their maps which differed slightly, not much

Anyhow, I have given this past history just to keep the House informed, that we treated the Pakistan Government in a friendly way in this matter because we thought that any action which they might take should be in line with the action we were taking in regard to this border, and should not conflict. Unfortunately for various reasons they have come to this agreement with the Chinese which is an interference on both sides with India's legal rights in the matter.

An Hon. Member : May I know whether the Chinese decision to deal. directly with Pakistan can be interpreted as mute acceptance--I mean the provisional agreement also--of Pakistan's stand on Kashmir by China?

The Prime Minister : Not entirely I think, because. as I have read out, they said that two sides have further agreed that after the settlement of the dispute over Kashmir between Pakistan and India, the sovereign authorities concerned shall reopen negotiations with the Chinese Government regarding the boundary of Kashmir so as to sign a formal boundary treaty to replace this provisional agreement. The idea apparently is that some kind of provisional agreement should now be arrived at between China and Pakistan about the boundary. This refers to the boundary west of the Karakoram pass, and they have apparently accepted the fact that when this matter has been, according to them, settled between Pakistan and India, then the sovereign authority of the area should sign the legal treaty.

CHINA PAKISTAN USA INDIA TUNISIA **Date :** May 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on President's Address

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement on Foreign Affairs while replying to the Lok Sabha debate on President's Address on May 2, 1962 :

NUCLEAR TESTS

....Now, while this is happening and a search is being made for some way to put an end to this horror of nuclear tests and piling up of armaments, we have again the beginning of further nuclear tests. I should like to read out to you what this 'nuclear test' means. This is a letter from a very erminent professor and a Nobel Prize winner-Professor Pauling, who is Professor of Chemistry at the California Institute of Technology. He has sent this letter to the New York Times, which has published it. It says :

"Prof. Pauling mentioned 'two principal reasons for objecting' to the present atmospheric test series. One, this act would 'decrease the chance of success of the 17-nation disarmament conference and would hence increase war danger through increasing the probability of a devastating nuclear war. The other is that the tests themselves would do damage to human beings not yet born'."

We associate damage with some frightful thing happening before our eyes, a house falling and all that. The kind of damage that nuclear tests do, apart from in actual war where of course, there will be cities destroyed, is this radio-activity which damage millions of human beings not yet born. Here it says :

"According to a 'rough estimate', by him, the total toll of the current atmospheric tests in terms of 'genetic damage' will be 'about 3 million' deaths. He added : 'I have estimated that the recent Soviet atmospheric tests will,. if the human race survives, reap a toll approaching 20,000,000 grossly defective children and embryonic and neo-natal deaths. President kennedy's statement assures us that the number of children sacrificed to the proposed American tests would not be so great. But should we not be concerned about polluting the atmosphere with additional radioactive materials in Such a way as to cause even a few tons of thousands or hundreds of thousands of defective children and of embryonic and neo-natal deaths?"

I do not know enough to say whether this

happens or not. But here is a man who is a very eminent scientist, a Nobel Prize winner and a specialist in the subject. Even if there is a chance of this happening, it is a terrible chance. And, this is when tests are undertaken. If that is the way, you can multiply that by any figure you like because the whole surface of the earth will be affected by it.

Therefore, it has become of the most vital importance that disarmament should take place, and the first part of disarmament is for these tests to stop because they are actually doing injury, and the biggest injury they do is to make disarmament itself more difficult of achievement. Of course, everyone knows that anything that comes in the way of disarmament is fear, and apprehension that the other may go ahead and if these tests continue, this fear and apprehension will grow.

Hon. Members may perhaps know--it was mentioned in the press-that I received a message from Mr. Bertrand Russel (now Lord Russel) some days ago suggesting that we should do something here, not only to protest against these tests but, to some extent, to try to prevent them. He suggested that we should send a ship to Christmas Island where the tests are likely to take place as our very presence will deter the country concerned from continuing these tests. And, please remember, it has been quite clearly stated that if the United States Government

106

carries on these tests, there is no doubt at all that the Soviet Union will also carry them. So, we will have a double doze of them in various parts of the world, and each will be an incentive to the other to do more.

I cannot understand, I do not understand the military significance of them. It is said that they increase the military power of a country, new weapons are forged and new methods of using old weapons. Anyhow, Mr. Bertrand Russel suggested that I should send a ship to the Christmas Island.

I am a great admirer of Mr. Bertrand Russel ever since my boyhood. I might say that when his books came out, they affected me very much and many people of my generation. I admire particularly his crusading zeal in this matter. But the more I thought of his suggestion, the less I understood how I could send a ship to Christmas Island.

It is obvious I could not send officially one of our warships. Mr. Bertrand Russel himself realises that. He suggested as an alternative that we may send a tramp or some other ship with some people in it. I have not yet been able to understand how I can do it. Who will be the tramp crew ? Will they be volunteers ? Who will engage them or send them ? So, I find myself unable to act up to this suggestion, even though I entirely agree with the urge that he has.

I have appealed previously here in this House, and I would appeal again to the great powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union to desist from nuclear tests. Even if we are not certain of the saying of a man of high knowledge like Professor Pauling that it is a crime against humanity, it is a crime against the survival of human race. So, I do submit that even though we are dealing with our national problems this matter is more important than any national problem, national growth, national advancement etc.

BORDER PROBLEMS

Coming to some other problems which are national and international, I come to our difficulties in our borders which was referred to some hon. Members. I believe there is an amendment too, saying that the President has said nothing about our border problems. Hon. Members will remember that only a month ago the President delivered another address to a joint session of Parliament about these border problems. The fact that he did not refer to that again in this address a month later did not mean that he did not attach, or the Government did not attach, any importance to that : only, he did not wish to repeat what he had said recently.

Our border problems are in the main two; Pakistan and China.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, we have almost learnt to live with it and the problem in the hope that some time or other it will solve itself because we have not seen at any time any effort to solve it on the part of Pakistan. To us it almost appears that they wish to keep it alive for such reasons as they might have.

KASHMIR

Even now when I speak here the matter is being considered--the question of Kashmir has been raised by Pakistan in the Security Council and is going to be discussed in the next few days again. I am not going to talk about Kashmir here because it is riot fitting that we should discuss it here just when the Security Council is discussing it. But few international problems can be based on such lack of truth as Pakistan's case is in regard to Kashmir right from the beginning. It is true that, even as Hitler said, go on repeating an untruth or a lie repeatedly and it will produce some effect on people. It may produce some effect.

I do not pretend that we are terribly virtuous, but we do avoid telling patent lies and we do avoid shouting at the top of our voice all the time because we consider it rather indecent. It is a little difficult for us to catch up with Pakistan in this kind of behaviour because fundamentally we think that in the Ion- run that behaviour does not do much good, and it so. India's patience and India's more courteous behaviour has produced an effect in other countries.

DACCA AND RAJSHAHI

At the present moment apart from Kashmir we have had further communal troubles in East Pakistan and in West Bengal. I do not wish to say much about them.

Many Hon. Members have wanted to know what has happened in Dacca and Rajshahi. I could give a few facts as to now many people are supposed to have been killed. We cannot be positive; we do not know how many houses have been burnt and all that. But unfortunately all this business only incites communal passions on this side or that. In Malda this happened. It was grossly exaggerated, as I said, by the Pakistan authorities. There is a reaction to that. Communal passions were excited in Rajshahi and Dacca and some people were killed or stabbed and many houses were burnt. It is easy to blame each other for these things but not profitable and it does not produce the atmosphere which we would like to produce. We can't deal with these matters by shouting too much or by cursing each other. But it is unfortunate that the whole policy of Pakistan appears to be to keep this tension up, and in a sense we play into its hands if we help in keeping up this tension. It is a very frustrating experience, not to-day, but for the last fourteen years.

We had hoped when partition took place that the two neighbouring countries with so much in common-in fact, not so much in common, we are of the same blood, same bone and blood and flesh-would be friendly to each other, would help each other and co-operate with each other. Instead of that, we have had to face the enmity of Pakistan throughout.

All over the world their chief activity, of their diplomats, appears to be to run down India. We cannot compete with that and go about running down Pakistan, because we do not think that that is right. And in their own country too, instead of talking as we do about our Five Year Plans, about economic progress and about other matters, the main topic that is raised there is fear and hatred of India. How a country can progress, basing its policy on fear and hatred, I do not know.

CHINA

Then there is China. Well, I must frankly say that there has been no improvement in the situation in our border. I think it would be correct to say that since October last there has been no material change in the border situation. A patrol may come a little this way or that way; that is no material change.

This House sometimes learns about our protests to China, about what they have done. They do not often get the large number of protests that we have received from China about what we do on the border. The fact is that we also take many steps to strengthen ourselves, to make fresh posts. If you start thinking, as the Chinese do-they start on the assumption that the territory in Ladakh, specially in the Aksai Chin area is theirs and has been theirs-well, everything that we do there is an offence to them. But if we start on the basis of thinking of that territory as ours, as it is then everything that the Chinese do is an offence. It depends on with what presuction you have started.

So far as our case is concerned, it is fairly well given in the Report of the Officials which hon. Members probably have seen. I am glad that at last this Report has been published in China, after a year, and people read it.

We are, of course, chiefly concerned about our own internal condition, but China is at present also afflicted by many things, chiefly by repeated bad harvests. And it is a terrible thing, with such a huge population, for harvests to fail.

And with a growing population, each year the growth of Chinese population requires an additional-I believe-three million tons of foodgrains, just for the additional part. Now, you can imagine how this goes on piling up every yearthree million plus three million, 'that is six million, then nine million and so on. And unless foodgrains are grown adequately there is continuously a very grave difficulty, an explosive situation.

Now, in spite of our strained relations with China nobody wants the Chinese people to starve and not to have enough to eat and thus create these explosive situations. Broadly speaking, we do not want-we dislike exceedingly-a war with China. But, that is not within our control. Therefore, we have to prepare for all contingencies.

Many questions are asked here and I find it difficult to answer them, because, the answers I give are really or may be helpful to the other party. It is not my desire to keep any information from the House. In fact, we have given practically everything. But, it has so happened that the information we give in the House has been used against us by the Chinese Government and the Chinese authorities. One has to balance these things. I do believe that relative to the position, we are stronger today-than we were and we are growing stronger to face-it. Whatever action we may take, we have to have behind that a certain strength. That we have built up.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA PAKISTAN INDIA BANGLADESH **Date :** May 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on President's Address

Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on international affairs in reply to the debate on President's Address on May 3, 1962 :

KASHMIR QUESTION

.... There is the Kashmir question in the Security Council. This matter has been brought fup before the Security Council as a matter of urgent importance. For six or seven years it had not been there and suddenly it cropped up and it was said to be very urgent. Why ? Because it was stated that India was on the point of marching on Pakistan or on that portion of Kashmir occupied by Pakistan. Therefore, it had

108

become very. urgent. Now, if I may say so with all respect to the leaders of Pakistan, they knew very well that nothing of this kind was going to happen. They have the habit of making statements which have no foundation whatsoever.

It is absurd to imagine that India is going to march an army over that part of Kashmir that they occupy. However, they made this a matter of great urgency. We had no particular objection to it, except that we saw no benefit coming out of this debate in the Security Council. Only it was likely that the speeches would embitter our relations still further. That is why we were against it. Otherwise, we had no objection.

Now, after making this tremendous plea for hurrying, lest something should happen, a date was ultimately fixed a few days ago. Mr. Zafrullah Khan delivered an address which he did not finish that day. Then, the next date for him to continue that address was a week later. Suddenly the element of hurry was absent now.

Now, this being settled to take place week later rather upset our programme or rather the programme of our Defence Minister who had to speak on our behalf. He had work here. He had gone there for three or four days to answer the charge and come back. So, when he arrived here, he was told that he had to stay there a week to listen to the concluding part of Mr. Zafrullah Khan's speech. He naturally said that it was very awkward for him. He had important work here and with great difficulty he got the date shifted by one day. Thereupon Mr. Zafrullah Khan said-he did speak on the new date fixed---that he had not been. given enough time to prepare his case.

Now, this is very extraordinary, Sir. Here is a matter, a pending matter, which for several years had not been there. He has been preparing his case and wanting it urgently. Then suddenly because the date was fixed a day earlier than he wants, he is not prepared, he says, to put forward his case, because his clerk is not there or something has happened.

This whole Kashmir matter is before the Security Council. In so far as Pakistan puts it forward, is so-I do not quite know what the proper term would be for me to use-unrealistic and it has so much to do with shouting and. abusing and untruth.

Now, Mr. Khurshid, who rejoices in the title of President of the Azad Kashmir Government, has threatened us recently again that they will resort to war to liberate "Indian-held territory."

Mr. Zafrullah Khan, in the course of his speech in the Security Council, has said, among other things, that a second tribal invasion of Kashmir will take place if the Council failed to find a suitable solution.

Now, Sir, we have got definite information that for some months past the Pakistan authorities have been registering names of tribesmen for 'khasedars' on a monthly salary of Rs. 54. Nearly 5,000 men had offered their services, but actual recruitment has not yet taken place. These figures are for one small bazar area only. Probably it is taking place elsewhere too.

These tribals were invited first to a function as 'khasedars', that is the name used for the local levants who function in those areas from the British times. They asked these 'khasedars' to serve in their own areas and they agreed to that salary. When they were told that they had to go to Kashmir they were not at all anxious to go there, as perhaps they were likely to meet the Indian army there. So, many have withdrawn their names. But my point is that here they go to the Security Council with these threats. threats of tribal invasion, threats of war. And I would beg this House to consider how far their whole attitude, that is, the Pakistan Government's attitude, which is unrealistic, because they know that if any such thing happens, there will be war, an all-out war.

Unfortunately, all their strength consists in the military aid they have got from the United States. If they had not got that aid, they would probably talk in a much lower key. And by their threats they seek to get more aid from the United States. I should like the United States Government, which I respect greatly, more especially under its present leadership, to consider the effect, and how they counter-balance their own policy by the military aid they give to Pakistan.

SINO-INDIAN BORDER

Then, Sir, secondly, I would like to refer to the Chinese border. I would like to mention that in today's papers or yesterday's, it is stated that the Chinese Government Published twentytwo notes exchanged between the Governments of India and China during the last four months and the Report of the Officials. Now, we have not got these papers and it is not quite clear whether the Report or the notes were published in full or extracts from them. There is some mention in today's papers about the latest Chinese note to us. This note has not arrived yet in full. We have received a summary of it by telegram, and I should not like to deal with it in detail till we have seen the full note. But the position is that this Chinese note and those some other notes have been protesting vigorously against what they call our intrusion into their territory. I should like Hon. Members

109

here to keep this in mind when they talk so much and draw attention to Chinese intrusions; how the Chinese look upon the position, bow they think we are all the time attacking them or preparing to attack them.

The fact of the matter is that some time ago, some years ago, a year or two ago, it was decided that we should avoid, that is, both parties should avoid sending patrols so as not to have conflict, military conflict. It was not exactly an arrangement, but it was mentioned. We told them even then that we had every right to end patrols on our own territory and not send across that. But therein lies the difficulty. What we call our territory they call their territory, so that they send patrols into our territory. We object to them and we send patrols. They say : "You are coming in our territory". They go on protesting, and we have therefore continued to send patrols and we have established a number of check-posts too. Sometimes the check-posts are behind their check-posts, behind their fines It is not a straight line. And this has rather annoyed them. Our progress is this way, and hence this last note. There is nothing to be alarmed at, although the note (from the telegraphic summary) threatens all kinds of steps they might take. If they do take those steps, we shall be prepared for them.

One rather interesting thing I should like to mention. I have seen in a Pakistan paper. In that, the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has said that he is not aware that the Chinese have occupied any part of India. It is rather extraordinary how limited his information is of the fact which is known all over the world. But apart from his other information, when I went to Pakistan a little over a year and a half ago-I went to Karachi and I went to Murree and Pindi. In Murree and Pindi I thought that I might discuss this Chinese question with President Ayub Khan and let him know-I did not want to discuss so much on our border-what the position was on that part of the Kashmir boider on which they were at the present moment; having occupied a part of Kashmir, they have to face the Chinese. So I told them of our maps, I showed them our confidential maps as to where we thought the Chinese were and where we were, and asked them what the position of the Chinese was on their side of the border.

Well, I did not get much help from them because I found they knew less than I did even on that side of the border. But we did discuss it, and it is most surprising that the Foreign Secretary who, I think, was present at that time, said that he knew nothing about those matters at all.

NAGAS

One thing more. It has appeared, I think, in the Press today that a Naga group of about 150 persons have managed to enter Pakistan crossing Indian territory, probably about 60 miles at its narrowest or more round about Cachar. We had heard that they were going there some days ago, and we had alerted our people; still it is not easy. When people go in driblets, in twos and threes, through forests, they manage to get through. They did come into conflict, with our forces and some of them were shot down by our police force, but in the main they got through. Why they have gone there, I do not know. It is possible that they might have expected Mr. Phizo to be there. They have gone to help him or welcome him.

According to our information, Phizo is still in London, and there is no immediate possibility of his going there, though of course he might. Anyhow these Nagas, about 150 of them, after some casualties, managed to enter Pakistan and apparently they were in touch with the Pakistan people, because some Pakistan troops met them at, the other end. They disarmed them, I think. Whether I could call it "disarmed" I do not know, it is not perhaps quite correct. Anyhow they left their arms there and then went with them. These Naga groups have lately been pressed hard by our security forces and have been driven right up to the Burmese frontier and some beyond that. The Burmese soldiery came into contact with them, and I do not exactly know what is happening, but they are in contact with them and at one time we learned that they surrounded them. Perhaps it is somewhat exaggerated. It is possible that our four airmen are with those people in Burma at the present moment.

TIBETAN REFUGEES

One thing more. In a communique issued by the Chinese Government it is stated

"As a further evidence of Indian had faith the paper quoting a despatch from Taipeh, Formosa, stated that some 2,000 Tibetan youths recruited from refugee camps in India were about to undergo special training in Formosa so that they might become the future leaders of Tibet".

It is absolutely wrong. We have, as everyone knows. a large number, about 30,000 or so of Tibetan refugees here. We have been particularly interested in giving opportunities of education and training to the young people among these refugees, and we have tried to settle them more or less permanently.

110

most of them are being settled in agricultural areas. Naturally we cannot settle them everywhere because they cannot stand a very hot or a very wet climate. Fortunately the Mysore Government gave us a piece of land, about 3,000 acres or perhaps more, I forget, where 3,000 of these persons have been settled. The Orissa Government is giving us another patch of land and the Madhva Pradesh Government also. So, we do not want to send too few of them but enough in numbers to lead a community life and keep up their own traditions as well as modem things. We have in fact, rather deliberately, taken them away from the frontier. There are some in the frontier working at the roads etc., but most of them are away and many of them will also be removed.

So this story, which has appeared in the Chinese press communique, is completely wrong. I do not know where they get their facts from. The editorial also took exception to the recent visit of the American novelist, Miss Pearl Buck, to Darjeeling. Miss Pearl Buck certainly came here on behalf of an American Society to help these refugees, and she visited some of the refugee camps. The editorial ended with the words :

"The United States imperialism and the Chiang Kai-shek gang are making active preparations to enable Tibetan serf-holders to ride once again on the backs of the people of Tibet."

Well, whatever may happen in the future, at present it is pretty obvious who is riding on the backs of the people of Tibet.

DISARMAMENT

Finally, Sir, I should refer just briefly, to the Disarmament Conference or Committee which is meeting in Geneva and to the test ban talks. Behind the Disarmament Conference there is the Berlin question. It appears, one might say, that the Berlin question is, in a sense, approaching some kind of solution. The solution is not obvious, but still one has a feeling that it is approaching a solution. If it does manage to get solved, it is a great thing and disarmament itself will be easier. Anyhow, disarmament has become now something quite essential. It is not like anything which may or may not be. There is no escape from it. The escape from it is only the escape into war. There is no middleway. And so, both from the point of view of saving the world from war, saving future generations and utilising these vast sums that are spent on armaments, for the betterment of humanity, it is essential that disarmament should take place.

Meanwhile, we have to face this question of tests, of a ban on nuclear tests. Unfortunately, nuclear tests have begun again. I have no doubt that the military people who hold strong opinions about the tests, they may be right from the military point of view. I don't know, but I do think and think strongly, that in such matters, military opinion cannot be the overriding factor. They simply think in terms of being stronger than the other party. Even that is not, if I may say so, very intelligent, when each party thinks the same way and makes advances in the same direction. But where strength has become almost useless, in the sense of protecting yourself, because both parties are strong enough to destroy each other and a great part of the world, then some other way has to be found, and this testing and thereby finding some new weapons and stronger weapons, is certainly not the way. That is not the way, because apart from the harm it does, as I said elsewhere, eminent scientists have said that millions and scores of millions of unborn children are affected by it.

You do not see the harm as in an earthquake, but the genetic effect of it is tremendous, of maimed and distorted and idiotic children, not now, but gradually. But apart from that, these tests make any agreement on disarmament much more difficult and that is the tragedy. I still earnestly hope that these tests will be stopped and more effort will be made to arrive at something, some understanding in the Disarmament Committee. Even in that Committee, the distance that separates the two main protagonists is not too great. They are getting nearer. But still suspicion and fear come in the way. I don't know how one can get rid of then except to decide to take the risk, because the danger of not taking the risk is the greatest risk of all.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA UNITED KINGDOM BURMA PERU SWITZERLAND GERMANY

Date : May 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Denial of facilities by Chinese Government to celebrate Republic Day

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on May 22, 1962, on a calling attention motion regarding the reported denial of facilities by the Chinese Government to the Indian Embassy in Peking for celebrating the Republic Day this year.

It had been the practice for our Embassy in Peking to hold the Republic Day Receptions in the Golden Hall of the Peking Hotel due to the

111

comparatively better facilities that were available there. This practice had continued unbroken ever since the establishment of the Embassy. However, when arrangements were to be made to celebrate the Republic Day on January 26, 1962, the hotel authorities were visibly uncooperative in their attitude. The appointment with the hotel authorities asked for by the Embassy on the 6th January was finally given only on the 9th January 1962. During the interview the official in-charge while acknowledging receipt of the Embassy's letter of the 4th January' 1962, wherein a request had been made for holding the Republic Day Reception in the hotel as in the past, merely stated that it was not possible to say whether the hall would be available or not and that the earliest that a reply could be given would be by the 20th January 1962, i.e., 6 days before the Reception was to be held. The Embassy was also informed that the charge per guest for snacks supplied by the hotel would be 2.50 yuan per head instead of 1.25 yuan per head as in the past.

Due to the above attitude of the hotel authorities, it was decided to hold the Republic Day Reception this year in the Embassy premises, in spite of the attendant difficulties. After this had been decided and all arrangements made, a telephone call was received from the Peking Hotel authorities on the 17th January 1962 offering the use of the Golden Hall for the Republic Day celebrations. The Embassy, in reply, informed the hotel that due to the latter's "vague and uncertain reply" to the Embassy's earlier enquiry, arrangements had been made for holding the Reception in the Embassy premises and that the hotel's services were not required.

The change in the Chinese attitude was apparently the result of the adverse reaction created in the diplomatic corps and generally in the foreign community resident in Peking. Apart from the above, the Embassy had also difficulty in procuring microphones, etc., for the Republic Day Reception. This difficulty was solved at the last moment after repeated requests had been made to the Diplomatic Personnel Service Association of the Foreign Office. Similar difficulties are understood to have been experienced by our Embassy at the time of the Republic Day and the Tagore Centenary celebrations in 1961. However, in these instances the obstacles had been cleared on the personal intervention of the Ambassador who had appealed to the Director of the Asian Department of the Foreign Office.

The Indian Missions in China and Tibet continue to be subjected to severe restrictions. Members of the Indian Embassy in Peking are required to obtain prior permission of the Chinese authorities to visit any place over 20 kilometres from the centre of Peking. The permission is not given for visits to important agricultural centres, communes, industrial establishments and other towns. There are difficulties also in the recruitment of local staff. The restrictions in Tibet are even more severe and the freedom of movement of our representatives and staff is severely curtailed.

112

CHINA INDIA USA TOTO **Date :** May 01, 1962

June

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Jun 01, 1962 Vol. VIII JUNE

No. 6

CONTENTS

PAGE

1. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- A. Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament 113
- B. Prime Minister's Reply to Debate on Foreign Affairs 116
- 2. INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna' Menon's speeches in the Security Council on Kashmir 124

- 3. PAKISTAN
 - A. India's Protest Note 139
 - B. Trade Talks between India and Pakistan: Joint Communique 140
- 4. PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA India's Protest Notes

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

141

INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA

Date : Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament

Initiating the debate on foreign affairs, the Prime Minister made the following statement in Rajya Sabha on June 23 :

Recently, an event took place in India which

has certain importance from the international point of view. That was the Anti-nuclear Arms Convention held in Delhi. I think that this was an important Convention and it dealt with a vital matter. Indeed if one looks at the world today and the arms that have been accumulated and that go on being accumulated and the danger of war, almost every other question, national or international, sinks into the background compared to this ever-present danger of a war and a war which will be so terribly destructive that it might put an end to civilisation and humanity as we know them. I hope that what was done at this Anti-nuclear Arms Convention will attract enough attention elsewhere in the world-I believe it has attracted a good deal of attention. It was essentially an Indian Convention but we had the advantage of the presence of some eminent people from outside, from the U.S.A., from the Soviet Union, from England and from some other countries.

At the present moment I was wondering if some symbol could be found for the modern world. Every age might be designated by a symbol, just as a country might also be. The present age probably would be designated best by the symbol of mushroom cloud which comes out of an atom bomb, It has become the recognised symbol of the atom bomb and of nuclear warfare and to live under the shadow of this cloud-the possibility of such a cloud arising-is to live a life which is not civilised. This leads me to the question of these nuclear tests because ultimately it is not merely the avoidance of nuclear tests that will put an end to this danger-because there are vast numbers of nuclear bombs accumulated in various countries notably in the U.S.A. and in the Soviet Union-but ultimately there has to be an assurance of a world without war. Some people may say that it is an idealistic concept. The world has never been without war, but the world has never lived with nuclear bombs as its bed-fellow almost. You have to meet this situation and there is no way out. There is no doubt that a war will lead to the use of nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons will largely destroy the world. as we know it.

It is true that even if we stop the tests, the war may occur. Even if we stop the manufacture of nuclear weapons and destroy those that we have got, there is a chance, if war occurs, of those weapons being manufactured again by industrialised communities. Ultimately we have to aim at a world without war. There is no choice left-either survival or extinction. But to aim at that as a far-off thing as logical, hut to aim at that as the first step is difficult. So we work for disarmament. Even in the matter of disarmament, although some progress has been made at Geneva, it is still rather faroff. The immediate change that we have to face is this question of nuclear tests. Nuclear tests make disarmament more difficult, make it more dangerous and the possibility of a conflict increases because a conflict depends more on fear and distrust as well as preparation for war than on anything else.

I do not know how many lion. Members present here saw the two films which were exhibited to the members of the Anti-nuclear Arms Convention. One was a Japanese film and the other I am not sure whether it was American or British. Both dealt with nuclear war and they were horrible films-not horrible in the sense of horrible things that were shown there, that is true--but the whole possibility, that it might occur was a horrible idea and all our arguments and ideologies sink into insignificance before this possibility.

So far as nuclear tests are concerned, we are arriving probably, I imagine, at the end of the present series of American tests. I do not know if the Soviet Union, as it is said, will have a series of tests now. It is difficult for me to say. But even if they have these tests, I imagine and experts tell me that this series of tests by the U.S. and by the Soviet Union will probably end for a long time to come-this testing business-because they have achieved their purposes.

113

they have got such scientific and technical knowledge as it was possible by these tests. But either very soon or after some tests have been undertaken by the Soviets, there will be a stoppage of them. Thus, virtue will come out of necessity but it is a very painful truth that we have arrived at a stage in the world when Powers, Great Powers, can play about with these weapons and simply because they are afraid of the other, Power, they take the risk of annihilation of mankind.

ALGERIA

Now, Sir, during these past months two pleasant developments have taken place. One is the agreement about Algeria between President de Gaulle and the Algerian Nationalist Movement. No country that I can think of even in history has suffered quite so much, offered so much sacrifice for its freedom as Algeria. It is said that one million of them had died in this struggle apart from the millions who have been injured or who have suffered by being driven out of their country. In a country with a population of ten-millions, this is a tremendous average and all our heart goes out to these brave people who have suffered so much. I hope that within a few days, possibly early, in July, the referendum or plebiscite will take place in Algeria, and there can he no doubt about the result of that, and that it will be followed by the establishment of the independent State of Algeria.

The great problem in Algeria now is how to meet the terrorism of the O.A.S., the secret army there. I do not know how far it is true but it is said that some kind of agreement has been reached between the Algerian Nationalists and this secret army of Frenchmen. Now, there have been fewer outrages by the Secret Army Organization in the last few days. It is obvious that by these terroristic tactics they are not going to frighten the Algerians or the French authorities. Having gone thus far, no Government in France and certainly no government presided over by President de Gaulle is going to surrender to some terrorists. We must realise this. Well, we have criticised many of the French activities in Algeria. This gives us a picture of the reality and the difficulties President de Gaulle had to face among his own people, not amongst the Algerians, in coming to an agreement with the Algerian Nationalists and I think we must extend to him our congratulations that he adhered to his decision and ultimately came to an agreement with the Algerians. This is the first thing we welcome.

LAOS The second is the settlement in Laos between the three Princes. Now. I speak without full assurance because we have had settlements before and they have broken down when somebody objected to them but I hope that this settlement will lead to a national government in Laos in the next few days and that will at least end the conflict in Laos, and this will no doubt have some effect over the whole Indo-China area, including Viet Nam which is in a state of high tension. Recently, the Commission there, the International Commission of which India is the Chairman, presented a Report. I cannot say much on the Report because it has not yet been published-It has been sent to the two Co-Chairmen, the United Kingdom and Russia but this I shall mention that they have pointed out infringements of the Geneva Agreement by both sides and the result is that both sides are annoyed at this Report.

An Hon. Member : The Prime Minister has said that violations by both sides have been alleged in the Report. Would he please give us some details or some idea of those violations ?

The Prime Minister : I cannot because, as I said it is a confidential document. I gave you this idea but I cannot read out portions of the document. On the one side, it is well known that American troops have landed there which is patent, nothing to hide and, on the other side, things there are not so patent but have been held to be violations of the Agreement.

The development in Laos resulted in the American authorities sending troops to Thailand. The SEATO suddenly came into action. All this time-the SEATO has been in existence for some years-it has not functioned at all. Suddenly if functioned. It chose a moment for functioning when it was least necessary to function. However, various countries sent their armies or air forces to Thailand to protect their border with Laos. As far as I know, there was no danger to that border and now that the people in Laos have arrived at a settlement among themselves, there can be no danger to the border and I hope that these forces in Thailand from other countries will be removed.

CONGO

In the Congo, the position is one of stalemate.

In December last a settlement was arrived at between Prime Minister Adoula and Mr. Tshombe at Kitona. During this settlement a declaration was made by Mr. Tshombe. It was a good declaration but very soon after he followed

114

his own practice of going back on his declaration and there the matter stands now in stalemate. Mr. Tshombe only believes in adequate pressure with some sanctions behind them. He made that declaration because there was great pressure on him. The moment the pressure was lessened he withdrew from it. It is obvious that the United Nations can only succeed in making Mr. Tshombe act up to his declarations by making it clear to him that they will take action against him, action including the use of force, if necessary. Unfortunately, he has got into the habit of getting some support from various quarters outside the Congo, I mean in other countries, who piously declare that there must be no force used against him and thereby they allow him to carry on in his peculiar ways.

Now, in regard to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, there has been an adjournment for a month. Their only positive achievement has been an agreement of a draft preamble to the Treaty, an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a good preamble but other difficulties remain. It is difficult to say what the result of this Conference on Disarmament will be but it is making some progress however slowly.

INDO-NEPALESE RELATIONS

Indo-Nepalese relations are more or less satisfactory. I would not say that they are cent per cent satisfactory as we would like them to be, but the visit of the King of Nepal here on the whole improved those relations. Recently we had a request from the Nepalese Government that in accordance with what we decided in our Joint Statement we should have a joint enquiry into some events in the border. We have agreed to that.

KASHMIR

Then, there is a matter which must be in the'

minds of many Members here and that is the discussion going on Kashmir in the Security Council. Hon. Members will remember that this matter was brought up a' little while ago before the Security Council as an urgent and immediate issue because according to Pakistan India was thinking of an armed attack on Pakistan.

It was a fantastic notion. Yet that was made the reason for going there because there is no other apparent reason why they should hurry this. For five years the matter has not been there and suddenly it has come because of this alleged reason and this alleged reason has of course no basis. Then that discussion took place there for a few days. Nothing happened; now it has again been revived there and I do not know what the result will be today or tomorrow but I must say that the course of events there thus far has been unsatisfactory, rather unpleasing.

It is very difficult for all of us, I believe, and certainly for me, to realise how any country, any representative of any country can fail to understand the basic issues involved in Kashmir; not only the legal issues, not only the constitutional issues which are quite clear and admitted that the Pakistanis or those who came under their shelter, the tribals, invaded Kashmir and committed loot and raping there after Kashmir had acceded to India-that is the legal and constitutional issue-but the practical issue which is raised in Kashmir, which is of vital consequence to us and I believe indirectly to Pakistan also is whether we should adhere to our policy of secular State or we should not. Pakistan of course is not a secular State. It is a conflict between those two ideologies and I do not pretend to say that all of us are secular-minded or that all the Pakistanis are antisecular-minded. Both are incorrect but there is such a thing as policy.

We have followed a policy for a long time and gradually it is becoming a part of the texture of Indian life in spite of the difficulties; in spite of breaches of that occasionally, it is the basic fundamental policy of India and I do submit that there can be no other policy for India constituted as India is. Even in theory in the modem age there can be no other policy because any other policy would mean the reversion to some medieval concept, but apart from that, India being constituted as it is, any reversion to that would mean India remaining backward and instead of devoting her energies to progress, spending her time in internal conflict. Indirectly-not directly but indirectly-this question comes up when we consider Kashmir because the whole argument for Kashmir on behalf of Pakistan is that Kashmir being a Muslim majority area must necessarily go to Pakistan. We have never accepted that arguments even for the partition of India; although it was raised, we never accepted it; we accepted a certain geographical argument and therefore practically speaking anything that we do which hurts that arguments hurts the whole concept of India we have had and brings about enormous trouble in India and Pakistan. That is why we have strongly said that we cannot possibly agree to any such think. I greatly regret that other

115

countries not perhaps realising the ultimate issues involved, are taking up lines which I think are quite wrong.

CHINA

On our border with China the position is broadly speaking more or less the same as it has been except that, as I have said previously in answer to questions in this house, we have made some considerable improvement in our position. That improvement does not justify any complacency but whether any action is contemplated or whether even apart from any action any operations are contemplated, they can only come from an improved position. The building of roads has gone on apace in those mountain areas and we have opened a number of new check-posts which give us a certain advantage. But whether it is China or whether it is Pakistan, or any other country, we do not wish to have war unless it is forced down upon us. In regard to Pakistan we have repeatedly stated that we are prepared to have a no-war declaration; that is to say, that every question between Pakistan and India must be settled or even remains unsettled but we will not go to war. It is Pakistan that has not accepted this. The India-China frontier raises far more difficult

problems for us. However we may solve them ultimately-and I have still not given up the hope of being able to solve them in a peaceful way-we have to he ready for all emergencies and that is what we have been doing all these years.

INDIA USA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND JAPAN ALGERIA FRANCE LAOS CHINA THAILAND CONGO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEPAL PAKISTAN

Date : Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Debate on Foreign Affairs

The following statement was made by the Prime Minister in Rajya Sabha on June 23 in reply to the debate on international situation

KASHMIR

Since I spoke this morning, news has come to us about the fate of the discussion about Kashmir in the Security Council. It appears that a resolution was introduced in the name of Ireland; the Irish delegate introduced it. It was supported by the permanent delegates, that is, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Formosan China and two of the South American States, Venezuela and Chile and it was opposed by two neutrals, Ghana and U.A.R., and opposed also by the Soviet Union and Rumania.

Now the opposition by the Soviet Union that has voted against is called loosely a veto. What the Charter of the United Nations desires is that the five permanent members of the Security Council should vote together in a resolution. If one votes against, it is called a veto-it is non-voting or voting against. Any how the Soviet Union voted against it. As a result, as it was called, it was. a veto by the Soviet Union, and it is supposed to be the 100th veto that the Soviet Union has exercised in the last fifteen years. A long, long discussion has taken place about this matter in the Security Council, and our representative, our Defence Minister, spoke at some length expressing his deep sorrow that this Resolution should have been brought forward and, more especially, that Ireland should have brought it forward. And others also spoke. Now the Resolution is over and the proceedings are over. But it is a matter for deep regret to me that repeatedly, when matters concerning subjects which concern us greatly, about which we feel rather passionately almost, subjects like Goa and Kashmir, it should be our misfortune that two great powers, the United States and the United Kingdom, should almost invariably be against us.

In a matter like Goa every Member of this House knows how strongly we felt about it and how, in spite of our feeling. we delayed any action till it was almost thrust upon us by circumstances. Yet, this was made an occasion for reading to us homilies and lecturing to us as to how we should behave properly in international matters. In regard to Kashmir also, I suppose, in the course of the last fourteen or fifteen years, the facts relating to Kashmir have been so often stated that they must be known, at any rate, to responsible people who speak in the Security Council, and yet, the patent fact that it was India that brought this matter before the Security Council and brought it complaining of aggression by or through Pakistan has not yet received the full-blooded attention of the Security Council. Always India and Pakistan have been placed, notably by those two powers,

116

on the same level. "It is a dispute", they say, between two quarrelling people. and they should sit down and settle it." We are prepared to sit down at any time with anybody, even with people who have done wrong. But this approach has been extraordinary.

The United Nations' Commissions have come here, individuals have come here; we have got

about ten fat printed volumes connected with Kashmir. In spite of this, these patent facts have not been realised by them in the Security Council as one would have hoped for. So the only other conclusion one could come to is that having realised them they do not like them because they have made up their minds to go in a certain way, to decide something in a particular way, and facts are not importantthe fact of aggression, the fact of accession, the constitutional aspect, the legal aspect about which I said something. But, quite apart from all these aspects, there is also the fact of the consequences of any action that they suggest.

Now we are reminded of the Resolutions passed in 1945 and 1949 by the United Nations Security Council and the Commissions they sent, which we accepted. The very first thing in that Resolution was that Pakistan should vacate. Then other questions arose. Now it does not strike the distinguished representative of the United States or the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom to lay stress on the fact that Pakistan has not vacated and has not carried out the Security Council Resolution for these fourteen years, and they always go on saying that India has refused to have a plebiscite. We agreed to a plebiscite, and I have no doubt we would have had the plebiscite then and there if Pakistan had withdrawn its forces, and in the normal course steps would have been taken. But they never withdrew their forces--that was an essential part. Now I am not going into the Kashmir issue here, but I express my deep sorrow that this should be so. As an Hon. Member just said, the United States, in addition to this fact, or, may be as a consequence of it-I do not know which--gives military aid to Pakistan, which leads to all kinds of consequences. It leads to an aggressive attitude on the part of Pakistan, constantly speaking in term of war. Almost every day or every other day in the Pakistan newspapers there is- something about some kind of aggression on India, being thought at, if not by regular armies, by' tribal hordes which, consequently, produce reaction on Indian opinion for India feels so strongly over this issue.

Well, any person would realise that giving this armed aid to Pakistan is likely to hurt India, not only to hurt us mentally but physically hurt us and drive us into spending more and more. We are getting aid for civil works and we are very grateful for that aid. But at the same time other steps are taken, like the military aid to Pakistan which compels us, out of our slender resources, to spend more money on defence. All this is very illogical and I really do not understand how these great statesmen of the United States and the United Kingdom fit in all this in their thinking. They are democratic societies and they are pushed hither and thither by the pressure of public opinion or by lobbies or by their Parliament as we are. I wish they would realise that there is such a thing as public opinion in India, there is such a thing that no Government in India can ignore. It is only to some extent that it can press the public to go this way or that way. Things are done in regard to matters to which we are passionately devoted which hurt and injure that public opinion very much so-and which, unfortunately, create a result which we do not want. This creates doubt in our minds about the goodwill of those countries towards India and unfortunately the work done for years, the work of creating that goodwill which we value so much is washed out by a stroke of pen or a vote given, or by a speech given.

The speech given on the occasion in the Security Council by the distinguished representative of the United States about Goa hurt us, annoyed us, irritated us, angered us. It had nothing to do with the facts. It was based simply on certain assumptions and, I regret to say, probably, to the dislike of India and all that India stands for. And now the same distinguished representative tells us what to do about Kashmir not realising that Kashmir is flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, and all that we know about the facts and about the law are in our favour. However, there it is. Unfortunately, much of the good that we have done in regard to relations with countries--I would not say it is washed out because good work always remains and brings its own resultthe immediate effect of it is lessened. And I have no doubt that we shall now have a plethora of good advice from newspapers in America as to how we are not behaving property in Kashmir and how the Soviet Union has misbehaved by voting against the matter.

MIG PLANES

In this connection I might deal with the issue the so-called M.I.G.s. Now, the facts are simple. At no time did I think that this would become the major international

117

issue. Our Defence Forces, perhaps rightly or perhaps not-I do not know-were agitated ever since the United States gave these Sabre Jets to Pakistan. No Defence Force is ever satisfied with what it has. It wants to make its position more assured. So they were pointing out that in certain respects Pakistan was stronger in the air than we were and they wanted naturally the latest type. For my part I believe, as a practical proposition, it is better to have a second rate thing made in our own country than to rely on the first rate thing which we have to import and which may stop functioning for lack of spare parts or anything. Therefore, our policy has been to make things and we have succeeded very largely. The Defence Minister has particularly laid stress on this and our manufacture in our Ordnance factories has grown up tremendously.

Apart from that we have made right from scratch a very fine supersonic aircraft in Bangalore with the help of a very eminent German Engineer. But to reproduce it, to make more of it, takes time. It will take two or three years before any numbers are available. If we have them, we would not require anything else. We have made the Avro almost from scratch. We got the blueprint from England and we have made such a good transport plane that some of our nearby foreign countries want to buy off even before we have made it. So, we are concentrating.

So, when our Defence people felt anxious, we thought immediately of the manufacture of a plane rather than merely buying it. It is get terribly expensive buying these goods, and we have to buy to begin with. But we do not want to continue this process. Fortunately, we have got the most excellent engineers and mechanics in our Air Forces, those who are in charge of the Avro being made at the Hindustan Aircraft Factory. They are first class men. And what is more to the point, they are men with enthusiasm for their job. not merely as a professional job, but they like building up things for India. So, this was the position. We examined various other planes. We had plenty of information about supersonic aircraft, American, British, French. Some of them were flown by our people too, and they gave us their report in regard to them.

Meanwhile some of our first class Engineers were sent by us to the Soviet Union to enquire whether they could make an engine or supply us with an engine for our supersonic aircraft made at Bangalore because the engine we had got from England for It had ceased-not that engine--they had stopped making that type of engine for various reasons. It had nothing to do with us. We were suddenly hard put to it. So, these people were sent out to find out about the engines and they remained there for some weeks, carefully examined the engines, talking, discussing. The engine that the Soviet Union offered us was excellent but it did not fit into our aircraft. They said, "Change the aircraft". We said, "No. We cannot change the aircraft. You change the engine." There was a long argument as to which was to be changed. Ultimately they agreed to change the engine to fit in the aircraft. That is the present position.

Only about four or five days ago another team of officers has gone to Moscow about the engine, to decide about small matters as to how that engine is to be fitted in. While this team was previously there, they were interested as experts La the M.I.G. There was no offer from us, no suggestion from us. To my knowledge, certainly, I do not know anything about it, but they enquired about the M.I.G. They saw it. They wanted to offer it. They discussed with the engineers. And it may interest you, Sir, to know about the new language that is growing up, the language of science and technology. To our surprise, our engineer, who does not know a word of Russian, but who was a very good engineer, discussed with the Russian engineer without any interpreter in some technical language, which I do not understand, for quite a long time. This language is developing, technical language, words, etc. So, these people when they came back, they reported to us. About the M.I.G. they said that for variety of reasons they thought that the M.I.G. was a good proposition for us. So far as the performance is concerned, they said, it is about the same as the American or the French Mirage, but it was probably more suitable for us. It was meant for rougher work. It could land on not very special airfields but ordinary fields, ordinary airstrips. And it was easier to manufacture. It was not so sophisticated and so complicated as the American or the Mirage was. That is important because although we have developed a great deal in our technology and in our manufacture of aircraft and others. still obviously we cannot compare ourselves with experienced technicians in America or in Russia or in England when it is a sophisticated thing. And they said that from the ease of manufacture also the MIG was desirable, apart from other reasons. Their performance was the same and the price was much less. That is the first we heard of it. Well, we discussed It amongst ourselves. And just then somehow--1 forget how

118

-it got out into the press, not only in the press here, but in the press of England, America, and may be in other places, and then to our great surprise there was a tremendous noise elsewhere. We had not looked upon it in this way. We thought it was relatively a simple operation of our buying anything that we chose to.

Now, may I go back a little and tell another story about the purchase of aircraft from the Soviet Union ? About six years ago we were again confronted with the fact that Pakistan had got some aircraft from America and was ahead of us and we were Worried about it and we wanted some aircraft, not to manufacture them--we did not think of it-but just to buy them. And among the things proposed to us was some Ilyushin aircraft, fighter aircraft, which we might buy from the Soviet Union. Now, till then we had not bought any aircraft except from England or America or France. We had not gone outside that charmed circle. Now, it so happened that a Minister of the United Kingdom was here then -I forget who he was. Anyhow, he was here and we discussed it with him. He said, "You a-re going out and if you buy these Russian aircraft"-there was no question of aid, mind you, this is a new question which has arisen-"it will hurt us very much. We have dealt with each

other all this time and now you go outside and buy abroad." So he pleaded against it. We had, in fact, thought of Russia only because the British people had refused us delivery. They could not supply us with that type of aircraft. Then he said, "No, we shall go and see to it that you get it" although previously, to our enquiry, they had said they could not. Now they said they would get it. Well, rightly or wrongly, we decided to buy English aircraft then, when they promised to give us these in quick time.

An Hon. Member : When was this, in point of time ?

The Prime Minister : About six years back, I think. And at that time. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdomnot the present Prime Minister, but his predecessor-saying something about this, because he had written to me, I think, and I replied to it, and we said that we would not give up the freedom to buy anything from where we like and when we like, and that should be admitted. In the present case, we said, as you are prepared to supply what we want-previously you were not-we will buy it. I added that because of our relations, if we want to buy anywhere else we shall previously let you know and consult you and then decide, the decision being ours. This happened some six or seven years ago and I had practically forgotten it, because there was nothing very important about it. But I am mentioning it now because when this question arose in this case, I was reminded of this letter and told that I had promised to consult them and to give them a chance before we came to a final decision. I told them that we had consulted our experts and they had considered various aircraft in England, America, France and Russia. They are good aircraft-it is not for me to say-out some are a little more complicated, some are a little more sophisticated, and some are simpler. That is the position.

Now, it is patent that no independent country and certainly not India, can agree to the proposition that our purchases of aircraft or anything can be vetoed by another country. It is an impossible thing to agree to. And nobody has said that to us, I must say that. No one has mentioned this. They have all agreed that we can buy where we like and what we like. Nevetheless they expressed their regret and sorrow that we should go and buy elsewhere, other than from their own markets. And behind it all, although it is not said as a threat, is the question of aid. "Aid will be given," they say, "we shall try our best, it will come," and so on. Nevertheless, as someone said, although there are no strings attached, something happens that is in its very nature, some kind of a thread, it may be a thin thread, but something which may have a certain psychological effect. We are quite clear in our mind. We have not considered the matter sufficiently. We considered it then and we postponed it then, partly because I was going away, and because the Defence Minister was going away. was going to Kashmir. We shall consider it again from every point of view. But speaking for myself, I have a tendency to resist large sums of money being spent on aircraft or any machines which are very costly and which are out of date after two or three yews. It is extraordinary that these aircraft that we are talking about, supersonic aircraft, am, in fact, out of date in big countries. They send us something out of date, because they have moved to the next stage of unmanned missiles. These are manned aircraft, dangerous things for the man inside. A number of accidents occur. You see frequently in the newspapers a small item of news on the Indian Air Force, something about an accident. It may look a small thing, but it is a serious thing, for whenever an accident occurs we lose one of our bright pilots, whom we have trained for years. It is bad enough to lose the plane, but it is much worse to lose the Pilot of it who is a precious person. These

119

things occur in every country-I am not talking of India alone--and when you enter the jet age, the accidents mount up. If we buy a dozen aircraft, we shall have to be prepared to see a number of them go under, plus the pilot who flies them. So I don't like these. I would much rather have, although it is the next stage, the unmanned missile. There is no pilot there, at any rate. It is more expensive and it is the next development. Now, most of the modern weapons used by the great powers have gone beyond the old-style manned-aircraft. These are now meant for petty work. Even these latest type of aircraft are out of date, because now they use unmanned missiles, ballistics and what not, with no man put there but simply electronic devices and so forth.

So, it is a matter for us to consider how far it is worthwhile for us to spend a large sum of money on things which will be out of date soon. One has to consider the element of risk in not having it during the period, two or three years by which time, I hope, our supersonic thing will be ready. I am taking the House into my confidence and telling things which are really not mentioned in public but I think we should know what the position is. Apart from this, our coming to a decision on the other facts, one thing is certain, that is, in coming to a decision we are not going to be governed or influenced by either pressure tactics from outside or hopes that aid will come if we did not do it. We want badly aid for our civil, economic programmes. All our Five Year Plans, etc., depend on that aid but we are not going to take that aid or ask for that aid if it means giving up our independence in any respect. Now, I was glad, therefore, that in this matter of MIGs, to observe that those Hon. Members who referred to it, although there were differing opinions in many ways, different groups, parties, opinions and almost as the poles asunder in other matters, did agree about this that it is improper for any country to put pressure on us to buy or not to buy a particular type of aircraft that we want.

In this matter there is a certain unanimity which is as it should be. We shall consider this entirely from the point of view of what is necessary and right for India and not be influenced by these pressure tactics and hints, almost threats, that aid will be lessened or will not come. It is not that we do not want aid but this is not a matter to be decided this way or that way now. It is a recurring matter. If we surrender our basic position in this now, we shall have to surrender tomorrow, next year and all the time. It will be said that we create a precedent which is bad for ourselves as well as for others. So much for that but I would remind the House that all this business of our buying these MIGs or any aircraft arose because the United States has supplied Sabre Jet aircrafts to Pakistan. In a sense, in that sense, the responsibility is theirs for taking

a step which creates these far-reaching repercussions.

FOREIGN POLICY

Now, I should like to refer to something which I consider rather odd, an Hon. Member's speech. He said that there should be no ideology in foreign policy. That Statement may or may not be true hut I do not understand what he means by ideology. For instance, he said that ideology means our policy of non-alignmeat. That itself is an ideology. That, if you permit me to say so, borders on the nonsense saying that. I am sorry that he is wasting perhaps (interruption) because for a variety of reasons, broadly speaking, I entirely accept that a foreign policy is there to protect the country's interests. What the country's interests are is another matter. A foreign policy has often to change, not the basis of it but the expression of it, the details of it, if the position changes in the world. Non-alignment means independence of one's foreign policy. That is all it means, not tying yourself up in a military way with other countries which ties you up in your foreign policy and in every case; even in war and peace, you are tied up. Therefore, you should keep your independence to that extent. I am not prepared to say that every country should do that. It may be situated in such a way that some small countries cannot afford that. That is a different matter although I think, in the conditions as they are in the world today, it is far better for the small countries as well as for the big ones not to be aligned to any Power bloc. When we talk about alignment we talk about alignment with military power blocs, military alliances. I am not again talking about the Arthashastra or the Mahabharata or the Ramayana, of alliances then but in the circumstances of the world today where there are two big military blocs carrying on a cold war, I say it is utterly wrong and dangerous and futile for a country to be part of a military bloc, most dangerous. Of course, it is going to cost your independence. If you are a strong country, then two strong countries having an alliance affect each other may be, but a weak country and a strong country having alliances simply means that you are dragged by the coat tails by the strong country and today it means in the world

joining in this present game of the cold war-

120

that hateful thing, abominable thing, I think it is, and a thing which is not stopped fairly soon will take the world to uttermost disaster.

An Hon. Member : May I ask the Prime Minister if Pakistan is suffering horribly from the military alliance with U.S.A. ?

The Prime Minister : I do not wish to say much about Pakistan, but Pakistan has suffered very greatly and will suffer more if this thing goes on because Pakistan depends so much on its military, because they are there, and if this is withdrawn. Pakistan will be helpless. It is difficult for me to discuss Pakistan. I have rather clear views but they are our neighbours and I do not wish to say much about them. I think they have adopted a policy not only about this but about other matters also, the sworn ideology of which is hatred of India. They have exhibited it to the United States, even to their SEATO partners and to other partners, and their emphasis, their thinking, ultimately is, call it, fear of India or hatred of India. And this recent flirtation they are having with China shows what lack of principle there is. One cannot discuss the inner conditions of Pakistan, of course. They have received plenty of money but that has not made Pakistan much stronger.

The Hon. Member also said something about the Commonwealth membership. The essentials of policy should be that it should be ever changing, he said. It is very extraordinary; in fact we should have no policy at all and should hope about from one thing to another. That is what it comes to.

An Hon. Member : As the interests of India dictate.

The Prime Minister : The interests do not change from day to day. Non-alignment means that the policy would- be governed by the interests of India at every stage and not by pressures from abroad.

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Now, I shall refer to the other matters. An Hon. Member said that we should withdraw from the Disarmament Committee unless nuclear tests were abandoned. I entirely disagree with this. It is a bad policy, this kind of boycotting because people do not agree with you. We should remain there. President De Gaulle has boycotted the Disarmament Conference because something which is not to his liking took place there or is taking place. I think it is completely wrong. The Disarmament Conference will not suffer by our withdrawal very much. It will go on but the good influence that we exercise at the conference will be no more.

VIETNAM

About the Report on Vietnam, I do not know how an Hon. Member or someone else disapprove of it. I suppose he has not read it. He may have read the criticism of it; that is possible. Certainly, the people we have sent there, who have written the Report, are some of our ablest ambassadors and they have done it after personal enquiry and personal knowledge. I for my part accept their Report. I may not be personally responsible for it but I do accept it.

Again, may I say about this idea that we should withdraw the Kashmir issue from the Security Council, I do not know if the Defence Minister said it. I suppose we could withdraw it but we may be dragged in there by the other party. We cannot refuse to go if the Security Council takes up the subject at the instance of the other party. We are the complainant, therefore we withdraw but somebody else will be the complainant and we will have to go.

An Hon. Member : On what basis can Pakistan complain?

The Prime Minister : The Hon. Member and I may agree that they have no basis but they are strong enough to induce various great powers and small powers to vote for them. That is the basis.

An Hon. Member : Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little clarification. When we went to the United Nations we referred to certain articles of the Charter and on the strength of that we filed an application. Now if we withdraw I cannot for one see on what ground Pakistan can accuse us. Under what clause of the Charter of the United Nations ?

The Prime Minister : I am not going to argue that matter with the Hon. Member. But it seems to me, we go there as accusers. We withdraw; that is, we withdraw our accusation, our complaint, against Pakistan. In effect we withdraw it but we leave it to Pakistan to frame such complaints as they like against us. However, we need not enter into that.

NEPAL

An Hon. Member asked about certain joint enquiry on the Nepal border. In the joint statement issued by the King and myself it was

121

stated that where any necessity arose, where there was any doubt as to what happened because our facts differed-they said some people have done something from India and we said, 'no'-we can have a local joint enquiry, not a complicated thing, an officer of theirs and an officer of ours go to a particular place where it is alleged to find out and report to either Government. A little while ago they referred two specific incidents to us and asked us for this enquiry and we promised to send them an officer to do it.

An Hon. Member said something about the officials of the External Affairs Ministry letting us down by not getting China to accept our sovereignty over Kashmir. I do not quite know how the officials could make the Chinese Government accept something or not accept it. From the very beginning we have repeatedly referred this to-them. The Chinese Government have used a language which can be interpreted in various ways. We interpreted it to begin with in a way which seemed to us natural that they recognised our sovereignty but later when the matter was put to them, they were less clear about it and said something that has made their position a little doubtful. I do not know how the officials could make other countries function in a way we like. If that is so, we have had quite a large number

of our ablest officers in the United States and in the United Kingdom but they have not succeeded in making any change because neither Government is prepared to change its mind.

An Hon. Member : May I clarify the point ? What I said was : there has been a let-down in the External Affairs Ministry. In 1956 Mr. Chou En-Lai told our Ambassador that the people of Kashmir had expressed their will unmistakably on the question of accession. In July 1961 when the Secretary-General visited Peking he reported to the Government that the impression was left on his mind that China supported our stand on Kashmir. Why should we leave it to a matter of impression? When the matter was mentioned, when he went on a tour to which many of us had taken objection, he should have really pinned down the Chinese Government and asked it to clarify its views unmistakably whether it accepted our stand on Kashmir.

The Prime Minister : The unmistakable clarification would have been against us. He would have insisted on something being said against us. The Hon. Member is saying something as if our officials or our Ministers or anybody can go and order about Mr. Chou En-Lai who is a very clever person to accept something that we say although he does not want to say it. Obviously he did not want to say it. Repeatedly I know if they say something which appears to be in our favour there is a qualifying clause afterwards.

Somebody asked me about Mr. Gizenga. So far as I know, he is kept in an island there.

IMMIGRATION BILL

About the Immigration Bill in the United Kingdom, I think Mr. Mani asked for a quota. I think that would be entirely wrong and rather beneath our dignity. I disapprove of the Immigration Bill, yet I do not like immigration into the United Kingdom from India. And we have tried to stop it-not students and other people who go there. But large numbers of people have gone there in search of employment, especially from the Punjab, and they go there without knowing a word of the language there, without knowing a word of any language except Gurmukhi and Punjabi. And with their habits and customs, they create social problems there. I do not want our people to be looked down upon anywhere, wherever they go. Therefore, we have been discouraging it. Because they could earn so much there, these passport scandals took place; bogus passports were sold for as much as Rs. 5,000. That is the draw there. But asking for a quota is to accept their scheme of immigration and ask for some people to go there. What for?

An Hon. Member : May I just rise on a point of clarification ? The Immigration Act, as it stands now, is an affront to all coloured people. That is what Mr. Gaitskell himself has said and under the quota system which the United States have, there is no question of a colour bar. It is a matter of self-respect of the members of the Commonwealth that they should have the right of admission under a quota system, because I quite agree that every country has a right to control its immigration and we realise Britain's special difficulties in this matter.

The Prime Minister : The quota system applies to places where large numbers of immigrants go like Australia, like Canada, like New Zealand. I can understand that. Some years back, Australia, New Zealand and Canada agreed to have a quota system, because they have a quota for every country. Whatever the quota was-100, 200 or 500-I do not remember, but the British have no such quota system for anybody. It is a well-populated country. They do not want people from outside to come and live there. It is rather extraordinary for us to ask for a quota system. We are not going

122

to ask for it. Quota applies to persons who have got to become nationals there. So to ask them for a quota so that Indians can go and become British subjects is extraordinary to me.

EAST BENGAL MIGRANTS

Now, one thing more and I have done. This is about the migrants from East Pakistan to India, Some reference was made to it. Originally, the story started by some relatively small incident in Malda, about the 'Holi' time in India. This wits grossly exaggerated by newspapers there. They said thousands had died and so on. This led to very serious occurrences in Rajshahi district and some other districts, especially Rajshahi, and the casualties were very large. Thereafter, some thousands of people, Hindus there wanted and expressed their wish to come over to India, They asked for migration 'Certificates. But for some reason they did not pursue this matter further. Some hundreds came and they went back. We did not refuse them facilities to come. I think the Pakistan Government tried to induce them and succeeded in keeping them back. They did some rehabilitation there too. Many of their huts that had been burnt were rebuilt and some help was given to them. Anyhow, they did not conic. except a few hundreds that came. There is always some traffic coming and going. I gave here too, I think, and in the other House figures of people coming from East Bengal to West Bengal and from West Bengal to East Bengal. It was extraordinary that during all this period of high tension, the traffic was more or less normal. I forget what the figures were, five thousand or six thousand either way. It may vary by a few hundreds. Now, when the Muslims were supposed to be, according to the Pakistan press, leaving India in their thousands to go to Pakistan, actually according to our figures, thousands of Muslims in the ordinary course were coming to India from there. In the same way, thousands of Hindus were going actually to Pakistan at the time these occurrences took place or after. Since then, a new development has taken place and that is what occurred in Rajshahi district. I do not know what happened there, but one night a large number, five hundred or six hundred Santhals at 3 a.m. tried to come across the river into the Malda district. That is the Pakistan version and they say of this crowd going at night. The police were naturally concerned and alarmed. They came up, they challenged them, whereupon these people shot arrows from their bows and used spears. And the police fired at them, with the result-the accounts vary--that one or two persons or seven persons were killed. About a number came across, may be 100 or 150 and the others went back.

Now, the present position is-I heard it today -that about five thousand of these Santhals have come to Malda district from Rajshahi. Apparently, they are coming without any obstruction from the Pakistani authorities.

They have conic this time with their animals too. They have come with their animals, bulls, cows, etc., and the Pakistanis have allowed them. Five thousand have come. We do not know how many more may come. It has affected especially the Santhals and there are round about 20,000 Santhals on the other side. More may come. Now, this raises difficult questions for us. For the moment, naturally, we have to give relief to those who come over, but permanent settlement is a difficult question. It was suggested that we should send them to Dandakaranya. Well, we can send some to Dandakaranya. We cannot send any unlimited number. For the moment, it has been decided by the Chief Minister of West Bengal-he has informed us of this-in consultation with our Government here to send a special train carrying about 1,000 of these Santhal refugees to Dandakaranya. and to choose agriculturists from them to go there, because there are many fishermen. Fishermen have no particular place there. There is no fish to be had in Dandakaranya.

An Hen. Member : Have you made any enquiries as to why the Santhals are coming in such numbers ? Does it mean that everything is not quite peaceful in East Pakistan ?

The Prime Minister : I have said that originally the difficulties arose because of some conflict between Santhals and Muslims. The very first thing was that a Santhal woman was selling some fruit and they had an argument about the price. The woman was slapped on the face. This was in Malda district. This resulted in the Santhals there too later attacking the Muslims, burning some et their huts and killing two or three persons. Then on the 'Holi' day, which came soon after, there was another attack by Santhals on Muslims. The Santhals were roused by this incident. On the other side in the major incidents that happened in Rajshahi district Santhals were also sufferers. But I cannot make out one thing, because nothing has been reported to us for the last month or more or six weeks. We thought that was over and we saw this traffic becoming normal.

An Hen. Member : How is it that it has not been reported, because in the Bengal papers-

123

also some Pakistan papers come to West Bangal-we did see reports appearing. How is it that Government has not received reports from its Mission in Dacca?

The Prime Minister : We have received full reports. I am saying that in the last month or six weeks nothing has happened not only to our knowledge but apparently to Pakistan Government's knowledge or Bengal Government's knowledge. I do not understand why this time particularly Santhals had come out. They had reason to come six weeks ago. May be they were thinking about it and they came to a decision, because they function in more or less in a tribal fashion, in a group fashion.

USA IRELAND CHINA FRANCE CHILE VENEZUELA GHANA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA VIETNAM NEPAL UNITED KINGDOM AUSTRALIA CANADA NEW ZEALAND BANGLADESH SENEGAL OMAN

Date : Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speeches in Security Council on Kashmir

Following is the text of Shri Krishna Menon's speech in the Security Council on 22 June 1962 during the debate on Kashmir:

We have sat at this Council table now for several days, listening patiently to find some reason for the convening of this meeting and to what its deliberations are likely to lead. We have now reached the stage when, from our point of view, the unfortunate position was reached yesterday when the United States received seven votes and was therefore able to continue this meeting. My Government has always taken the view that there was no reason for convening the Security Council because no new situation had arisen to aggravate any positions in Jammu and Kashmir, so far as we are concerned, although there might have been actions on the other side.

We understood that that was the position of a large number of countries and that this meeting was convened merely at the insistence of the State of Pakistan, to which others concerned agreed. My country, Government and people are mystified that, though the insistence was on the side of Pakistan, the initiative in the debate was taken over by the United States from the day the present sittings began.

This afternoon-though I did not see it only at this moment-I saw this draft resolution this morning-we still had hopes that, realizing the consequences of the action that is proposed in the resolution on the general situation in Jammu and Kashmir, Ireland would refrain from putting its name to the draft resolution which we had expressly informed that Government would be regarded by us as an unfriendly act-I do not want to exaggerate this, I am sure my friend. Mr. Boland, would accept it in the spirit in which it is made. I think that the sense of shock in our country about the Republic of Ireland being the spokesman-I would not use any other word--of this particular move would be very considerable. The relations between our two countries did not begin vesterday, and I mean the close relations between our two countries. They go back to the last century, right through the period of the struggle of the Irish people against repression and empire, to the dispossession of their lands and all the troubles that went on, to the days when the Mayor of Cork died in his defiance of the Empire. Later the Irish Free State was formed. However, Ireland was formed not by a process of agreement; it was formed through the imposition of force by the Empire. However that may be, I cannot but say, in sorrow-not in anger but in sorrow-that we deeply regret that Ireland has become the spokesman for this draft resolution although it is perfectly within its sovereign rights to do what it likes. Equally, so are we to think as we are led to think about

it.

When we come to the text of this draft resolution-we do not yet have the text of Mr.

124

Boland's speech in our hands, but I listened to it very carefully. The sentiment that ran right through it was that this draft resolution represented the consensus of opinion in this Council or the majority opinion. I have been at some pains after Ambassador Plimpton speech yesterday, to analyse this assumption. In that analysis one finds that the statement does not reflect the opinion even of the majority; it reflects the opinion of Pakistan whose case has been somewhat ably argued by a number of members. First of all, it was said that seven members--that is to say, the majority in this case are supporting this position Yesterday Ghana, on the one hand, and Venezuela entered their caveats against that statement. Mr. Haseganu suggested when he spoke that the UNCIP resolutions were impracticable or that they could no longer be implemented. This is therefore not part of the majority view. The total number of members who supported this point of view would be five and not seven. The majority of the members did give expression to sentiments in regard to negotiations, so called, between Pakistan and India. Most of them -I believe with the exception of the United States and the United Kingdom--emphasized the necessity of creating the necessary atmosphere for fruitful talks. If I am wrong about that, I shall withdraw it. Ambassador Plimpton also quoted five members in support of the idea of the good offices of a third- party. Two members-Ireland and Ghana-qualified their statements. The remaining three, even if we take all five as constituting a group, are still a minority. Ambassador Plimpton said vesterday that all members have not failed to comment on the responsibility of the Security Council in this matter.

We do not deny the responsibility of the Security Council. On the other hand, the main basis of our position would be that the Security Council has tremendous responsibility, but the question is whether, in exercising or discharging its responsibility, it is doing so to any benefit. Ambassador Plimpton quoted seven members in support of the view he had taken. Four members, the United Arab Republic, Ireland, Chile and France qualified their statements in this respect. The remaining three constitute a minority. I am not going to speak more about this aspect now; I will do so at a later stage.

Then we come to the draft resolution itself We have no vote in this Security Council. We are here by invitation under the relevant article of the Charter in order to participate in these proceedings. It is the practice of the Council to hear the views of the party concerned as though it was a member except for the purpose of voting.

At the present moment I propose to confine myself to this draft resolution and not to the large numbers of statements which have gone into the record, statements which my Government cannot intend to leave uncorrected. The first paragraph of the preamble reads :

"Having heard statements from representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan concerning the India-Pakistan question".

I suppose this refers to the speeches made in April and May in regard to which the representative of the United States and of the United Kingdom wanted time to contemplate. They contemplated for a month and a half, or approximately that time, and then acquiesed in calling this meeting under Pakistan's pressure. They did call this meeting however and have express their opinions-no doubt, after contemplation. They still wanted time to contemplate; that is to say, it is right to conclude that either they made those statements after consideration or without consideration. We decline to believe the latter. If they made their statements after consideration, my Government does not see any reason whatsoever for having dragged these meetings out, almost to the point of seeming dilatory. As I stated previously, this is hardly the way to treat a Member State of the United Nations. Having suggested that there was some grave urgency in this matter, and after one of the Governments concerned had communicated the difficulties it had in attending meetings of this kind-meetings which would serve no useful purpose whatsoever-the Security Council meets for a couple of hours each day, not for the purpose of further clarification here but no doubt for other reasons which we now see resulting in this resolution.

My Government, first of all, is against any resolution coming from this Council at this time because any resolution that would come out at this time, from our point of view, would not have any factual relevance. It would not be of any value unless it were a resolution calling upon Pakistan to vacate its aggression. That the Council is not yet ready to do. Some day it will do so; we do not consider it impossible.

125

We think that any resolution from this Council, like the present, will only be interpreted in India on the one hand as a very partisan statement. The effect on Pakistan on the other would be to think that she has the moral support in this matter and in her aggression from the great Powers who occupy these chairs.

However, dismissing this aspect of it, we come to the next preambular paragraph which reads :

"Having considered the Report of the United Nations representative, Dr. F. Graham";

I presume that this means a private consideration because we have not considered the report in this Council. The report has been here for four years, it has never been presented and never been received. This does not worry us very much because Dr. Graham's position is one to which we are not a party. When the UNCIP was appointed after a certain amount of conversation, discussion, and so on, ultimately we became a party to it and we agreed to it. UNCIP dissolved itself, and afterwards, with the exception of Sir Owen Dixon, the various representatives were appointed on the unilateral decision of the Security Council, to which we are not a party.

Following the traditions of our country, however, whenever these famous gentlemen have

visited our shores, we have offered them our traditional hospitality in so far as our poor resources would permit, and we treated them with the courtesy that is characteristic of our relations with visiting people. But apart from that, we have not recognized Dr. Graham's position in regard to this matter. We would not be prepared at any time to say that these efforts have in any way assisted in the solution of the Kashmir question, as it is now popularly caved, but indeed it has aggravated it.

Then we come to paragraph I of the draft resolution (S/5134) which reads

"Reminds both parties of the principles contained in its resolution of 17 January 1948, and in the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan dated 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949." These three resolutions at least must be taken in two parts. The resolution of 17 January 1948 was an appeal to the two parties not to aggravate the situation.

For fourteen years, the Security Council knows-through the records and through the communications made to it by the UNCIP, and by all the facts of which, as lawyers would say, you can take "judicial notice"--that the resolution of 17 January 1948 had been continuously disregarded by Pakistan, by continuing and progressive aggression, which we fully discovered only afterwards and was uncovered before the Council, and also by the very considerable psychological warfare in the shape of what is called die propaganda for jehad, the holy war against India.

With regard to the resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, this is not the time to go seriatim into the various paragraphs. We want to say, however, and not merely for the purpose of the record, that we hope that even at this late stage some of the members would not allow preconceived notions on this problem to rule out the factual situation. These resolutions were hammered out between UNCIP on the one hand and, so far as we are concerned, our Government, mainly our Prime Minister on the other. In regard to each of them and the main parts of these resolutions, the UNCIP at that time gave us various and categorical assurances. Those assurances were not private assurances; they were not personal assurancesthey were assurances of the Security Council and they are commitments on behalf of the Security Council.

Therefore, we submit that we cannot speak about the 13 August 1948 resolution or the 5 January 1949 resolution without taking the whole of them as one body and, what is more, in the context in which they were formulated, and even more, leaving out the assurances. These assurances were to us very solid parts of whatever engagements we have entered

The word "obligations" has been used very, freely, particularly by the United States. Speaking in the Security Council in 1957, my Government made it clear that while it would honour all international obligations, the resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949which. as I said, differ from the resolution of 17 January 1948-were in the view of our Government engagements and not obligations. Those engagements were carried out in the context in which they came about, and if the

126

resolutions did not become implemented, the fault does not lie with us.

Therefore, to speak of the principles contained in the draft resolution as though in twelve or fourteen years no changes have taken place is not only unrealistic, but it is to disregard the political, economic and other realities, and the military realities, in regard to our two countries and in our part of the world. What is more, it is to disregard the continual violation and flouting of decisions and resolutions and the concealment of facts by Pakistan from the Security Council.

Mr. Stevenson was at pains, in opening this debate in this particular continued series of meetings, to read out paragraph 1 of the resolution of 5 January 1949. It is of course possible to do that if one desired. It is possible to read the scriptures and prove anything by one paragraph. The whole of that resolution, first of all, is supplementary to the resolution of 13 August 1948, and until the 13 August resolution has been implemented, the 5 January resolution has no meaning.

Secondly, if paragraph I of the 5 January resolution must be read, then paragraph 2 must also be read, and there are so many others that should similarly be read with it. I do not intend to elaborate on the matter at this stage, but I want to say that Clause 1 of the operative paragraph of the present resolution is probably stronger than any resolution adopted here, although we have not accepted most of them. It is not in conformity with the facts as obtained now,

The only part of the resolution of 13 August 1948 that has been implemented by and large is the cease-fire. It is the intention of my country to observe that cease-fire until someone else seriously breaks it on a large scale and in such a way that you cannot maintain it any longer. So even though the other parts of the said resolution have not been implemented and logically it would be right for us therefore even to disregard the cease-fire agreement, we do not intend to do so.

Then comes paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which :

"Urges the Governments of India and Pakistan to enter into negotiations on the question at the earliest convenient time" I will stop there and read the rest of it afterwards. Here I want to say that we have always taken exception to the fact of treating Pakistan and ourselves on the same basis in regard to this question. We are equal Members of the United Nations; in that way we do not claim any differentiation. But in regard to this question they are the aggressors and we are the aggressed.

We brought here a complaint. That complaint is in regard to the situation created by Pakistan in respect of Kashmir. The only answer Pakistan gave relevant to Kashmir, on 15 January 1948, was to say that it was not invading, that it was not in Kashmir. Therefore, there is the first preliminary objection with regard to treating India and Pakistan as though they were two peas in a pod. This has been usual with the British always, when it comes to a serious matter of this kind here, we have to go into the substance of it.

We have said that this Council is not a court of law. You are not the World Court. This body has no right to go into the legal questions or to judge upon them. At best it is a body representing the United Nations and basing itself on the principles of the political relations in terms of international morality and law, and I also submit that those who want remedies here must come with clean hands. But over and above that the immediate objection to this is that those who sponsor the draft resolution and, I fear, the majority of the Members of the Council either are ignorant of the fact or refuse to accept the position that in the last few months -let alone past history-the Government of India, as expressed by the person of the Prime Minister, has repeatedly invited the head of the State of Pakistan to come and talk these things over-negotiations may not be the right word, but any way it was to talk these things over.

The Prime Minister during his visit to West Pakistan extended an invitation to President Avub Khan on 23 September 1960. My Prime Minister went there. This invitation was renewed through Pakistan's Minister Mr. Akhtar Hussain on 10 January 1962 when the latter met the Prime Minister in New Delhi. The Invitation was again renewed by our. High Commissioner in Karachi on I March 1962. The Security Council was informed of all these invitations in document S/5060 and document S/PV. 990. Therefore we say that you cannot make a proclamation here now in the air "calling upon the two par-ties", when one party invited the other to come and they have refused. What is more, the other party said they

127

preferred to conic tot to us, but here. Therefore, there has been no response to the move for bilateral meetings. If the resolution had said "Calls upon the Government of Pakistan to respond to the repeated invitations of India and to go and talk to them", that would have been the reality. But the approach in the resolution is partial. I am certain that my Government is not prepared to accept this position. As regards the second point, the representative of Prance, the President, has referred to it more than anyone else. The resolution says :

"....at the earliest convenient time with the view to its ultimate settlement in accordance with Article 33 and other relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations."

To a lay reader, the person who does not know the details and the nuances of these things, and if he reads this draft resolution alone it all looks very nice. What could be better than arbitration, conciliation and all those things that have been set out? Therefore, he would think this is a very equitable and honourable thing for nations to do, and what they expect of the members of the United Nations. But what is forgotten is that this issue comes under Chapter VI, under the pacific settlement of disputes and not anywhere else.

It is our submission, and has always been our submission--and we will maintain it--that the Indo-Pakistan question, so called, that the position that exists in this connexion, is not a "dispute" in terms of the Charter. It is a "situation" created by Pakistan's aggression on our territory, by the annexation of it, by the repeated violations of the principles and resolutions of the United Nations, and that therefore Article 33 is inapplicable to this case in any way. But even if it is said that the substance of Article 33 can be defended on grounds of good conscience and should be accepted by nations--that is negotiation, enquiry mediation, conciliation, arbitration-judicial settlement-I submit that all but the last has been tried over all these years. We have had so many negotiations on this--here, in Geneva, in Paris, in all kinds of places. There have been men of goodwill who have come over and talked to us and we have talked to them. So there have been negotiations, direct and indirect, times without number. As to enquiry, I suppose even the Security Council would be satisfied with the volume of material which has come out as a result of enquiry. As to mediation, this has also been tried, in the sense that men of goodwill have talked to us including Mcnaughton, Dixon and Jarring.

However, when we come to arbitration, international law, as I shall point out at the appropriate time, lays down certain principles that are basic to arbitration. There are some things that are arbitrable, others that are not arbitrable. That is true in individual relations, domestic relations and international relations. There are some things beyond arbitration ! The sovereigney of a country, its independence and integrity, are not subjects of arbitration. The belief that they are so arises from a fallacy for which there is no cause. United States delegation should not be guilty; Mr. Warren Austin, speaking many years ago before this Council, laid it down without any reservations whatsoever that sovereignty was with India, and therefore there is no question that there has been any dispute on this matter.

We hold, therefore, that in so far as the substance of Article 33 which would be applicable in good conscience--the substance of it, not the form of it--has been carried out. The invoking of Article 33 in the resolution is a further tightening up on us in this matter. The Security Council is being used as a means of porpaganda, so that the representative of Pakistan can come here and say, time after time : "Yes, we agreed and India did not agree." What they agreed to is a different matter. "We agreed and India did not." He has sometimes forgotten that the crucial resolution, the one of 13 August, was largely hammered out by us and, what is more, was accepted by the Government of India long before Pakistan touched it. The draft resolution then says :

"Appeals to the two Governments to take all possible measures to ensure the creation and maintenance of an atmosphere favourable to the promotion of negotiations. "

We have no objection to this appeal. But, so far as we are concerned, it is pushing an open door--and those who push an open door are likely to fall on their noses !

The draft resolution "appeals to the two Governments to take all possible measures"when, for years, we have informed this Council of the psychological war being waged and of the gathering of troops and intruders or threats of the same. Even this morning, the news from India is that, in the puppet State of so-called Azad Kashmir, they have been collecting people, and other agencies of Pakistan's creation have been collecting people, in order to make so-called tribal invasions on India.

128

I do not know whether at this time you want me to read many things out. The main mouthpiece of the Pakistan Government, the newspaper founded by the first President of Pakistan -some people regard him as the founder of Pakistan-says :

"The final settlement of the Kashmir question is not going to be worked out in New York. The hands of the Indian tryrant will be forced by other means, leaving him no alternative but to liberate his victims."

The same paper went on to say that, if India wanted a war, we would have one, and they would raze Delhi to the ground, and every city in India would be destroyed, and things of that kind. Fortunately, we take all these things in our stride.

On 9 May, the same paper said that, on the BBC television-the BBC does not normally allow people to say things of this kind-I lived long enough in Britain to know this the representative of the Azad Government of Jammu and Kashmir said :

"The faith of the Kashmiris in the United Nations Security Council has been shaken, and they might soon take up arms on the Algerian pattern."

The same paper, reporting the answers to questions by Mr. Ludwig Kennedy of the BBC. went on to say :

"Mr. Khurshid declared that Kashmiris would take up arms rather than go breaking their heads against the stone wall of Indian intransigence. He confirmed that the recently elected Council in Azad Kashmir had adopted a resolution requesting China for assistance in the Kashmir struggle for freedom. He also expected the people and the Government of Pakistan to help in kashmir's fight for liberation from the yoke of Indian military colonialism.

Again, ten-days afterwards, one of their leaders announced that "the All-Jammu and Kashmir Moslem Conference has decided to resume the Kashmir liberation movement following the failure of the United Nations to solve the Kashmir issue."

A great deal has been said about the dignity, the responsibility and the role of the Security Council. Is the Security Council going to pass resolutions under threats of this kind-we had one when Sir Zafrullah began his speech on the last occasion-I am glad to say that be modified it toward the end ?

"The All-Jammu and Kashmir Moslem Conference."-not a public meeting, you know-the main political party in so far as they have any political parties-announced today its intention to resume the liberation movement by the middle of August of this year. This decision was taken at the annual session of the Conference, concluded today. The Conference decided to recruit 10,000 trained mujahids (crusaders) within three months from today.

They cannot find people from Azad Kashmir to undertake this 'mission', and therefore, according to our information, 1947 is to be repeated, and the 'tribal' people from the North-Western part-what was formally the North-Western Province-are to be enlisted.

Mr. Bhutto, one of the Ministers of the Pakistan Government, said last month, after we met here-these dates are important-after we met and concluded the last session, this Minister, who must presumably be reflecting the views of his Government, even in a non-parliamentary system told a news conference :

"Pakistan now realized that the Kashmir problem would have to be settled by 'our intrinsic strength', and the Kashmiris may rise to the same heights as the Algerians."

I will not tax the Council with more editorials, because it can always be said that they have a free press and that nobody can stop anybody from saying that. But the President-of the Azad Government again comes on 29 May, a few days after we met here, and reiterates that :

"The fight of liberation would have to be fought on three fronts-namely, the diplomatic front, the propaganda front, and on the ground."

He also said : "He was glad that some people who, till recently, talked of peaceful agitation, had ultimately agreed with his point of view that the Kashmir liberation fight would have to be an armed struggle."

The representative of Pakistan at this table is one of those people who have talked not about peaceful agitation, but about peaceful settlement. I suppose there is a difference between the two.

I would ask the Council not to dismiss this newspaper, though it is one of several newspapers I would not say it is an official paper, I do not mean to say so-but it is usually regarded as expressing the voice of the

129

Government in that country, not only in this regime but in previous regimes. It goes on to say :

"Pakistan must have the Kashmir question settled, no matter what it takes, no matter what it costs. Indeed, the repudiation by India of the Security Council resolutions, including the one calling for the cease-fire and the aggressive deployment of her forces, have made Pakistan's task a little easier. The great impediment to the liberation of Kashmir namely our obligation to maintain the ceasefire, no longer exists. The grave danger to our territory, our interest and our people is mounting. Acts of violence, of intimidation and threatening speeches have become a common feature across the border to keep us away from liberating our Kashmiri brethren.

"Pakistan is threatened with an all-out war if the Azad Government of Kashmir makes any move to alleviate the sufferings of the Kashmiris under Indian occupation, while that country's determination to occupy the Azad territory is voiced on every conceivable occasion by the Defence Minister. These threats, of course, can have no fear for us. If India wants an all-out war, she will get one. If Lahore, Dacca and Karachi are bombed, Bombay, Amritsar and New Delhi will be razed to the ground."

Nobody has said anything about bombing Karachi or any other place.

"For us in Pakistan, the virtues of peace are no different from the virtues of war of liberation" --a very odd statement-if it is a war of liberation-and when a great newspaper does not know the difference between peace and war, you know what you are dealing with.

"The people of this country were prepared for the present aggressive posture of India and the repudiation by her of international commitments, having witnessed the impotance of the United Nations"--that is for youand of the big Powers in regard to the occupation of the Portuguese enclaves. We should no longer ask ourselves whether we should start defending our country only when the, first bomb drops on our territory or when soldiers cross our borders. The time for active defences has come"-that is preventive war, you know,--"Now is the time to thwart the designs of the Indian expansionists. The massing of forces within striking, distance of our territory is an aggression of which we have to take note. The repudiation of the cease-fire is nothing but a declaration of war. We have never sought and do not seek a shooting war, but neither do we want peace so much that we are willing to pay for it by permitting India to perpetuate an occupation of Kashmir and constantly menace our very independence. To gain our objective, the liberation of Kashmir-we should readily accept aid or friendship from whatever quarter it comes. What does it matter if our friendship does not meet the nationalistic purpose of our allies? As we have said Pakistan regards as real friends only those who stand by it on the crucial question of Kashmir."

That may be the reason why some peoples

subscribe to these things.

The Security Council says that it is appealing to the two countries to maintain a peaceful atmosphere. As I said earlier, the appeal loses its point because you are pushing against an open door on one side. Even in the highest circles in Pakistan, no attempt has been made to create a favourable atmosphere. As I pointed out, not only has there been no favourable response to India's repeated requests for a "No War" declaration but even the invitation from the head of our Government, to the head of the State of Pakistan who is also the Prime Minister, de facto, has not produced any response.

The representative of Pakistan in the Security Council has successfully made every attempt to keep this debate in progress and to create a sense of controversy in order, perhaps, to promote feelings of irritation with India and cause difficulties for her.

The fourth operative parapraph of the draft resolution :

'Urges the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan to refrain from making any statements, or taking any action, which may aggravate the situation." (S/5134)

We have asked this Council repeatedly for the past twelve years to point out to us what statements we have made that are aggravating the situation, even- though the fact remains that forty thousand square miles of our territory are occupied by the other side.

The fifth operative paragraph of the draft resolution :

"Requests the Acting Secretary-General to provide the two Governments with such services As they may request for the purpose of carrying out the terms of this resolution." (Ibid.)

130

That part of the resolution is innocuous; it is one of those omnibus clauses that are added on to resolutions. Furthermore, we do not want to bring the Secretary-General into this controversy at all. In any Case, since we are not likely to request these services, that paragraph is inoperative.

This, therefore, is the draft resolution which has been submitted when each of the Governments concerned knows for a fact that it will not lead to solution of any question. It will only aggravate the situation and will be used in Pakistan for a purpose which is entirely different from what is intended. Besides, it is entirely contrary to facts.

The draft resolution ignores several very crucial points, that were made by members of the majority in this Council. One of these points is that conditions have changed. In spite of the fact that the representative of Venezuela devoted most of his speech to arguing the case for Pakistan, he did point out that there is no question about Pakistan having any sovereignty in Jammu and Kashmir. If Pakistan has no sovereignty there, I do not know how she dares to do anything on our territory. The fact that there have been many changes in conditions was recognized hereby France, by Ghana and by Rumania-which is not part of the majority, but still a member of the Council, Ireland also spoke of this but it does not appear in her resolution. Venezuela, Chile and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics all have said the same. Everyone has referred to these changed conditions and when the times come for it, I propose to submit to the Council both the law and the facts which apply to these changed conditions in Kashmir.

It is not my intention to make a more detailed statement at the present time but I hope, in fairness to my Government and in view of the large number of misstatements that have been made in the Council---either out of ignorance or for political reasons-that I will be allowed to put the record straight so that, on a future occasion, it will not be said-as has been said so often-that the Government of India did not take exception to this, that or the other.

We have the same feeling as a lot of other people that the repetition of these things is becoming a bit tiresome. But then, if I neglect to object to any particular point, that omission is brought up at the ensuing meeting and it is said then that India had no objection to it. Therefore, we intend at the appropriate time, if that is the pleasure of the Council, to put our position with regard to this matter more fully on the record.

The other speech to which I should really refer is the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. I shall not do so for several reasons. The first is that it is expected; the other reason is that I have no desire to aggravate the relationship between our two countries. But I hope that they will stop speaking to us in the fashion which they have, abjuring us vaguely to preserve the status of relations in the Commonwealth in regard to these matters. Pakistan is a military ally, not only one of the members of the Commonwealth. In the context of things as they appear therefore, such statements fall very unpleasantly upon our cars. But our relations with the United Kingdom, in spite of everything, are very close and no doubt Sir Patrick Dean follows his instructions and his own wisdom in the matter.

I wish to reiterate to the Council that in passing this resolution it will not be, as Mr. Boland has said, discharging a duty that will promote the purpose which motivate it. Besides, it is not the function of the Security Council to pass resolutions without purpose. If I may say so, we sometimes develop a habit of doing things and then do them whether they have a purpose or not. I remember being interviewed by a newspaper editor on television some time ago. He told me that I did not understand his difficulty, that sometimes great problems arise in the world that are so difficult that it becomes impossible for even statesmen to unravel them but they have to write editorials and pronounce on them in quick time. I told him that I could not understand the nature of an obligation to pronounce out of ignorance.

Similarly, there is no real obligation for the Security Council to pass a draft resolution which is not likely to lead to anything but which will only proclaim to the world that this question has not received the kind of consideration that it should from members of this Council and from nations that are committed to the same principles as we have observed in our country. Therefore I submit, with 'all the earnestness at my command, that particularly the uncommitted countries 'should not now become parties, either passively or actively to a resolution of this character.

I have no desire to analyze closely the other statements that have been made which will only give strength to forces of disruption either in India or in relation to India and Pakistan, and 131

would not be calculated to lead to peace in our part of the world. Conditions have changed. Since I intend to refer to them more fully later, I will not do so now. Therefore, I request the members of the Security Council, even though a draft resolution is before them, not to complicate the difficulties in the situation by adopting it or even supporting it.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN IRELAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA VENEZUELA CHILE FRANCE SWITZERLAND ALGERIA CHINA

Date : Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Speech of Shri V. K. Krishna Menon after Voting on Ireland's Resolution on Kashmir

In my last statement when I spoke on the draft resolution I took care to reserve my position with regard to the various statements of the members of the Council. I deliberately did not make comments at that time in order that the Council might proceed with its business on the draft resolution. Even after I made that reservation and the voting had taken place, and there was another discussion which went on and on which it is not my business as a non-member of the Council to comment, I still had reservations with regard to entering into a debate again. Although the representative of Pakistan had all the time, from the fifteenth of this month onwards, liberty to intervene in this matter he did not do so. He has spoken at the tail end now. It would hardly be fair to my country and Government to leave unanswered the statements which, if they remain unanswered on the record, might perhaps be taken as having no answers. That would not be proper. My Government and I would not be able to justify this to our people or to our Parliament.

Although the representative of Pakistan, with all this skill and ability, has tried to condense these points, it is necessary to reply to them because what he has done has been to throw a number of stones-a stone can be a very small one but it can hurt a lot and its impact can be widespread. It is quite easy for Sir Muhammed to say that accession is in "dispute", it is necessary for me to prove that it is not in dispute. The tactics is the same as 'in the cases of their infringements upon our border. They choose the place where to fight. If we shoot it will be into the jungle but they can shoot in our villages as they choose the place for aggression. This is always the tactics of people who do not follow the rules of war or peace. I shall deal with these points one by one.

First, the representative of Pakistan said that the Government of India has said that there is no dispute. This is certainly a "dispute" popular language in the sense that there is difference of opinion, there is a difference of views, there is a difference of interests; but there is no "dispute" in terms of the Charter. It is a "situation" which was created by the aggression of Pakistan over the territory of India. At one time it was admitted by Pakistan itself in that they said they were not there. Therefore other people who came there were not authorized to be there. We maintain that this is a situation of aggression and not a dispute. They have said that there are points in dispute namely accession. Accession even if it were in dispute, would not come here. Validity of accession at best is a legal point. There is no dispute about the fact of accession; the fact is with us. Onethird or one-fourth may remain with them by illegal occupation. Therefore, even if the issue merely a question of the legality of accession, it would not have come here.

But since Sir Muhammed raises the question

of accession again, what am I to do except to point out that, as we have repeatedly said, the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Union of India, both by her Act and by our Constitution, by the Agreement of the British Government, Pakistan and ourselves, is full, complete, final and irrevocable. Therefore, any removing of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, or any part of it from the Union, would be an act of cession and an act of disintegration of our country. Therefore, it is not right to say that accession is still in dispute.

As I said once before today and once on a previous occasion, this was admitted and was stated in this Council by no less a person than the representative of the United States, whose statement I quoted on the last occasion; Mr. Warren Austin said that the sovereignty of Kashmir was with India and that is why she is here; otherwise she would not be here at all. Moreover on the question of accession. if it was a dispute, the Security Council still could not be seized of it. On the other hand, if Kashmir had not acceded to India, we would not be entitled to be here.

132

Then comes the question of the UNCIP resolutions. This is a matter which unfortunately requires very considerable elaboration. It does mislead a number of members of the Council who, I have no doubt, are well intentioned. It has been said more than once that the UNCIP resolutions-the two resolutions--wash out everything we contend about sovereignty etc. In fact, they do nothing of the kind. Each of the main paragraphs in this resolution was discussed by the Commission and by the Government of India, mainly by the Prime Minister, and when we agreed to it clause by clause or part by part it was in the context and on the basis of the assurances that were given to India. I could read the text to the members of the Council if they had time to listen. But I shall summarize the points of these assurances.

The first assurance was : "Responsibility for the security of the State rests with India." This was not only agreed to by the Commission, but it was also stated in the resolution itself, when the Government of India was asked to maintain garrisons in the Northern areas, to keep external forces from coming into our territories and to assist in the maintenance of law and order within the cease-fire lines in the places which are illegally now occupied by Pakistan and where, it was anticipated, they would evacuate and the territory would be returned to India.

Secondly, "The sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir Government over the entire territory of the State shall not be brought into question." On this particular matter-and I would like my colleagues to take note of this-pointed questions were asked by the Prime Minister and the answers were given by the Commissions in the mariner I have mentioned.

Thirdly, "Plebiscite proposals shall not be binding upon India if Pakistan does not implement Part I and II of the resolution of 13 August 1948." Part I has not been implemented. The only part of this resolution that has been implemented is the cease-fire part. Even Mr. Jarring, when he went to India, discovered that implementation was open to question. If you look at the resolution, you will see that Part 1, section A, deals with cease-fire, which has been implemented. Section B follows : "The High Commands of the Indian and Pakistan forces agree to refrain from taking any measures that might augment the military potential of the forces under their control in the State of Jammu and Kashmir." That was on 13 August. The Commission itself found that they had organized forces, that battalions had come into existence. The Commission itself said that this created a "material change in the situation" and that therefore it could not be said that the provisions had been implemented. Therefore the whole, of sections B and C remain unimplemented. Unless these are implemented, we do not come to the second part. In spite of that, we went on discussing truce terms envisaged in Part It in the hope that they would be implemented.

The fourth of these assurances given was that : "there shall be no recognition of the socalled Azad Kashmir Government". I am bound to say that there has been no recognition by the United Nations although attempts have been made in that direction. But Pakistan is a party to this agreement. There were no Azad Kashmir forces recognized at that time, they cannot be recognized as an entity let alone as a government !

The fifth condition was that : "the territory occupied by Pakistan shall not be consolidated." Not only has it been consolidated, but it has been annexed to Pakistan under their constitutional law and some sort of accession obtained from some parts contrary to any provisions anywhere.

The sixth assurance refers to the "Reversion of administration of the evacuated areas in the north to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and its defence to the Government of India, and to maintain garrisons for preventing the incursion of tribesmen and to guard the main trade routes."

I want to submit that what I am reading were and are not demands by India, and were not proposals submitted to the commission but are the assurances given to India on behalf of the Council.

The seventh of these assurances states "Azad Kashmir forces shall be disbanded and disarmed". That is to say, since these Azad Kashmir froces were presumed to be at that time for the most part people from that area itself, they could not be sent away; they belonged there. Therefore, the only thing was that they should be disarmed and disbanded. There was some argument about this, and the Commission ultimately agreed that disbanding and disarming go together and cannot be separated.

Finally, there is : "the exclusion of Pakistan from all affairs of Jammu and Kashmir." Right through this argument there is no question of Pakistan having anything to do with this plebiscite except under the control of the Plebiscite, Commissioner at the time of the plebiscite. If

133

it came about, they could have observers. The Plebiscite Commissioner was to be appointed by the Government of India, the administration was to be provided by the Government of India, as is the custom in taking plebiscites in Trust Territories. That was the position in regard to these assurances.

When speaking about this resolution, therefore, you cannot take it outside of these assurances and the other assurances that have been given at various times. As the President has asked me to be brief, I cannot do very much more on this question.

Then we are sometimes asked : why is there no plebiscite 7 Apart from the question of "changed conditions", the impossibility of talking it, how can we take a plebiscite even if we wanted to unless Part I and then Part II and Part III of the resolution of 13 August are implemented 7 In the implementation of Part III will come the discussion between the Governments of Pakistan and India separately with the Commission as to the manner of determining-it does not even say a plebiscite in the third part of the resolution-the future status of Jammu and Kashmir in accordance with the will of the people. Implementation of Part III had been prevented not by us but by Pakistan from those days. We immediately proceeded to democratize the area under out control. Elections have taken place not only nationally, not only in towns and urban areas, but also in villages all over. There is democracy, in the areas administered as part of the Union right down to the village level. I know that this is not part of the pattern of Pakistan, but that does not mean that is not what was intended. We had never agreed to a plebiscite at that time following all these things step by step. In any case, there has been no opportunity, even within the limitations that exist, for the people of the so-called Azad areas to express their views in any way whatsoever I

The texts of these resolutions are before you and as I pointed out, each of these paragraphs were agreed to in this way. India accepted this resolution, Pakistan did not accept it at first. After three or four months of negotiations they said they accepted it.

Then came the 5 January resolution, Mr. Stevenson has made reference to one paragraph in it. It should be understood that the 5 January resolution was supplemental to the previous one. It is like an architect's plan, that is, when the third part of the resolution is implemented, then if we agree on a plebiscite the way of doing it was there. That was the idea of that resolution. It is clearly set out in Paragraph 4(b). We have nothing to hide in this matter.

It is quite true that immediately after the cease-fire, which incidentally we helped to bring about-and it was done in the context of an advancing, not a retreating army-- we did think of a plebiscite as a solution when the State was rid of the invader. The entire onus of delay in this matter of prevarication and obstruction has been on the side of Pakistan largely, I am sorry to say, on account of the support given to it by other people; I do not mean military support only, I mean support largely by interpretation arising partly from lack of knowledge of this matter or for other reasons.

I will skip a number of other points and then come to this point raised by Mr. Muhammed Zafrulla Khan which obviously will have a kind of superficial appeal to people, that is to say, the Security Council had promised the people who were fighting for the liberty in Kashmir how it should be settled. Who were the people fighting for liberty in Kashmir ? Pakistan and its predecessors were fighting for the British Government against the people who were fighting for liberty in Kashmir.

It was also said that the whole of the trouble in Kashmir arose because of the rebellion against the Maharajah by the people. As I said, unfortunately for me but perhaps fortunately for you, because you do not want to be bored by it, there is a whole set of papers here which I cannot read out now. If it is the desire of the' Council, we could either put in as a document or read out to you. This is the diary of Major General Scott, the British Commander of the Maharajah's forces. He was not suppressing a rebellion. There is no instance in this diary, except in one or two places, where incidents had occurred in which the local population had joined the intruders. Apart from that, the diary of Major General Scott, which I intend to put in as one of the documents states on 31 August 1947, that is to say, sixteen days after independence in a note :

"Encounter on 29th between the Military proceedings to Bagh and hostiles who were armed with modern rifles...." I will not read all of it even though it is well documented. The Maharajah's army was not dealing with the population of Kashmir but with the people who had conic from the trans-Kashmir area from and over the territory of Pakistan. We had been told by the then Prime Minister-which we accepted in good faith-

134

that this invasion was not through their connivance or their assistance. The intruders, we were told; could not be stopped because they were co-religionists or something of that kind. They were however armed gangs from west of the Jhelum River and they had been at large in Western Poonch since 4 September.

We see an entry in General Scott's diary on 16 September 1947 as follows .

"Report is Pakistan army visited Alibeg on 14th within State border and a Sikh centre." Unless this diary is read out fully, it does not convey the whole picture. In view of the President's appeal, I am however prepared to be brief and not do it. Therefore, any idea the Council may have here of poor people being suppressed by a tyrannical Maharajah, whom we had gone to rescue, is an entirely wrong picture. What happened was that the territory, after the breaking of the standstill agreement by Mr. Jinnah, who is no longer with us, was invaded by external forces and hordes. They committed plunder and rapine, burned even churches, committed atrocities on nuns and what not, and did everything I read out to you the last time. It was in those circumstances when nearly a quarter million of these people who came from outside were destroying the State that accession was offered by the Maharajah, not in the way suggested by the representative of Venezuela where he simply signed a form. He wrote saying that : "my people have been destroyed, my State will be destroyed unless you come to our rescue. Since I know that India will not go beyond its borders with its armed forces. I have made up my mind now to accede to India."

The argument that is repeatedly advanced is that Lord Mountbatten said something at

that time and wrote a letter at that time, No one denies this. What is more, he wrote it on the advice of the Government of India for he was the constitutional Governor General. What is to be remembered however is that there was a document of application for accession and an acceptance by the Governor General which made the accession complete. This letter is not part of that document, it is a separate matter. Once accession is completed anything else that is said is a unilateral declaration on our part which may be moral or immoral for us not to implement, but it is not a matter for the Security Council. Since we could not implement it in the way we wanted to implement it because as we have said over there, and it has often been repeated in this Council, even by our friends, that Lord Mountbatten also said that when the country was rid of invaders--and the country has never been rid of invaders--it would be implemented. It was not as though any part of anything he said had been morally, legally or otherwise breached in performance.

Then, reference has been made to the constituent Assembly of Kashmir. The United States delegation in 1957 was slightly misled on the question of the Constituent Assembly. In fact, they thought that the delegation of India had made long speeches in order to practice what is familiarly called in this country filibustering. I could not have filled in for five days in any case, but over and above that we have said from the very beginning-not vis-a-vis the Security Council but vis-a-vis the Constitution of India-that under our system the states may express the forms of government they "ant, and so on. It is quite unlike the United States where they have State rights vested in the States; our reserve powers are in the Centre. And so we say, well. of course, we will very gladly have you say all these things, but they will not be binding. They have or may have a moral effect no doubt, but they are not legally binding upon us. There was no need to drag in the Constituent Assembly here, but if the Constituent Assembly discussions are of validity, they are all against the case made by Pakistan. I have no desire to repeat all the details because they have all been placed on the record.

There have also been references to unilateral denunciations. We have made no unilateral

denunciation of any treaty, but everyone is well aware that no country can carry on an agreement that is totally against its interests. We cannot, whatever may be pleaded, accept anything which will lead to the dismemberment of India.

We are told that we want a release from the UNCIP resolutions. Nothing of the kind as suggested or implied by those who say this. If we wanted to be released from the UNCIP resolutions, why do we honour the cease-fire line? Yet it is a cease-fire line which we have many reasons for terminating, because it is not always administered-according to us--with the degree of impartiality that is required of those concerned. What is more, Pakistan even after the marking of the cease-fire line has taken territory-which we could retake by force, but that would lead to an aggravation of the situation. So, striking a-balance, we let them keep it for the present. There are other parts on the international frontier of Jammu and Kashmir which have also been breached in this way by Pakistan. There have been as many as 140 violations

135

of the cease-fire line in this year of 1962. There are on an average ninety or ninety-five incidents inside Kashmir organized by Pakistan, in the way of violence and sabotage, in which Pakistan, British and American ammunition has been found. I am not for a moment suggesting that either the British or the Americans gave it to them for this purpose, but what I am saying is, give a child a knife to play with and he will hurt somebody. He will not ask the permission of the parent to do that.

We have been asked why we do not go to the World Court for an advisory opinion. I certainly understand Mr. Zafrulla Khan's respect for the World Court; he has been there for some time, but this is not a matter for a World Court for its advisory opinion. This is a political issue and, what is more, we are both members of Sir Patrick's much-loved Commonwealth and under the terms of our adherence to the World Court we have made some exceptions in regard to the matters which can be referred to it; while there may be no reason why they or we should not change these reservations, we are not going to throw the baby out with the bath water without finding out what will be the consequences. What with the common and the uncommon markets, all kinds of disputes may arise and we shall find ourselves, instead of being in a fraternity, engaged in all kinds of litigation. That is my personal opinion. So the question of reference to the World Court does not arise.

Before I conclude, and I shall not take much more time. I would like to refer to the scepticism that exists in regard to our argument about changed conditions. Let me point out what it means. If I had the time I could quote instance after instance where the United States, from the time of the Revolutionary War and its independence right up to the time of President Roosevelt, has invoked this doctrine of rebus sic stantibus in order to get out of obligations which could no longer be applicable. However, there is no time to do so and I will leave it, like that, but it is not the United States alone; rather is it every important country in the world which has had to do this because the conditions under which agreements had been reached became no longer 'valid.

The United States invoked in 1881 certain changes of circumstances as a reason for the revision of the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwar Treaty of 19 April 1850 between Great Britain and the United States. Lord Granville, who was the British Secretary of State at that time, replied that the opinions of acknowledged writers on international law could be quoted to support his own opinion that "The principles upon which the whole argument of the despatch is founded are novel in international law". He therefore treated the matter from the side of the practical considerations it involved, reserving the legal dispute. That is to say that even the British Government, at that time, while having doubts about it did not reject it.

Then other Secretaries of State-in regard to the Panama Canal, a very sore subject -argued in 1882 and 1883 that the treaty was voidable because the articles relating to the Canal had become obsolete, and because Great Britain had violated important provisions of the treaty. The first contention was based upon an interpretation of the treaty, contested by Great Britain, according to which the treaty related "to a particular ship canal to be constructed by a particular company', and so on. So, anyway, conditions had changed.

Then we come to the Secret Treaty of London of 1915. France, Great Britain and Russia agreed with Italy in 1915 that if the latter would enter the war against the Central Powers on the side of the Allied Powers the former would consent to the extension of the frontiers of Italy in case of victory. But President Woodrow Wilson argued in 1919 and 1920 for a revision of the treaty of 1915 diminishing the rights promised to Italy because "the whole face of circumstances has been altered" since 1915. That was with regard to a secret treaty which, at that time, was considered to be even more binding than an open treaty.

I shall not read many more of these. There are so many of them. There is your own country, Mr. President. On 10 July 1929 France invoked precedent and practice in its support of the doctrine of rebus sic stantibus. Mr. Paul-Boncour asserted that "a series of diplomatic notifications emanated from the British Government which denounced, by virtue of the same clause rebus sic stantibus, a whole series of treaties concerning the abolition of the slave trade, believing that the treaties which had ruled a determined situation in the middle of the century no longer responded to present circumstances." He asks :

"What was the reception accorded to this act-this unilateral act--of a great Power declaring abrogated the treaties by the sole fact that they no longer corresponded to present circumstances, though none mentioned it except Great Britain? What was the reception made of this unilateral application.

136

pushed to the extreme, of the cause rebus sic stantibus?"

His conclusion is that no objections were raised, and that the incident constituted "a whole series of examples which prove that it is a constant rule of public international law that, even when it is not expressed, the clause rebus sic stantibus is tacitly understood in treaties of unlimited duration."

I want to say here and now, first, that because I have read only a few of these things that does not, mean that there are not many more of them, and, secondly, that we are not for a moment suggesting that either the resolutions of the Security Council or anything that takes place here have the status of a treaty. We are here saying that even if it were a treaty this is the position., We have not accepted the position that these are treaty obligations or even that they are obligations. We have said that they are "engagements" which we have entered into, and therefore they cannot be treated as treaty obligations.

Then it might be seriously asked whether these changed conditions which we speak of are so serious as to affect our position. Our answer is that conditions have changed in the sense that Pakistan, in violation of its obligations under international law, has annexed our territory, committed fresh aggressions after 13 August, taken over the territories in Gilgit and other parts of the northern areas, accepted accessions--or similar things-from the small titular chiefs in the northern part of the Kashmir area, in Hunza and Nagar, thereby changing the whole political contours of this area, and has thus created changed conditions. Second, Pakistan entered into a military alliance with other countries, both of Asia and Europe, whereby-as representatives will find if they read the SEATO treaties-along with most of them, and as party to that agreement, Pakistan takes South Asia under protection. The political map changes thereby, and this was all done after the Kashmir situation.

Thirdly, conditions have changed because of the creation of Azad Kashmir-practically a separate entity. Sometimes we are told it is administered from Karachi, now from Rawalpindi, sometimes not. It may be that a separate State has been created. But conditions have changed by virtue of their being at least twenty-five to thirty battalions of. so-called Azad-Kashmir forces-which are front forces for the Pakistan Army-today equipped with modem weapons made available to Pakistan from its own resources or from its military allies. It was expressly stated that the territory under aggressive occupation should not be consolidated. That was part of the undertaking given to us by the Commission. The consolidation, as I said, has taken place-in fact, so much so that they have a Minister of Kashmir Affairs in their Government.

I will not say anything about the psychological war that goes on making it impossible for a fair plebiscite to be obtained under the conditions. We are a secular State, all of our organization is political and has nothing to do with the religious aspect of a people. We are not prepared to face the position where religious fanaticism is to be or is protected.

Over and above this has occurred the situation in which Pakistan today-not for any good reasons, but merely for nuisance value and as an instrument to pressurize us-has entered into negotiations and, I believe, has concluded agreements with the Central Government of the People's Republic of China. That agreement or negotiation is in total violation of any rights or authority she has, for she has no sovereignty over this State; it is not hers to trade away or to negotiate about. Secondly, it was not necessary even for circumstances relating to her own security. What is more, it has been done on a basis which we cannot accept-that is to say, our position in regard to China and her claims, which is not under discussion before the Security Council.

Our frontiers are "delimited" and "demarcated". For the most part, they are demarcated but it is all delimited. Our frontiers are delimited in their entirety by historical circumstances and all other factors that go with it, and demarcated in places. Now, Pakistan has agreed they are neither demarcated nor delimited ! That is to say, they sold away our birthright in as far as they can. All these changes that have taken place in regard to our own territory and in South-East Asia are matters which make the position, as you see in the book, no longer possible.

I am sorry, therefore, that some countries which, quite rightly, have an affinity for legalisms, take one clause out of an agreement and say that "we agree to self-determination" or something of that kind. This is not tenable.

I am sorry that other extraneous circumstances have lengthened the meeting to this extent, but mainly on account of your kind courtesy and the patience of your members I have made my very brief submissions I would like to express my appreciation to you and to the Council. I

137

do not suppose I have succeeded in boiling down Anna Karenina to ten pages, but I have tried to answer- I will not say the arguments -but the impact of the stones thrown at us at the last moment, when there was plenty of time to do it on some other occasion.

I want to say here and now that we are as anxious as anybody else that there should be no breach of the peace-of international peace and security in our area. Our people would suffer by it most, We are as much concerned about it as any other Member of the United Nations is concerned with international peace and security. Even those who do not agree with us, I would hope, would not challenge that.

Secondly, I want to say that when the Security Council is asking us for direct talks on the one hand, and also referring to the question of not changing the situation by force, I want this to be taken into account: On behalf of the Government of India-not only now but on all the occasions when we have met-we have said that irrespective of our legal, moral, political and equitable claims, or any other rights we may have, it is not the intention of the Government of India, to change or redress the wrongs against us by taking the initiative through use of force.

We were not asked to make this statement; we volunteered it. What is more and must be obvious to all, despite the fact that no part of the agreement is implemented or honoured, the cease-fire is still observed.

In answer to our challenge of the attitude of the Government of Pakistan and compelled by our peaceful declaration, Pakistan, through Sir Muhammed Zafrullah Khan, said something the other day somewhat similar, but only somewhat like that. His statement goes on to say : "of course, if people come and invade the country, we cannot be held responsible" So one (ours) is an unqualified and unreserved statement, in spite of our experience over the last ten years, in spite of our 5,800 miles of frontier with Pakistan-in spite of our experience all along our frontier with Pakistan, we have said we shall not take the initiative in the use of force. And I go further and say : we shall not even succumb to small acts of provocation, even though, we are able to justify, in a logical kind of way, retaliation in the face of what is continually happening. We can take some of it, but if it really comes to an invasion of our country, I am sure there is no one around this table who would say that we are to submit to further aggression

With regard to the "guarantee" of which Sir Muhammed spoke, as I have already said, -- it should however not be forgotten that this comes after the first statement a few days previously threatening us with war. He has said he would not seek to bring about a change in the situation by any except peaceful methods--that Pakistan will always have recourse to peaceful methods for a settlement. But he took care to say that he was "bound to warn the Security Council that the situation may not always continue passive-not that the Government itself will do something to convert it into a tension, but tension might arise. That is not something anybody should raise his evebrows over. How can it happen? It has happened. Governments are upset; new Governments take their places; and new Governments can change policies. People get out of hand. There is nothing extraordinary in what I have mentioned to the Council. I have merely stressed that there is a live dispute. . . . " There are likely to be changes in government, more so in our country where there are elections, than anywhere else but we have not made reservations. Therefore, this is a very qualified statement compared to ours.

Finally, we are two members of the United Nations, and, as Sir Patrick would like to say also member States of the Commonwealth. There is no reason why we should not talk to each other; we have talked to each other on quite a lot of things. But it is one thing for us to initiate talks in that way, and something else to talk under some mandate of the Security Council with its concomitant implication of a report back, and the same kind of controversy going on.

What I really want to point out is this : that during this year my Prime Minister, directly, in his own person, and through our respective representatives, has made at least two efforts to initiate this, and each of them has been turned down. So the Security Council turns around and says that the "two parties" should get together, and so on. I told my friend from Ghana the other day that I understand the desire for conciliation and peace. However, there should be a difference in approach as between those who do some things and those who do not. While it does not mean that you should not make an appeal for talks, the fact has to be taken into account that the fault is not on our side.

Therefore, I conclude these observations by saying that the Government of India will continue to pursue the path of conciliation and maintenance of the articles of the Constitution

138

of the Union and all that we are legally entitled to, refraining from the use of force on our initiative. But if a condition should, arise where, on account of changes that are taking place, and that I read to you a while ago, that is, if they are going to have some tribal raids over the territory, we will take whatever police or military steps are required to meet them. When the situation arises, we shall meet them as we have tried to meet them in the past. Equally, if there are alliances promoted between any part of sovereign India though under illegal occupation of any other country, that is Pakistan, then a new situation arises.

There is a great deal of loose talk about doing this or that or the other. The only good thing that has emerged from Al these deliberations of this Council over the years, as well as from our efforts and their efforts, is the willynilly cease-fire line. In spite of all provocation, I say, in all conscience-I know something about this-in spite of all provocations, we have not allowed war to break out. I hope the Security Council, in spite of all the other extraneous circumstances that may condition the thinking of some of its members, whatever side they may belong to, will take into account the fact that, for us, this is a question of great and vital importance on which is centred the unity of India, the secular character of our State, and, what is more, internal peace of the country, where there is a population of so-called minorities of nearly a hundred million, where very large economic and social experiments--if you would like to call them that---are taking place, sometimes shaking the out of date foundations of an age-worn society.

If it is your desire to see progress take place, it is not achieved by passing resolutions which have no meaning, which cannot apply in the present circumstances, and which would be used by Pakistan only in order to prove to their people that "we have big people outside to assist us and therefore you can do what you really want to do"-that is attack India, provoke her and be intransigent.

It is not our desire to create more trouble in the world than there is. But at the same time, the Council should not mistake our desire to continue the state of quietude and patience in this matter as an attitude of weakness or subservience or a willingness to surrender of our sovereignty under pressure. Our sovereignty we shall never negotiate; our sovereignty we shall never surrender. But we will make a very peaceful effort to prevent the situation from developing into one that would threaten the peace of the world and, wherein it would threaten the peace of India as well. The union of India, its integrity and progress, is a matter of vital concern to us. We are often told by our friends who are concerned for our well-being of their great concern for us. Do they really mean that? If they do, they will bear this in mind.

I thank you and the members of the Council for your kindness and patience.

INDIA IRELAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA PAKISTAN VENEZUELA PANAMA FRANCE RUSSIA ITALY CHINA GHANA

Date : Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

India's Protest Note

Following is the text of Government of India's note dated May 10, 1962 to the High Commission of Pakistan in India, regarding Sino-Pakistan border negotiations :

The ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the High Commission of Pakistan in India and have the honour to state that according to a communique issued by the Government of Pakistan on 3rd May 1962, the Governments of Pakistan and China have agreed to enter into negotiations to locate and align that portion of boundary between India and China west of the Karakoram Pass which is presently under Pakistan's unlawful occupation.

When earlier reports about these proposed negotiations appeared in the Pakistan press, the Acting High Commissioner of India had, in his letters Nos. CH/CO/9/61 dated 4-5-61 and HC/180/61 dated 12-6-1961 to the Foreign Secretary to the Government of Pakistan, conveyod the surprise and concern of the Government of India and pointed out that these reports were confusing as Pakistan and China had no common boundary between them. The Acting

139

High Commissioner of India had also taken the precaution to warn the Government of Pakistan that the Government of India would not be bound by the results of any such bilateral discussions between Pakistan and the People's Republic of China, should these discussions concern the boundaries of the State of Jammu & Kashmir.

Despite numerous reports in the press and

the Pakistan Government's refusal to provide the clarification sought from them, the Government of India had all this time been disinclined to believe that the Government of Pakistan would in fact enter into negotiations with China in respect of the territory of the State of Jammu & Kashmir which forms an integral part of the Indian Union. The Government of Pakistan are obviously not entitled to negotiate with China or any other country about territory that is not their own.

As the Government of Pakistan are aware the international boundary alignment in the sector west of the Karakoram Pass of the. boundary of Jammu & Kashmir State of India follows wellknown natural features, has been recognised in history for all these years, and does not require fresh delimitation. The position regarding this boundary was made clear in the Note given to the Pakistan Government at the time of Indian Prime Minister's visit to Pakistan in September 1960. The Government of India will never agree to any arrangements, provisional or otherwise, between the Governments of China and Pakistan regarding territory which constitutes an inalienable part of the Indian Union.

The Government of India lodge an emphatic protest with the Government of Pakistan and warn them of the grave consequences of their action.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the High Commission of Pakistan the assurances of their highest consideration.

PAKISTAN INDIA CHINA USA **Date :** Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Trade Talks between India and Pakistan : Joint Communique

The following Joint Communique was issued on June 2, 1962 at the end of the trade talks between India and Pakistan :

"Talks were held at New Delhi from May 23 to June 1, 1962, between the Pakistan Trade Delegation led by Mr. K. S. Islam, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, and the Indian Trade Delegation led by Mr. S. Vohra, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The working of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement (1960-63) was reviewed and decisions were taken regarding the value of the commodities to be imported by the two countries in the final year of the Agreement ending March 20, 1963. The talks were held throughout in a cordial atmosphere.

The two major commodities to be supplied respectively by Pakistan and India both under the Special Payments Arrangement and against convertible foreign exchange during the third year of the Agreement are cotton to the extent of 1,00,000 bales and coal at the rate of 1,30,000 tons per month.

It was agreed that the unutilised amounts of the ceilings of the last two years under the Special Payments Arrangement will be carried over into the third year. In addition the ceilings fixed under this Arrangement for the third year are : Rs. 40 lakhs for import of fruits by each country, Rs. 210 lakhs for import of cotton and Rs. 40 lakhs for import of jute cuttings by India, Rs. 180 lakhs for import of coal by Pakistan, Rs. 70 lakhs for import of iron and steel items, bidi leaves, railway material, cement etc. by Pakistan and Rs. 115 lakhs for import of miscellaneous commodities by each country.

Difficulties experienced in the free flow of trade between the two countries were discussed. and measures were agreed upon for removing the bottlenecks.

The Agreed Minutes of discussions were signed today by the Leaders of the two Delegations.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

India's Protest Notes

Following is the text of Government of India's note dated May 14, 1962, to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China, New Delhi:

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and has the honour to refer to the note handed over by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Indian Embassy in Peking on, 30th April 1962.

It is obvious that the allegations made in the Chinese note are misconceived and are based on an erroneous notion of the territorial boundary of the Sinkiang and Tibet regions of China. The Government of India have repeatedly tried to correct this erroneous notion but their patient and repeated efforts in this regard seem, to have had no effect on the Chinese Government.

It is an indisputable fact that, by stages, since 1957, the Government of China have occupied unlawfully a large area of Ladakh which has always been part of India. It is in this process of enlarging their occupation of Indian territory that the Chinese post on the Chip Chap river was established at 35(degree) 19' N, 78(degree) 12' E in 1961. The Government of India had, in their note, dated 21st October, 1961, drawn the attention of the Government of China to the fact of the establishment of this new post and had urged the Government of China to withdraw the post from Indian territory. This protest, like many others before and after it, has gone unheeded, and meantime, a further gradual change has been brought about in the territorial status quo in this region of the Sino-Indian border.

It is strange that in spite of this deep advance into Indian territory, the establishment of military strong points and the construction of roads through Indian territory linking these military strong points with rear bases, the Government of China continue to affirm "that they have stopped sending patrols within 20 kms. on their side of the boundary". This claim, as the Gov ernment of India's earlier notes have shown, is patently false and, in the context of further inroads into Indian territory pointed out in the various notes of the Government of India, absolutely meaningless.

The Chinese note alleges that the Government of India have set up two posts at 35(dg) 16' N, 78(dg) 8' E and at 35(dg) '22' N, 78(dg) 5' E. No post at these points has been established by the Government of India although the Government of India have had posts at approximately 78(dg) 06' E, 35(dg) 17' N and at 78(dg) 02' E, 35(dg) 21' N. These latter posts which are well inside Indian territory have been in existence for some time.

The Chinese note cites 18 cases of alleged intrusions from April 11 to 27. This entire area into which Indian troops are alleged to have intruded is part of Indian territory and the Government of India are responsible for the protection of this territory. In compliance with this defence responsibility, the Government of India have certain posts in the area and men at these posts have been going out occasionally for essential purposes. These posts have been established there to defend Indian territory from further inroads. They are not there to attack anybody or for any aggressive activity as alleged in the Chinese note.

The Government of China are doubtless aware of the aggressive patrolling which Chinese troops in the Chip Chap river area have been carrying out. A few recent examples of such patrolling are cited below --

 On 16th April 1962. 11 Chinese soldiers reached a point at approximately 78(dg) 14'
 E, 35 (dg) 16' N and tried to encircle 4 Indian soldiers at 78(dg) 13' E, 35(dg) 15' N.

- (2) On 21st April 1962, 20 Chinese soldiers with 7 horses reached a point 2,000 yards to the north of the Indian post at 78(dg) 11' E, 35(dg) '16' N for reconnaissance.
- (3) On 22nd April 1962, approximately 70 to 80 Chinese soldiers debussed from three 3-tons lorries immediately to the north of the Indian post at 78(dg) 11' E, 35(dg) 16' N. These men moved forward and occupied at a hill feature at 78(dg) 12' E, 35(dg) 15' N, approximately 3,000 yards south-east of the Indian post.
- (4) On 6th May 1962, at 0930 hours, approximately 20 Chinese soldiers came within 150 yards of the Indian post at 78(dg) 07'E, 35(dg) 28' N. They were supported by a party of another 100 Chinese soldiers, who were approximately 1,000 yards away. When the 20 Chinese soldiers moved up closer to the Indian post, the Indian post commander walked

141

up to within 100 yards of the Chinese party and asked them to withdraw.

The examples cited above show which of the two sides is pursuing an aggressive course in the area. The fact is that not only have Chinese soldiers been carrying on aggressive patrolling deep inside Indian territory and systematically violating India's territorial integrity and security but the Government of China have themselves been constantly threatening to extend these activities along the entire Sino-Indian boundary. Such threats and aggressive activities are not indicative of peaceful intentions.

In the context of the position stated in paras 3, 4 and 7 above, the Government of India must point out that the order which has now been issued by the Chinese Government to their frontier guards to resume patrolling in the sector from Karakoram pass to Kongkala and the further threat that Chinese troops in certain contingencies will resume patrolling along the entire border can only mean that far from maintaining "tranquillity on the border" the Chinese Government propose to adopt further aggressive measures and precipitate clashes. The Government of India hope that the Chinese authorities will consider the grave consequences of what they have threatened to do and act with circumspection.

The Prime Minister of India stated in Parliament on 2nd May 1962, "India does not want and dislikes very much, a war with China. But that is not within India's control." The Government of India hope that the Government of China are earnest about maintaining peace. if so, the two Governments should take necessary steps to prevent armed clashes on the border, ease the tension now existing in the northern sector of Ladakh and lay a Proper foundation for peaceful Degotiations on the boundary question between the two Governments. In this connection, the Government of India would urge the Chinese Government to give serious consideration to the offer made in the Indian Prime Minister's letter dated 16th November, 1959 to Premier Chou En-Lai, which inter alia proposed as an interim measure that, in the Ladakh region. the Government of India should withdraw their personnel to the west of the line shown in the 1956 Chinese map and the Government of China should withdraw their personnel to the east of the international boundary shown in Indian official maps. This will apply not only to armed but also to unarmed and administrative personnel which should be withdrawn and the entire area between the boundaries claimed by the two sides left unoccupied. The adoption of this suggestion will lead to the relaxation of ten-Sion in this border region and create the necessary atmosphere for settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary problem by negotiations and discussions. The Government of India are prepared, in the interest of a peaceful settlement, to permit, pending negotiations and settlement of the boundary question, the continued use of the Aksai Chin road for Chinese civilian traffic. In renewing the Prime Minister of India's offer of 16th November 1959 and also providing for the continued use of the Aksai Chin road, pending negotiations and settlement, the Government of India are solely motivated by their earnest desire to settle the boundary question by peaceful methods. The Government of India hope that the Chinese Government will give serious consideration to this proposal and avoid threatening and aggressive postures which solve no problem but only

create a climate of conflict.

The Ministry of External Affairs renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of its highest consideration.

Following is the text of Government of India's note dated May 10, 1962:

The Ministry of External Affairs present their compliments to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China and have the honour to state that according to a communique issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China on the 3rd May 1962, the Governments of China and Pakistan have entered into an agreement "to locate and align their common border".

As the Government of China are aware there is no common border between Pakistan and the People's Republic of China. It is the India-China boundary which starts from the trijunction of the boundaries of India, China and Afghanistan at approximately long. 74(dg) 34' E and Lat. 37(dg) 3 N and runs eastward up to the trijunction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China.

There has never been any doubt that the sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu & Kashmir, including that part which is under Pakistan's unlawful occupation, vests solely in the Indian Union. The Government of India had so far believed that the Government of the People's Republic of China had accepted this basic position without an reservation. This was confirmed by Premier Chou-En-lai when he stated to the Indian Ambassador in Peking on March 16, 1956 "that the people of Kashmir had already expressed their will" on the issue of Kashmir's

142

accession to India. The same impression was gained at the meeting between the Secretary General of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the Chinese Prime Minister in July 1961. At that time it seemed that the Government of China still acknowledged the final accession of the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the Indian Union. The Government of India are, in view of this background, surprised that the Government of the People's Republic of China should have suddenly decided to enter into an international agreement to negotiate the boundary of that part of the State of Jammu & Kashmir which is under the unlawful occupation of Pakistan with the Government of Pakistan. This is a reversal of the attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China in regard to India's sovereignty over the entire State of Jammu & Kashmir and is, obviously a step in furtherance of the aggressive aims that China has been pursuing towards India in recent years.

In lodging an emphatic protest with the Government of the People's Republic of China for this interference with the sovereignty of India over the State of Jammu & Kashmir, Government of India solemnly warn the Government of China that any change, provisional or otherwise, in the status of the State of Jammu & Kashmir brought about by third parties which seeks to submit certain parts of Indian territory to foreign jurisdiction will not be binding on the Government of India and that the Government of India firmly repudiate any agreements provisional or otherwise regarding her own territories arrived at between third parties who have no legal or constitutional locus standi of any kind.

It is clear that the Government of China are in this matter acting in furtherance of their aggressive designs and are seeking to exploit the troubled situation in Kashmir and India's differences with Pakistan for their advantage. The Government of India will hold the Government of China responsible for the consequences of their action.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of the opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China the assurances of their highest consideration.

143

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU PAKISTAN AFGHANISTAN BURMA **Date :** Jun 01, 1962

Volume No

1995		
Content		
Foreign Affairs Record Jul 01, 1962	2	
Vol. VIII JULY	2 No. 7	
CONTENTS	PAGE	
ALGERIA	145	
Prime Minister's Statement		
DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE		
Shri V. K. Krishna Menon's Spee	ch in Disarmament Committee 145	
ECONOMIC CONFERENCE OF N	ON-ALIGNED NATIONS	
Statement by Leader of Indian De	elegation 152	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS	3	
Finance Minister's Statement in E on U. N. Development Decade	COSOC Session 156	
-		
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AF GOVERNMENT OF IN	FAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISIO IDIA	N
ALGERIA INDIA		

Date : Jul 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

ALGERIA

Prime Minister's Statement

The Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru issued the following statement on Algeria's independence on July 4, 1962:

The almost unanimous vote of the Algerian people in the referendum for independence, and the French Government's formal acceptance of the independence of Algeria, bring to a happy end the epic story of Algeria's struggle for freedom. Surely history gives us few examples of such a valiant struggle against great odds and involving tremendous suffering and sacrifice. In a world where almost every day brings some news which distresses us., the news from Algeria has come as a blessing and a tonic.

Everyone who believes in freedom will rejoice at this happy consummation of a long struggle. We in the Government of India and the people of India are particularly happy and would like to convey our warm and fraternal greetings to the people of Algeria and their brave leaders, more especially the Provisional Government which has for so long guided and inspired her heroic struggle. We rejoice to find that the ideals which they have, set before them, of social justice, secularism and non-discrimination on the basis of race, religion or creed, are ones which we have ourselves enshrined in our Constitution. We look upon them, therefore, as partners in a common endeavour.

We would also like to congratulate President de Gaulle and his Government for bringing to an end this long drawn out struggle in a manner befitting the best traditions of France in the cause of human liberty, equality and fraternity.

We intend to establish diplomatic relations with free Algeria as soon as possible, and to do it in a manner most acceptable to its representatives.

ALGERIA USA INDIA FRANCE **Date :** Jul 01, 1962

Volume No

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon's Speech in Disarmament Committee

Following is the text of the speech delivered by Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Defence Minister, as Chairman of the Indian Delegation on the 24th July, 1962 in the conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the co-Chairmen of the Conference and to you, the Chairman of today's meeting, for kindly allowing me to speak here at all this morning and to come before the other speakers whose names you have read out and who have kindly given way.

We opened this Conference on 14 March, and it is now entering its fifth month. Some of us have not been able to be here right through the session, and this gives rise to two observations which I make on my own behalf and that of my Government.

Firstly, we are appreciative of the very diligent and persevering work done by our alternates in this Conference. it has also given us the opportunity of sensing-in a useful way, I think-what the world generally thinks of what is going on here. 'Mat is to say, in our own countries and elsewhere, although this Conference is not open to the Press, people's eyes are very much turned to it, and, therefore, we are able to react to public opinion very much more than if we were locked up in this Conference over here.

My Government also wants me to draw attention to the fact that we had at the beginning suggested that, in spite of the formalities that are inevitable in any international conference, a considerable degree of informal discussion as between the whole of us or any groups of us or any numbers of us should take place. On that basis we submitted a proposal in the earlier part of the Conference, which the co-Chairman after consultation accepted. While we are appreciative of this, it is the humble view of the Government of India that perhaps a greater degree of informal discussion will help the progress of this Conference. This is not at all said by way of criticism but because of the concern outside and the concern among Governments that the longer these problems remain the more difficult of solution they become. These problems of today did not exist two, three or ten years ago, and, if there had been wisdom on the part of mankind and a lack of suspicion among nations, and if the pressures of public opinion had been able to induce settlements, perhaps some of our difficulties would not be before us.

Secondly, it is inevitable that in a Conference of this kind there should be a considerable amount of paper-though there is far less than we are accustomed to United Nations Conferences or other international conference and large numbers of proposals.

In the first statement I made before this Conference I said that we had a document from the Soviet Union and a proposal from the United States which we thought would soon formulate itself into more definite proposals. That has happened, and it is all to the good. There have been other proposals, mainly concerned with various stages and details. This is inevitable, but at the same time there is to our mind the danger that we may get lost once again, as in previous disarmament discussions, on the impossibility of agreement on some particular matter, therefore this fear of not being able to see the wood for the trees is very much in our minds.

Having said that, we would like to point out that we have gathered here on the basis of the acceptance by the United Nations of full and complete disarmament, and the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of the United States and the Soviet Union, which forms the basis of this Conference, has that same foundation. Therefore any proposals that may be put forward by one side or the other, any compromises or ways of conciliation, must have this one objective in mind-that is, that we are not really seeking the regulation and limitation of armaments, we are not arranging for controlled warfare, about which

145

so much has been written in modem literature, but to establish in our own time and in a very short time a world free from war.

We now look at the situation. In the past five months there have been advances and it would be very wrong not to take notice of them. There has been agreement on the preamble; there has been no overt departure from the Joint Statement, although some of the proposals may give rise to concern; there has been agreement on two or three clauses of the draft treaty; and, what is more, if newspaper reports are correctand we have no other source of full information on this matter-there has been considerable discussion between the two great Powers whose decision must finally settle the fate of armament or disarmament. So in this way there have been advances. As I have said, there has been agreement on the preamble (ENDC/L. 11 /Rev. 1), the first three articles dealing with general obligations have been more or less agreed and a significant phase has been reached as indicated in document ENDC/40; and then there are the two full and complete plans for disarmament. To a certain extent those complete plans are an obstacle because they represent positions already taken; on the other hand, they give a certain amount of definiteness and direction to the discussions.

But although these factors are favourable the situation in the world is that during this period there have been more nuclear explosions. in number and in quantum and intensity, than ever before. What is more, it appears from the recent announcement by the Soviet Union that we are caught in this spiral of explosions in one place followed by explosions in another, in which both the fear that other parties which have carried out explosions have gained advantages and national prestige conic into the situation. So unless we are able to take a bold step in some way and the great Powers agree to stop this rehearsal for nuclear war in the air the world will be in a very bad way. During this year there have been more radiation, more explosions and more preparations for this than in any corresponding period in the history of the world.

We are also in a position in which, in spite of our best efforts, this Conference still remains incomplete on account of the absence of one of the nuclear Powers. I shall refer to this in a moment.

My Government regrets the decision of the Soviet Union to renew tests. This has nothing to do with who renews them or who does not; our position in this matter is exactly the same as it was when the United States unfortunately decided to renew tests. There is enough scientific evidence to show that even the radiation so far released in the universe is of such a character as to have genetic effects of highly deplorable dimensions. In the short time that is available to me, both on account of my own circumstances and because I do not want to tax the patience of the Conference, I have no desire to go into such scientific details as one has been able to gather, at second hand. if you like, but from both sides. There have, however, been advances

146

in this direction. - I hope the Western countries -the United States and the United Kingdomwill not misunderstand me if I say that my country has for seven years taken the view that it is possible, by and large, to detect nuclear tests. Even when the first conference met for discussions in the United Nations this position was opposed. After this Conference began the eight Unaligned countries put forward proposals in this sense, and my Government itself did so, on the basis of its being possible for all practical Purposes to detect these tests through the monitoring by national stations of tests outside their territory, and by various other devices. I shall not go into the details of these, but I am happy to think that the document (ENDC/45) circulated by the United States on the Vela Project-and I hope Mr. Arthur Dean will not mind my mentioning this name, because he took me to task for mentioning it in other circumstances--confilms what has been said in this room and elsewhere-that it is possible for all practical purposes to detect tests of one kind or another. We therefore hope that with this advance the observations I am going to make hereafter will become a little easier.

So far as our own position is concerned, we would like this morning to lay stress upon three or four matters, largely because it is not possible for an individual, even if he represents a government, to come into one meeting and, in a short series of observations of the kind that I am going to make, go into the details of the first, second and third stages. I would only say that my Government is fully committed to the position that no country should be placed in a position of disadvantage by any sacrifices, restrictions or restraints it imposes on itself, and, secondly, that no step in disarmament is, worthwhile if as A result considerable armaments are left in the world which can procreate themselves more or less and develop the equipment required for large-scale war. In other words, both the speed of disarmament as a whole and its quantum at each stage must be adequate to make an impact, and while it is true that it can be logically pleaded that there are some security holes in this matter, our wisdom should be addressed to the task of plugging these rather than just pleading them in bar of advance. This is the position of my Government.

May I interpolate here that it would be a great advantage if, before the next session of the General Assembly, some tangible advances could be made here, because otherwise, in the general trend of discussions in a much larger body expressing perhaps the greater emotional concerns of the peoples of the world, more 'difficulties may be created, in which public commitments cannot be made by the leading Powers. Therefore it is the considered request of my Governmerit that before the General Assembly meetsthat is to say, in the next five or six weeks-this Committee should make advances which will inspire confidence among the nations and not turn public opinion to cynicism. In other circumstances, and in days gone by, before things had advanced so far, we would perhaps have made greater references to the threat to the world of the knowledge of outer space in relation to war; but, taking the practical considerations into account, one can only say "Here is another factor that has come. If we have disarmament beforehand then we do not need to be afraid of it". Therefore, I repeat, the sooner we get some agreements on some things the better.

So I take these items, not in order of importance-after all, one has to speak of things one after another-and first of all I take the dissemination of weapons. There is a very large degree of agreement on this matter. It has the endorsement of the United Nations in resolution 1665 (XVI) of the General Assembly. Now my own Government is not adequately satisfied with this resolution, because it provides for the dissemination of information though not for the dissemination of weapons. Having regard to the technical advance of certain countries, which it would not be proper to name the dissemination of information is itself a, danger; but we hope that this Conference will find a solution to this problem, since there is a considerable degree of agreement in this matter on both sides. Again I do not want to spend time in quoting, but there is a considerable degree of agreement on the side both of the United States and of the Soviet Union in regard to this, and there is the urging by the United Nations. There is a real danger of these nuclear weapons getting into the hands of a larger number of Powers which are-if one may say so-less heavily burdened, and might, therefore, use them at smaller provocation than otherwise. So the non-dissemination of weapons, to our mind, must have greater priority.

We all live in conditions where, in our neighbourhood, there are symptoms of instability, where still the system of military alliances of one side or the other obtains, and, since there is a stockpile or storehouse from which they can be drawn, even the technique of using them without nuclear warheads would, if they were transmitted, create instability in the world. So the first point I would like to lay stress upon is that we should come to some definite decision, however difficult it may be, in regard to the spread of nuclear weapons. 147

In this connexion once again my Government -and I am sure this view will be shared by all governments in the Conference--would appeal to the Republic of France and to its President to take part in our deliberations, because so long as one nuclear Power is outside the agreement the others, or at least one or other of them, will not feel sufficiently safe, or feel that the agreement is free from holes and escapes. Therefore the adherence of France, which is the other nuclear Power and is in a position to transmit information, is of very great importance. So the Government of India, although it is generally regarded as unrealistic, still makes its appeal to the nuclear Powers, in regard to dissemination to take unilateral action: that is to say, it should be an article of faith with the nuclear Powers, pending the abolition of nuclear weapons and their total destruction, at least not to spread this terrible evil all over the world and place it in hands less responsible than their own, Therefore the knowledge either of the manufacture or of the use of nuclear weapons should be restricted to those who have it.

May I say to my colleagues who are what may be called "smaller"-that is at least in relation to others-that there is no national pride involved in this. We do not claim national ego to possess atomic weapons. It has been asked now and then, "Well, if there are going to be nuclear weapons why should they be confined to the great ones"? There may be some force in this in the case of something that serves mankind but so far as my country is concerned we do not feel any national suppression, any national humiliation, any national backwardness in not being able to possess nuclear weapons. Non-dissemination is an urgent necessity. This is not a theoretical Position. There have been investigations made in regard to this by at least twenty countries in the world, including my own, capable of making them. And, what is more, with the advance of science and the smaller size of these weapons, and their portability, their ominousness is increased.

It is interesting, in this connexion, that President Kennedy said on 14 July:

"In the resumed negotiations the United States will continue to seek agreement which will meet the dangers of the nuclear threat. These dangers will only increase if early action is not taken to halt the growth of stockpiles of modem armaments (and) the spread of nuclear weapons into the arsenals of a widening number of countries (ENDC/44).

The Soviet Union has said the same thing in previous documents. So we have, so far as we can see, unless there are reservations in the minds of the parties concerned, a comparatively easy road to travel. But no, road in international affairs, particularly in this business, seems to be easy.

Then we come to the test ban. Most people are inclined to look at this rather cynically. We have been saying this for eight years. My Government and Parliament made submissions to the United Nations in regard to the suspension of nuclear tests for the first time in 1954. For many years it was regarded as an unrealistic proposition, as something academic-in the same way that Antarctica was-but now it has become part of the most serious things that are being considered. We would assume, as comparatively ignorant people, that these tests surely are not for the purpose of national glory. They are not for the purpose of amusement. They are intended to perfect nuclear weapons : that is to say, it would be very wrong to say that they are not integrally connected with disarmament, because nuclear tests are the rehearsal for nuclear war. They are the rehearsal for nuclear war, apart from the definite and objective damage they do to the world, feeding the war mentality and feeding all suspicions. We have said all this so many times before that it is not necessary to repeat it.

Now we come to the stage of negotiating a test ban. It is not for us to say in what way this should be done, but this spiral is very ominous. The ban continued for some time. It was broken when the Soviet Union exploded its giant bomb, and this was followed by very considerable explosions by the United States. And now the Soviet Union is going to have more explosions, and I suppose then others will come afterwards, as things are. Our appeal therefore is that there should be some stop to this. After all, even the power of destruction reaches A point of saturation when it has neither moral nor psychological, neither physical nor lethal, value. Therefore we must now proceed to the conclusion of a treaty. There must be a treaty. I do not want to be misunderstood, we are not retreating from our position with regard to a treaty. What I am saying is that with the advance of knowledge and the advance of everything that has been done and the detectability that is available, wherein even non-nuclear countries can participate, this will lead to the development of some sort of international code of behaviour, the foundations of a future international law, it should be possible now to do something About a test ban in such a way that both of the great nuclear Powers will be able to commit themselves to it without reservations.

Now our own submission is that this test ban agreement will never be reached either in this Conference of in a Conference of four, five or six. This has to be agreed between the United States and the Soviet Union, and it is very largely within the ambit of the capacity of the United States itself--I will not say its responsibilityto bring its other Western ally into the agreement.

On 16 April this year eight of the non-aligned countries at this Conference tabled a memorandum in this connexion which today stands supported by the knowledge gained in what the United Suites calls the Vela project and the tests.

Now we come to two or three other matters which are on the one hand plus factors, a matter of congratulation to ourselves, but on the other hand matters which require further progress. One is with regard to accidental war and the other With regard to surprise attacks. My colleague of the delegation will naturally, when it comes to details, go into this more fully on behalf of my Government but I would like to say that both the co-Chairmen seem to agree, according to the document ENDC/48, that these two or three items may be placed on the agenda.

Now, with regard to the danger of accidental war, considering that this apparatus is no doubt widely disseminated, that so many people are handling it and that there are so many places where accidents can happen, the fact is that, world politics being what they are, some accidents might not even be mere accidents but might, unbeknown to the principles, take place at the hand of interested parties. It would be wrong for me to go into further detail, but I am quite sure we are all grown up people who understand how these things happen. So the possibility of accidental war arising in this way, which is largely of a technical character, has to be avoided.

My Government and its Ministry of External Affairs, and I as a representative at this Conference, keep closely in touch with all developments that take place here, and we know that there has been progress in this matter. There have been proposals, on the one hand, by the United States and, on the other hand, by the Soviet Union in

148

which-irrespective of the fact that there are other points which do not present a picture of concord-there are points on which agreement has been reached. We ourselves think that the agreement by the Soviet Union to an exchange of military missions, which is provided for in the United States draft, is a very considerable advance. It is a considerable advance not only in the way of what is intended but in the way also of allaying suspicion. The military missions of these countries can be in each others' places. Well, we may hope for the time when there will be no military missions, but, if I may say so, in the conditions of the world " they are they do represent at present from the, point of view of the United States a step, however small, however great, towards to what it calls an open world; and, on the other hand, it is a recognition by the other side that it for its part will accept the dangers and the risks of what it calls discovery or espionage in order to prevent a greater accident to the world. As far as we are concerned we express our appreciation of what appears to be greater concord on this matterwe are much too innocent to understand what lies behind it-and of the fact that some beginning in this way has been made.

Equally there is the proposed system of reliable communication between heads of governments which also would be a contribution to what has been called an open world and which, what is more, would inspire greater confidence in world public opinion. It would also be an example to smaller Powers and to those who have ideas of becoming nuclear Powers themselves, that, if they do those things, they would have to notify and to give information-which, to a certain extent, perhaps, might damp their ardour in this connexion.

We therefore venture to make an appeal in this Conference that those who are in a position to do so-and as far as we are concerned we have already done it-should make further and more sustained efforts to obtain the co-operation of France in this because, if France did not come in here, we would have a greater obstacle to overcome in the way of confidence and in the way of creating agreements which are tighter and less likely to be breached than otherwise.

May I interpolate here somewhat left-handedly

it may seem that in spite of all this-in spite of the fact that there have been explosions all the way round, this Conference has been sitting.

Ten years ago, I suppose, that would have resulted in an attitude of, "There have been explosions; there is no point in having a, conference", and they would have shut down. That is an indication that, while we are not licensing evil, we all recognise as realistic people that in spite of this, we have to get on. So, whatever happens, we must proceed-with these efforts and strive persistently to obtain A total ban on these tests. That is tied up with the whole conception of the stoppage of the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

There have been also, I see from the newspapers, proposals with regard to our old friend known as "surprise attack". Of course, the main remedy for that problem of surprise attack 149

is the creation of mutual confidence, and, as I have said, irrespective of the fact that there is not much agreement, apart from the question of Laos, on the various international problems outstanding outside this Conference--or even here except for these few clauses--there is the recognition that negotiations must go on and that they cannot be broken off. In this connexion there have been many suggestions for notification of military movements, and we at. one time suggested the publication of the inventories of arms, and so on-not in a very detailed way, but, whatever it was, the giving of greater information would, be of some assistance in this direction.

There is one further matter I want to speak about before I come to general things. It is that we, of the smaller countries, are sometimes inclined to think, privately or publicly, that the devils in the disarmament business are the great countries. Very often it is said, "if only the under-developed countries were more developed there would be peace". There is no indication that that is so. We must take equal responsibility and blame in this matter. First, in our own lands we have to prepare our public opinion for the time to which Lord Home referred in his first speech, but the people have not become accustomed to the idea of a world without war. As I said, the English have become accustomed to a world where there are no king's horses and no king's men-in the sense of fighting troops. So, in our own countries, this has to come about, and in the practical sense, just as there must be restraint or abolition of the dissemination of nuclear weapons, so the idea that the great Powers are more sought for in the less developed lands in order that they may perhaps have greater access to armed power-that also has to suffer retardation.

To a large extent there would be a restraint on this factor if each nation had to find the resources to arm itself. It is when it is all gratis and post free that more armaments come in, but if nations had to pay for it themselves--if they had to tax their people, if they had to tighten their belts, to impose restrictions and everything else---then I think internal opinion would be greater. On the other hand, if it all comes as Christmas presents then, of course, it is a very different matter.

So, while I have no desire to go, as I may appear to be going, into another problem altogether, if the two great war blocs in the world could restrain themselves from the tendency and what they consider the necessity to distribute war weapons all round and bring greater and greater areas of the world into their zones, then the factors contrary to the possibility of disarming mentalities developing in smaller countries would be reduced.

I want to say something else here, although it will perhaps be misunderstood in some parts of the world. It is one of those problems we have not touched here. We are dealing with the United States, the Soviet Union, the British Empire and France cutting down their armsbringing down their conventional arms to this, that or the other level. We all have armies. We all have troops, aeroplanes, navies and various other things, in our own way, whether it be a few thousands or a few hundred thousands. But all the dangers of armament are not confined to the people against whom it is intended -because radiation cannot be stopped, nor can all the havoc, military, political or economic, be confined within the national borders of a country. And while it may appear, perhaps, a little in the distance at the moment, there is a necessity to create the mentality, the approach, the psychological receptivity for a world without war all over the world, particularly in the newer countries such as ours. When you have so many new nations in Africa and Asia, on account of their desire for self-preservation-their desire that empires should return to their own places, or their fears of their neighbours, and this, that and the other, although they are assisted by one side or other of the warring groups-then, for all these reasons, military power is stepped up. And that stepping up takes place largely, as I have said, because it does not require sacrifices internally. This factor has to be examined, and that leaves the position that while this Conference has to meet behind closed doors-indeed one good thing here that the television cameras are absent-and while we have to discuss seriously in private, we also have to consider, probably nationally, educating or, rather, preventing a tremendous cynicism and lack of faith arising in the world with regard to our work itself. I lay great stress upon this because, although we may perhaps not realise it, the whole volume of feeling of all kinds in the world-irrespective of country, ideology, and so on-in regard to nuclear tests, nuclear war, and war itself, is today not what it was ten, five or even two years ago. Even in my own country we have always said, "There is no need for peace propaganda here because it is carrying coals to Newcastle". Even there we find that governments are hard pressed for information-which they may not well give-out of the degree of confidence we must exercise with regard to this Conference itself, and it would be a great tragedy if all this feeling which comes out of a good sense of humanity and basically out of a sense of human fellowship and the desire to

150

survive were to be turned into cynical channels and people were to turn round and say, "Eighteen nations are sitting in Geneva. They will talk and talk, they will go home for a time, and then they will come back and talk again". That would be a great loss to us, because ultimately it is not the documents we write or the signatures which we put upon them which count: it is our ability to carry our own peoples with them. We must be able to carry the entire population with us. As I have constantly said here, "Our national procedures will not permit, our public opinion will not permit." All it means is that we have to carry our entire populations with us.

I have deliberately confined myself to making more general observations than I would otherwise have done. However, I should like to conclude by saying that this whole problem must be dealt with on the one hand without any lessening of the intensity of our concern for the main objective which is general and complete disarmament -not the regulation of war; not the regulation or the limitation of arms; not licensed evil but the ending of it.

First, we believe that the intensity or impact which any stage can make, as well as the total period of disarmament, must be limited to a short period because it is the considered opinion of my Government, repeatedly expressed by my Prime Minister in Parliament, that either we must disarm in a reasonably short time or the problem will become far worse than before. Nuclear energy was one of those things in the early days of the United Nations Organization which created a problem which was not dealt with at that time. Now it is outer space. Each time various ancillary problems arise which make the solution of the basic problem more difficult. Therefore the impact that any stage can make on the whole quantum of arms and on the world must be sufficiently heavy to make a difference. I am not able to go into any details here without working out the whole theory.

Secondly, the period that each stage takes and the period which the whole programme takes must be comparatively limited because otherwise there will be sufficient time within the stages for nations to resume the process of rearmament. It is as though there were a poisonous tree in our garden; if we do not cut it out by the root so that it does not grow again-even if we do not get the whole of it out--then the cutting has no particular value.

Thirdly, it is necessary that there should be no intervals between stages; that is to say, it is just as in economic planning, where the third plan is thought out while the second plan is proceeding, and the fourth plan is thought out while the third an is on its way. It is not as though we can finish one plan and then sit down to decide to go on to something else in the light of what has been done. In other words it has to be a continuous process, and there must be an element of vigilance and control-not necessarily because the great Powers may think the other party may do something wrong, but in order to inspire confidence.

At no time in the last eight or ten years of discussion has my Government ever departed from the view that, the world being constituted as it is. the factor of creating confidence on all sides calls for degrees of control. However control should not be pleaded in bar of the effort itself.

So in spite of the clouds on the horizon, in spite of the larger and more beautiful bombs that are exploded, in spite now of the overt statements that these are intended to perfect more weapons, in spite of the fact that more and more conclusive weapons-I will not use any other adjective-are available and, if I may say so to some of the partners in these great alliances even though partisanship is still dominant in these discussions-and we ourselves, as a group of non-aligned countries, probably have not been able to achieve the impact, the degree of catalyctic process, that is necessary in a deadlock--I hope that, as a result of the wisdom, the sense of responsibility and, what is more the greater knowledge possessed by the nuclear Powers, than whom nobody knows better what are the consequences of all this, the time will soon come when this Conference will be told by the great Powers that they have no objection to the disclosure of the quantum and location of nuclear stocks and that, after that disclosure, it will be easier to proceed towards the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

It is interesting to note that although the United Kingdom delegation has not communicated the information to this Conference at any time, and has not been asked to do so, the British newspapers published the quantum of stocks held in the United Kingdom and the reason why they cannot hold any more. Britain is a small island and so it cannot keep any more--and nowadays the British do not take any more islands. So there it is.

The impact of facts will push us in this direction, but the part of wisdom lies not in being pushed by facts but in foreseeing facts and utilizing them for mutual advantage and for the common advantage of mankind.

I thank the Conference for the attentive reception of my remarks, and also the co-Chairmen and yourself, Sir, for allowing me to attend the Conference.

INDIA USA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE RUSSIA LAOS SWITZERLAND **Date :** Jul 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

ECONOMIC CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS

Statement by Leader of Indian Delegation

Following is thee text of the Statement by the Leader of the Indian Delegation, Shri Manubhai Shall, Minister of International Trade, India, on the 12th July 1962, to the Conference on the Problems of Economic Development held at Cairo.

Mr. Chair-man, distinguished delegates and friends: Our Conference has, indeed, started off well. We were fortunate to hear from the distinguished President of the U.A.R. a most inspiring address. Under the farsighted and dynamic leadership of President Nasser, this land of ancient civilisation has once more caught world attention. I have been a frequent visitor to this land and the great and striking and agreeable changes that have taken place since the Revolution can be seen by everybody visiting the U.A.R. now.

The world is in the throes of revolutions. Almost all the parts of the globe are today enjoying freedom and a few more remaining countries are to join the rest of us. It is, therefore, timely that President Nasser wisely reminded us of the supreme need of peace. As the President said, peace alone can bring prosperity and progress. Waging peace will enable mankind to wage the grim battle of man against poverty, hunger and ill-health. It is, therefore, good that we have met here today to discuss the problems that confront us and which, if not resolved, would menace the peace of the whole globe.

The foundations of peace, the ever lasting one or at least a long spell of peace, can be secured if we can remove the factors which militate against peace. Tensions, irritants and disparities between man and man are the root cause of all conflicts and wars. It is in this spirit of removing tensions and disparities and of creating international harmony and forging far-reaching co-operation between the countries of the world that our conference has met to discuss economic problems of the developing-under-developed countries.

We are gathered here today because we all consider that rapid economic development of the less developed countries is one of the most important requirements of the world today. We all know that there are big differences in living standards between the highly developed and the less developed countries. Statisticians use many refined techniques to measure the inequality of income distribution. The broad fact that per capita consumption in the highly developed countries is 8 to 10 times as high as in the underdeveloped world is, however, indisputable. What is more, the gap is growing and yawning. The distance and disparities of incomes and living standards between the highly industrialised countries and the under-developed countries instead of reducing are rapidly increasing. It is natural that the gap should widen in the absence of largescale remedial action for the richer countries naturally save larger proportions of their national income than the poorer ones.

We are, I am sure, all agreed that this situation is one which must be changed quickly. It is wrong and dangerous that millions of people should not have the minimum requirements for a civilised life and for upholding the dignity of man. The existence of wide gaps in per capita incomes as between countries result in the creation of situations which threaten world peace. Within our own country, we are all determined to achieve a fuller measure of equality and social justice; and this objective can only be effectively pursued when aggregate national income is rising.

Sir, I would suggest that there is no need for us to be defeatist in approaching this problem. In all our countries, there is a determination to move forward rapidly taking the necessary domestic measures and co-operating with one another. There is also increasing recognition in the industrialised countries of the need to co-operate adequately in the task of promoting growth in the less developed countries. It is gratifying and heartening to see that the idea of "world responsibility" is catching and growing to dimensions never known before. Isolation and self-centred-

152

ness are yielding place to mutual assistance programmes and world responsibility for all round human welfare of all the peoples. We all know that the United Nations has, with universal consent, devoted more and more of its attention to this matter in recent years. It is imperative that we aim to secure rates of growth high enough to solve this problem of under-development in the relatively near future. Unless we do so, we shall lose by default the major struggle of our times.

As the time at the disposal of our Conference is somewhat short, I would not like to dilate upon all our social and economic problems. We are all fully familiar with these problems which are common to most of our countries even though tire intensity may vary from country to country and the nature of problems may be somewhat different according to the size of the population and the magnitude of the natural resources.

We may assure the United Nations that we in this Conference desire to secure solutions of our problems through the forum of the United Nations, We have not met here with any negative or parochial approach. As we are confronted with common problems, we have met here to discuss them and would like to meet again in future to discuss our problems and place them before the United Nations so that in the spirit of harmony and co-operation, remedial measures can be found to these problems. It is clear that only through the co-operation of all the industrialised countries that these problems of ours, which are the problems of the whole world, can be satisfactorily settled. It would, therefore, be proper for us to request for periodical meetings

under the auspices of the United Nations for discussing economic problems of the underdeveloped countries. Our Conference here can specifically study at experts level in a more detailed and integrated manner these problems and suggest solutions and remedial actions and policies which can form the background for the deliberations of a World Economic Conference.

I would also like that our Statement of Conclusions on which the Drafting Committee is engaged may clearly stipulate what we consider our own obligations which we should discharge towards the solution of our problems. Therefore, one part of our Statement can be devoted towards our own obligations and the other part may, perhaps, deal with our needs--that is the needs of the developing countries in terms of economic and trade policies and actions.

On the subject of our own obligations, we may indicate in our Statement the full significance of what we consider as our own obligations towards the raising of the living standards of our people. The world knows that we are not asking for any assistance and co-operation from them excepting through our own programmes of selfhelp. In the ultimate analysis, only self-help, sacrifices cheerfully borne by our people and hard work put in by our millions can secure for us the destruction of the hideous spectres of poverty, hunger and disease. And we want to assure the more fortunately placed countriesthe highly industrialised countries-that we are ourselves prepared to undertake and discharge our own duties and obligations squarely.

As a part of our obligations, I would emphasise that in this Conference we devote some attention to some of the most important things that we might intensify in our own programmes of national reconstruction, while we may look forward to the world assistance from the more prosperous countries for solutions of our economic problems.

One deficiency, which is common to most of our developing countries is the lack of adequate skilled manpower and trained workers and lack of technically and scientifically trained personnel. Modern technology moves on the locomotion of well-trained technical and managerial class. Therefore, while primary education, secondary education and higher education have got to be given the most important place in our programmes, it is very vital that we all fully cooperate with one another in launching upon more intensified programmes in our countries for imparting technical and scientific training to a much larger number of our young men and women. It is the failure of the human element which in the ultimate analysis has been the bane of underdeveloped countries. If the history of the countries which have phenomenally progressed within the last 15 years since the Second World War is examined, one could see that those countries which had a well-built foundation and supply of specialised training and skilled man-power, were the first to catch up and accomplish accelerated rates of growth and construction. We of the developing countries should, therefore, give our undivided attention to this. Along with technically trained personnel, higher management and middle-management personnel has to be adequately increased.

Another point on which we need to further concentrate is on raising agricultural productivity because agriculture is the most important industry that our countries possess. I know that all of our countries around this table have given agriculture a very high place. But sometimes our natural and felt needs for modem industry makes us less aggressive to the need of more intensified agricultural productivity and modem agricultural practices. We ourselves in India have found

153

that sound industry could be only built on a sounder agricultural base. As most of us are, at the present moment, producers of primary products, it is all the more necessary that we grow more per acre or per unit of agricultural land available to us. Then also, we should grow better and more valuable crops in terms of crop land. We should not rely on one or two agricultural and plantation commodities. We heard vesterday our friend the distinguished delegate from Brazil mention that diversification of their Largest crop, namely coffee, was being contemplated by them in order to create for Brazil a more dependable agricultural base. Thus higher productivity in agriculture and properly diversified agricultural crop pattern could help us to reduce our sole dependence, so to say, which

exist today on one or few agricultural or mineral or plantation products. It would also procure for ourselves better prices in the world market for our well-planned, higher productivity orientated and diversified crops. While, therefore, I will mention the question of commodity prices and their stabilisation in a subsequent reference, I should like to draw attention of our friends here to the urgent need of our accepting and adopting a more diversified pattern of production and higher productivity techniques in our agricultural plantation and industrial sectors.

With regard to the industrial development and provision of public utilities in which India has achieved some experience in the last decade of planning through our First Five-Year Plan and the Second Five-Year Plan and now we are in the midst of our Third Five-Year Plan, I may mention that the creation of an adequate infra structure is most essential for our developing countries. Adequate development of power resources, of transport by rail, road and water, and adequate development of fuel and mineral oil resources would in the ultimate analysis prepare the right background and facilities for a speedier growth of industrial sector. From the speeches that we heard since the last two days and from the account that we have before us of the programme of economic development adopted by all the developing countries, it is obvious that each one of us is paying good attention to the creation of a sound infra structure in our national economy.

External trade is broadly a part of internal trade of any country. It is, therefore, but proper that if we want to raise our exports, we, the under-developed countries, will have to strengthen and establish healthy and fair trading practices and quality consciousness at home. Some of the commodities of our countries are sometimes not graded properly and quality consciousness is not as widely spread as one would wish it to be. I am quite sure that all the countries around this table fully appreciate the need of establishing strong trading traditions and quality consciousness for all our major products that go into the external trade. This is not difficult to achieve and the sound trading and commercial ethics would help us to strengthen both our internal trade and our foreign trade.

We have accepted the need for planning our social progress and our economic development. All the developing countries have been attempting to formulate such long-term plans as a supplement to short-term plans for five years or some years period. We have found that international co-operation is most valuable in the process of planning as each one of us can learn from the experiences of the other. The United Nations is providing valuable guidance in this respect. In the ECAFE region, some useful work has been done in the recent past on these matters. Recently, we had the pleasure of welcoming to New Delhi planners from several Asian countries and we had fruitful discussions. The different regional economic commissions of the United Nations are doing this. AU of us are aware that the U.N. Secretariat is playing a more active role in the field of industrial development; and the present time, much useful information on planning policies and procedures in various countries is being collected. I am hopeful that in course of time, the United Nations will be able to play even a more valuable part in aiding and co-ordinating our efforts to build up and sustain high rates of growth. It would be useful if we were to record in our statement that we attach high priority to the activities of the United Nations in the field of development studies in general and of industrial development in particular. We in this Conference may, therefore, express our support to the concept of planned development of our national economics and of planned and coordinated trade and economic policies and programmes on the international plane.

I now turn to the question of the needs of the developing countries which we should try to bring out clearly in our Statement of Conclusions. These needs must be met adequately and quickly by the world as a whole and ourselves in order that there may be rapid economic development.

I referred earlier to the great need for skilled personnel in large numbers in order to carry out development programmes in our countries. While we should make all necessary arrangements to train workers in the various fields, a developing country will also need to get from the industrialised countries a number of specialists in many different fields, to carry out urgent tasks and to, impart training. Further, it is necessary to send abroad large numbers of trainees from the tinder-developed countries. We know that the activities of the United Nations and other international organisations in the field of technical assistance and technical training programme have grown greatly in recent years. However, they are still far short of the requirements of the developing countries. There is urgent need on the part of the United Nations and the industrialised countries for sizeable expansion of these training and technical assistance programmes in order to provide more fully for the inescapable requirements of the developing countries. We should emphasize this in our conclusion.

Coming to the need for finance and credit assistance as the Ethiopian and Algerian delepates rightly pointed out that the requirements of finance capital of the developing countries for maintaining adequate growth rate cannot be met unless the quantum of credit and financial assistance is greatly increased. We should, therefore, indicate also in our conclusions that the credit assistance may be made available more liberally and in larger amounts and on terms of repayments which do not impose too onerous a burden on the balances of payment of the less developed countries. The credits should be repayable on very long-term basis.

It is natural for underdeveloped countries which may have plenty of labour and which are starting to industrialise to begin with the simpler manufactures such as textiles and light engineering goods and a variety of other light and medium industrial products. The less developed countries can supply these products to markets abroad and thus earn more foreign exchange for their development programmes, as a supplement to the export earnings from agricultural and primary products. It is important that this trend should not be inhibited by restrictions of various kind being imposed by the industrialised countries. It is in the interest of the more developed countries also to gradually turn to the more complicated manufactures of capital goods and complex products and avoid the simpler industries and thus to plan on the basis of an international division

of labour. It should be remembered that the developing countries are already providing to the industrialised countries an ever expanding capital goods market. Therefore, it would be appropriate that the consumer goods and light products manufactured in the under-developed countries should find adequate markets in the industrialised countries.

The developed countries can also promote economic development by adopting positive policies to promote the exports of the under-developed countries through appropriate adjustments of tariffs, elimination or liberalisation of quotas and assistance in marketing. Tariff walls, if raised, will retard the growth of world trade. The GATT Ministerial Declaration of December, 1961, provides a valuable policy statement for the liberalisation of imports into the more developed countries of primary products and manufactured articles from the less developed countries thus making available expanding markets for the economies of the under-developed countries. Our statement should draw the attention of the United Nations that what is more imperative and necessary now is to make Ministerial Declaration effective in implementation, because on one hand we welcome long-term assistance which will only be returned to an expanding market of exports for the developing countries in the markets of the industrialised countries.

Many of our colleagues have here emphasised that regional economic groupings of the industrialised countries can damage the interests and economies of the developing countries if conceived and operated in a restrictive manner. We may express the hope that such groups, and specially the European Community, will regard the liberalisation and expansion of trade with the less developed countries of the world as a primary responsibility. It is only if they do so that the natural movement towards closer regional ties can also be constructive in a world-wide context.

The expansion of trade should be on the basis of equality and non-discrimination. It will be wrong for the developed countries to seek and receive special privileges in some markets at the expense of the trade of other less developed countries.

It is well known, Sir, that the less developed

countries rely mainly on exports of primary products for foreign exchange resources. Most of our colleagues here have emphasised the importance of ensuring fair prices on a stabilized basis for these items. As our colleagues from Indonesia, Brazil and Ethiopia pointed out, the matter has been discussed in very considerable details in several forums over the last few years and there is a mass of information available on all the aspects. We would like to press that concrete solutions should be found in order that this problem of price stabilisation at fair levels for primary agriculture and plantation products may be solved.

Instead of relying on one or two of the products we seek to diversify direction so that the

155

stabilisation of prices presents a practical problem. Such solutions can be mutually agreed and implemented through appropriate mechanisms and international agencies for the various products. The data on all these commodities is fully known. Therefore, perhaps I do not see much need, as suggested by my distinguished delegate from Brazil for a new survey team or group for this purpose, actually the data on all the plantation group is available in an extensive manner with the U.N. And if any team or group at this stage is proposed, we should clearly state that what is needed is formulation of policies and active programmes by the appropriate agencies of the United Nations.

I should also like to refer to the need to expand trade between the less developed countries. We should identify and overcome the obstacles such as lack of transport facilities or of knowledge of trading possibilities which have stood in the way. We should adopt the policy measures needed to promote the trade between the developing countries. It is quite possible that a large volume of expanding trade could be done within the developing country itself. It is regrettable that we often impose severe restrictions on one another's trade because of balance of payment reasons. We could all gain by mutual liberalisation. On this matter also, the GATT Ministerial Declaration of December, 1961 contains many wise and far-reaching suggestions. The Declaration calls on the less developed countries to keep in mind the possibilities of encouraging sound economic development through increased trade among themselves when formulating tariff commercial and economic policy measures. This is a thought that could appropriately find a place in our conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the above are some of the thoughts that I have ventured to place before the Conference so that our Statement of Conclusions and declarations to be submitted to the United Nations in the appropriate form by our Conference could reiterate our complete adherence to the United Nations; we could express out clear feelings that we are participating here in a constructive spirit for more comprehensive and detailed discussions of our problems and exploring of grass root remedies in a forum of friendly countries, with common economic problems; that we are conscious of our own obligations to ourselves and to the world and that we are expressly stating our emergent needs of quicker development and expanding export markets for our primary products at fair and stabilised prices that we seek international division of labour in the field of industrialisation so that the process of industrialisation of the under-developed countries does not get plagued by tariff barriers and quantitative restrictions to the exports of their manufactured products to the more developed countries.

The proposed International Trade and Economic Conference that is a World Economic Conference under the auspices of U.N. which we are looking forward to should help to formulate economic and trade policies to achieve goals of securing harmonious and balanced development of all the countries of the world and all the peoples.

INDIA EGYPT USA BRAZIL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA ETHIOPIA RUSSIA **Date :** Jul 01, 1962

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Finance Minister's Statement in ECOSOC Session on U.N. Development Decade

Following is the text of the Statement by Shri Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister of India on Item 4 of the Agenda of the 34th Session of Economic and Social Council of the United Nations -UN Development Decade.

Mr. President : This is the first time that I have had the privilege of participating in the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. And I am very happy indeed that I should have this opportunity when the subject matter on our agenda is one of the highest importance to my Government and my country as much as to the world community as a whole.

The words "Development Decade" have a very familiar ring in India. We have just completed the first decade of planned development and we are aware that the second decade of development in which we have just enteredthe decade that coincides with the U.N. Development Decade-marks a decisive phase in our efforts to eradicate the abject poverty of the millions of our countrymen. What is true of India is true, by and large, of two-thirds of the human race which has been left behind in the struggle for economic betterment. And it is only in the fitness of things that the General Assembly of the U.N. unanimously adopted a resolution calling attention to what is undoubtedly going to be the most vital problem confronting the international community in the next generation or two.

So much has been said and written about the development of the less-developed countries in the recent past that sometimes I wonder if we are not in danger of substituting talk for

156

action and indeed, of talk inhibiting action which cannot wait. But, even at the risk of some repetition it is important to focus attention on the basic issue which is at stake. Statisticians and economists have been telling us for a long time that the riches of the world have been distributed unevenly, that the disparities between the nations that have been transformed by science and technology and those that have not been so transformed, have been growing rather than diminishing; and that such are the laws of growth that we can expect these disparities to grow further unless something is done to transfer resources from the richer to the poorer parts of the world. I venture to submit, Sir, that while it is important that we know how equal or unequal is the distribution of wealth among nations the really important and deepseated urge among the people in the poorer parts of the world is not so much that of achieving a status of equality or near-equality in economic terms with their fellow human beings in other lands as the urge to achieve that sense of dignity and self-respect which comes from elimination of the fear from want.

It seems to me that it does not matter at all if the countries which are already rich continue to progress at the rate of 5 or 6 or 7 per cent per year as long as the people in the poorer regions are also able to witness a steady improvement in their living conditions. Indeed, in many ways, the fact of rapid progress anywhere will facilitate a somewhat faster progress everywhere. It is not so much. the concern for some abstract concept of equality but the desire to live in dignity and without fear which moves the minds and hearts of people in the poorer regions. Unless we appreciate this basic fact, we are not likely to devise measures of international cooperation which will truly enhance the cause of peace and security among members of the entire human race.

I, for one, have no doubt whatever that sooner or later the problem of poverty and want would be solved in every country of the world even if the people in the poorer parts of the world have to life themselves by their own unaided efforts. The means to overcome poverty are there, thanks to the patient labours of scientists and technicians everywhere. And a people aware of their own wretchedness and conscious of their self-respect and dignity would sooner or later find the will to wield the means that are at hand. In this struggle for economic betterment, there is no such things as nations destined to remain poor and nations destined to be rich any more than there are nations destined to be dependent and those that are destined to remain free. Notwithstanding the doubts of many, the winds of political change have swept across practically all parts of the world and in the short span of some fifteen yews political independence as become reality in most parts of Asia and Africa. In time, economic betterment will follow the advent of political independence. No one who has watched the course of human history can have any doubts on this score.

For the international community, the really important question is this. "Granted that the major part of the burden of development must necessarily be borne by the people of the developing countries themselves should we not, as members of an international community strive to lighten the stresses and 'strains that inevitably accompany development and to reduce the hardship which might result from the efforts of the poorer people to develop fast enough against heavy odds?" For one of the most relentless aspects of the dynamics of development is this, that it is only by foregoing the fruits of current development, at least in part, that future development can be assured. And if you start with abject poverty, the price of development in terms of privations, hardship and indeed harshness is particularly high. Add to this the prospect that a nation thrown on its own devices so to speak, with no escape from harshness unto itself will develop excessively inward-looking traits which accord ill with the edifice of international understanding and goodwill that we in the U.N. are trying to construct. It is, I think, in the considerations I have just mentioned that we should look for the rationale of the Resolution which has been adopted unanimously by the General Assembly and which we must now seek to implement in concrete terms.

Now that the United Nations has explicitly and in concrete terms recognised the need for international action by designating the current decade as the United Nations Development Decade, it is essential that we should apply our minds to the specific measures which should be adopted to fulfil our basic objective. This objective, let us appreciate, is a modest one. If we can achieve the increase at the rate of five per cent annually in the national income of the developing countries, then, by 1970 a country like India will still have a per capita income of less than a hundred dollars a year. The position would be similar in several other countries.

The question to which we have to address ourselves is how this objective is to be attained. The Secretary-General has helped us in our

157

task by preparing a comprehensive report on what is being done and what needs to be done. He has also this morning in his opening speech re-emphasised the importance and the coinplexity of the tasks ahead. My delegation endorses the proposals for common action set out in the Secretary-General's report.

I should also like to say that we are in agreement with many of the points which ambassador Stevenson made in his speech this morning. Quite clearly the primary responsibility for initiating development programmes and for providing the resources to carry them through must be that of the developing countries themselves. What others, the more prosperous nations, and the international community as a whole can do is to make good those deficiencies and those shortages which the developing country itself through its own efforts cannot meet. Without doubt from this point of view the highest priority needs to be given to the twin problems of trade and aid.

The nature and extent of the problems relating to trade expansion for developing countries have been increasingly engaging the attention of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly in recent sessions. Much detailed and painstaking work has been done in the GATT and its committees concerning trade problems of less developed countries. In November 1961, a declaration on promotion of trade of the less developed countries was unanimously adopted at the Ministerial meeting of members of the GATT. All these things are useful as far as they go, but the progress in implementing the policies unanimously endorsed is still very slow. The first thing that the industrialised countries can do in order to help the developing countries to help themselves is to remove the existing obstacles to the exports of these countries. These obstacles take various forms-tariffs and quota restrictions, internal fiscal levies and administrative procedures. Basically, the arguments in favour of such restrictions are protectionist arising from the fear of possible disturbance of certain sectors of the domestic economy if imports from the less developed countries were allowed to come in more freely. It is indeed paradoxical that the rich and technologically advanced countries which, because of their resources and knowhow, have an advantage in producing the most complex products of the modem industrial society, should insist on protecting and subsidising simpler forms of manufacture in the production of which the less industrialised countries have a comparative advantage. They do this at considerable cost to themselves and immeasurable harm to the developing countries. I am in full agreement with what has been said both in the Secretary-General's report and in the speeches today about the importance, through commodity arrangements of ensuring fair terms of trade for developing countries. We should, however, not forget that it is not through the exports of primary products alone that developing countries can achieve viability. Their processed goods, semi-manufactures, and simple manufactures must find markets abroad. In the past, preferential treatment was being given to products of underdeveloped countries in markets of industrialised countries with whom they had special political ties. Such preferential treatment had the major drawback of discrimainting between one developing country and another and of making each developing country dependent on a particular market. Clearly, preferential arrangements which discriminated between one developing country and another cannot and should not be perpetuated. But the basic philosophy of allowing underdeveloped countries to sell their product on specially favourable terms in the markets of industrially advanced countries is worth preserving. It should not be allowed to become a casualty in the process of regional grouping.

In the field of capital assistance though there has been some progress in regard to the quantum of external assistance in the last few years, we have still a long way to go before reaching the goal that we have already set before ourselves. The General Assembly, at its fifteenth session, passed unanimously a resolution urging that the net flow of capital assistance going to the under-developed countries should approximate one per cent of the combined national income of the wealthier countries. Available estimates show that at present the net flow of long-term funds from the developed countries falls short of the target of one per cent envisaged in the General Assembly resolution.

My delegation would also like to emphasise that in estimating the flow of financial resources from the developed to the lessdeveloped world, one has to be careful in weeding out flows which are not directly in the nature of net capital inflows. For instance, the estimation of net flows into the under-developed countries must make allowance for repayments and also for interest charges on previous loans. It should also exclude funds transferred to under-developed countries for defence support, or expenditure incurred in dependent territories on administration and security. When such adjustments are made to the estimates of net

158

inflows---and my delegation would urge that in, presenting UN estimates of flows from the developed to the under-developed countries, appropriate corrections should be carried outthere is little doubt that the net figures of capital inflow will fall substantially short of the level of one per cent accepted by the General Assembly.

The national incomes of the wealthier countries are now nearly ten times as much as the total incomes of the developing countries and they are growing roughly at the rate of five per cent annually. In absolute terms the annual increase in national income of advanced industrial countries is about 45 to 50 billion dollars. The additional assistance necessary to reach a level of one per cent of national income is hardly one tenth of the annual increase in national product of advanced countries. This order of additional sacrifice should certainly not be beyond the reach of statesmanship in the industrially advanced countries.

No less important than the quantum of assistance is the question of terms of assistance. Let us be quite clear in our minds that what is needed is aid or assistance and not loans on ordinary commercial terms. Interest rates and repayment schedules must be such as to ensure that they do not impose an intolerable burden of debt service on developing countries. It was the recognition of this principle which led to the establishment of the International Development Association as an adjunct of the World Bank and it is the same principle which has governed the policy of a few of the advanced countries. But, here again, practices vary widely and progress in the direction of the principles already accepted has been slow. Despite the most persuasive efforts of the World Bank and its President Mr. Black, there has been little progress towards enlarging the resources of the IDA; and to put it mildly, the proposed UN Capital Development Fund has not yet found favour with those whose support is of crucial importance.

It must be clearly recognised that there is no way of repaying an international debt except through export surpluses. Countries in the process of rapid development are likely to be in balance of payments difficulties for years to come. Their net capacity to repay will continue to be a negative one until they have progressed a long way on the road to development and that too provided their export opportunities are enlarged rather than restricted. Most of the countries which are today making available credits to help developing countries, insist, in order to safeguard their own balance of payment, that these credits should be tied to purchases in the lending countries. An extension of the same principle would suggest the conclusion that when these loans are repaid, the repayments should be tied to purchases from the borrowing countries,

Mr. President, I do not want to take up more of your time. We are agreed upon our basic objectives. We know that the international community as a whole has got the resources to achieve the kind of growth that the Development Decade seeks to achieve. We are aware of the ways through which real progress can be achieved and of the pitfalls and dangers to be avoided. The thing to do now is to act-to act with courage, determination and faith. The longer we delay the bigger will be the burden that all of us will have to carry.

159

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date : Jul 01, 1962

August

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record		Aug 01, 1962
Vol. VIII	AUGUST	No. 8

CONTENTS

FRANCE

Instruments of Ratification of Treaty of Cession	163
Prime Minister's statement on transfer of Pondicherry	163
INDONESIA Prime Minister's Statement on West Irian	163
IRAN	
Trade Agreement between India and Iran	164

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Chief Secretaries' Talks

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinese Activities in Ladakh	165
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on India-China border situation	166
Prime Minister's reply to Lok Sabha debate on India-China border situation	168
Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on India-China border situation	178
Prime Minister's reply to Rajya Sabha debate on India-China border situatio 9	n 17

POLAND

Agreement with Polish firm on new Coal Washery 186

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

USA FRANCE INDONESIA IRAN INDIA PAKISTAN CHINA POLAND **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Instruments of Ratification of Treaty of Cession

Instruments of Ratification of Treaty of Cession between India and France in respect of former French possessions in India were exchanged in New Delhi on August 16, 1962, between the Prime Minister and the French Ambassador. The Prime Minister and the French Ambassador also exchanged notes stating that these instruments have been exchanged.

The Treaty of Cession was signed by repre-

sentatives of India and France on May 28, 1956, regarding French establishments of Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam. This Treaty was to come into effect on its ratification by the two Governments. The Government of India had ratified the Treaty at that time, but the Government of France ratified it on July 27, 1962. The Instruments of Ratification in respect of this Treaty were accordingly signed by the Presidents of the two countries.

FRANCE INDIA USA

Date : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Prime Minister's statement on transfer of Pondicherry

Statement of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in Rajya Sabha on August 22, 1962 on the de jure transfer of Pondicherry to India :

I should like to refer to the recent de jure transfer of Pondicherry to India. This matter has been pending for a large number of years, and most of us, and many Members of this House, must have felt rather frustrated at the great delay in this transfer. But ultimately it has taken place. We realised then, and we realise now, that France was going through a difficult period, and there have been big constitutional changes in France and, therefore, although We pressed for it, reminded them of it, we did not Wish to say or do anything which might injure our relations with France. I am glad that the policy of patience pursued by us has led to a successful result. Now, Pondicherry and the other old French Settlements are part of India, and presently the matter will come up before this House in another form. But the main thing is we have done this, in accordance

with our habit and practice, peacefully and without injuring in any way our relations with France, and I should like to express my appreciation of the French Government and specially of its eminent President, President de Gaulle.

FRANCE USA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Prime Minister's Statement on West Irian

Statement of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in Rajya Sabha on August 22, 1962 on the agreement between the Indonesian Government and the Government of the Netherlands in regard to West Irian.*

You will permit me, Sir, to refer to one or two developments of international significance, which have no relation to this subject, but I feel the House will perhaps appreciate my references. One is the recent agreement arrived at between the Indonesian Government and the Government of the Netherlands in regard to West Irian. I should like to congratulate both these Governments on the peaceful settlement of a very difficult and delicate problem and-I should like to add-more especially congratulate the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U. Thant, who took the initiative in this matter, and also, if I may, Mr. Bunker, who played an important role in these negotiations. This removes one source of conflict in South-East Asia. A little while ago there was the Laos settlement, which also has removed another source of conflict in South-East Asia. There are still other conflicts going on in South-East Asia, but the settlement of these two is a matter of good augury for the peace of South-East Asia,

and we are particularly happy not only because of our intimate contacts with the countries concerned but also because, in a sense we are part of South-East Asia, and we earnestly hope that there will be peace there.

163

INDONESIA USA THE NETHERLANDS LAOS **Date** : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

IRAN

Trade Agreement Between India and Iran

A new trade agreement between Iran and India was signed at Teheran on August 16 by the Iranian Commerce Minister, Mr. Ghulan Husain Jahanshahi, on behalf of his Government and the Indian Ambassador, Shri M. R. A. Baig, on behalf of the Government of India.

Speaking on the occasion, the Commerce Minister said that Iran attached great importance to India in trade and other matters and looked forward to an increasing commercial relations between the two countries. The expressed satisfaction at the present agreement and said : "I hope that good relations that exist between the two countries will further improve in future".

Replying, the Indian Ambassador reciprocated the Minister's remarks and said that the agreement was another link in the age-old connections that had hound Iran and India together.

Emphasizing the need for improving and increasing trade between the two countries, Shri Baig expressed the hope that the present agreement would work out happily to mutual satisfaction and lead to better agreements in future. The main items of export from India to Iran listed in the agreement are tea, light engineering goods, Such as, diesel engines and pumps, fans and electrical equipment, machinery for tea, sugar, textile and other industries, sewing machines, batteries, pharmaceuticals, chemicals and drugs. The main items of export from Iran to India include dry fruits, gums, dates, red oxide medicinal herbs and plants, etc.

To promote trade in respect of items of special interest to Iran and India, it has been agreed that the Government of India will authorise the import of Iranian dry fruits of the value of ten million rupees and other items of the value of two million rupees. The Iranian Government will authorise the import of Indian tea subject to the minimum of six thousand tons. Both Indian and Iranian quotas agreed to will be authorised in two equal halves.

IRAN INDIA USA **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Chief Secretaries' Talks

The 35th Conference of Chief Secretaries of East Pakistan, Assam and West Bengal and the Chief Commissioner of Tripura was held at Dacca on August 1st and 2nd 1962. The discussions at the Conference were free and frank and took place in an atmosphere of cordiality. The Conference reviewed the progress of work of demarcation of international boundary between East Pakistan and Assam, West Bengal and Tripura and considered ways and means of expediting the completion of this work by removing procedural and other difficulties. It was agreed that the work on demarcation on all outstanding sectors should begin on the 1st of November, 1962. The Conference considered the situation arising from the deportation of persons from Tripura and Assam and the influx of refugees from West Bengal to East Pakistan and vice versa. The Chief Secretaries of East Pakistan and West Bengal agreed to facilitate the return of the refugees to their home districts and their rehabilitation therein. The two Chief Secretaries reaffirmed the determination of their respective Governments to maintain peace and communal harmony. In this connection the Chief Secretaries noted with concern that during the recent communal disturbances a section of the Press on both sides had published highly objectionable and exaggerated stories which tended to result in inflammation of communal passions and aggravation of tension. The Chief Secretaries decided to appeal to the Press to desist from publishing such material and, instead actively assist in the speedy restoration of normal and peaceful conditions and amity on both sides of the border.

The Chief Secretaries agreed to hold their next meeting at Shillong (Assam) by the middle of November, 1962. 164

PAKISTAN USA **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Chinese Activities in Ladakh

The following is the text of the statement made by the Prime Minister in Lok Sabha on August 6, 1962. on Chinese activities in Ladakh, while placing White Paper No. 6 on the table of the House :

On the 28th November, 1961, I laced White Paper No. 5 on the table of the House. This contained the further notes, memoranda and letters exchanged between the Government of India and the Government of China. I am now placing on the table of the House another White Paper No. 6, which contains some ninety notes sent by us to China and sonic sevenly-five notes sent by China to us, since the 10th November, 1961. Many of these have already been published in the press. The Chinese Government sometimes publish their letters and notes to us even before they reach us. This led us to publish our replies to them earlier than was customary. Normally, according to diplomatic practice, publication takes place some time after receipt of the communication. We have drawn the Chinese Government's notice to this diplomatic practice and we hope, in future, this will be adhered to. Because of this we have not till now given publicity to our last note to the Government of China dated 26th July, 1962. I am now, however, placing this note also on the table of the House. This is not included in the White Paper No. 6.

During the last session of Parliament referred to the measures taken by Government to stop further Chinese advances into Indian territory. These steps continue to be taken by our Government and a number of military posts have been established. It may be said that it is very difficult for Chinese forces to advance now because of the establishment of Indian posts at various points without an actual conflict between the two. It is in this context that the strong and almost abusive Chinese notes must be interpreted. We have in all our notes repeatedly pointed out to the Chinese authorities the dangers inherent in Chinese aggressive activities and our determination to defend our borders even though we will avoid doing anything to precipitate a clash.

In recent weeks Chinese troops in superior strength have sometimes come up close to our posts with a view to harassing and intimidating them. This has happened in the Galwan Valley. Our men exercised the utmost self-restraint and exhibited exemplary courage and patience in the face of gave provocations from the Chinese forces. The Chinese forces thereupon retired to some extent, but Indian and Chinese forces in this area continue to be in close proximity, though no untoward incident has occurred so far in this area.

In the lower reaches of the Chip Chap Valley, an Indian patrol, while performing routine duties, was ambushed by Chinese forces and attacked by rifle, machine gun and mortar tire. Our men had to return fire in self-defence. Two members of the Indian patrol were wounded, one slightly in this incident. Another incident occurred in the Pangong Valley. Despite the provocation, our forces did not return the Chinese fire there.

A feature of Chinese propaganda in these incidents has been to allege that Indian troops have encircled Chinese forces and fired at them, while the Chinese are reported to have waved and shouted to our troops not to attack. We have found that these allegations are baseless and are merely attempts to cover' up Chinese aggressive activity against our posts or patrols. As the House will remember from the correspondence contained in the White Paper, the Chinese notes display a characteristic ambivalence. The first part of the note generally contains baseless allegations, often in exaggerated and even abusive language, while the latter part refers to the Chinese desire to settle our border differences by peaceful negotiations.

The recent increase of tension in the Ladakh region has been the direct result of intensified Chinese military activity which is inconsistent with the Chinese professions of their desire to settle this question by peaceful negotiations. We in India are by our background and temperament peaceful by nature. We earnestly believe in the settlement of differences by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The unwarranted Chinese aggression on our territory came, therefore, as a shock and surprise to us. Despite the Chinese aggressive behaviour and the inconsistency between their professions and practice, we still desire to settle our differences with China by peaceful discussions/and negotiations. At the same time we will not hesitate to meet any threat to our territorial integrity with firmness and, where necessary, by force.

In a note we sent to the Government of China on the 14th May, 1962 we made concrete suggestions regarding mutual withdrawal to the boundaries claimed by the two sides in the Ladakh region with a view to creating the necessary atmosphere for settlement of the dispute by peaceful discussions and negotiations. The Chinese did not agree to it. Indeed, the incidents during the last few months have created further tension. We have, in our recent note dated 26th July 1962, again pointed out to the Chinese Government the necessity of avoiding incidents and reducing tension and of making an adequate response to the consructive suggestions made by us to create the necessary favorable climate for further talks and discussions of the boundary question. I quote the following paragraph from our note of July 26 :

"Paragraph 8. The Government of India are prepared, as soon as the current tensions have eased and the appropriate climate, is created, to enter into further discussions on the India-China boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials as contemplated during the meeting of Prime Minister Chou En-lai with the Prime Minister of India in 1960. The Government of India hope that the Government of China will give a positive response on the concrete suggestions made by the Government of India for relaxation of the current tensions and for creation of the right climate for negotiations."

To this note of ours we received a reply in the late afternoon yesterday. This reply is rather disappointing as the Chinese Government continue to repeat the charges made by them and to maintain their position as stated previously. They go on to say in their final paragraph as follows :

"The Chinese Government approve of the suggestions put forth by the Indian Government in its note for further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries. There need not and should not be any preconditions for such discussions. As a matter of fact if only the Indian side stop advancing into Chinese territory a relaxation of the border situation will be effected at Once. Since neither the Chinese nor the Indian Government want war and since both Governments wish to settle the boundary question peacefully through negotiations further discussions on the Sino-Indian boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials of the two countries should not. be put off any longer. The Chinese Government proposes that such discussions be held as soon as possible and that the level, date, place and other procedural matters for these discussions be immediately decided upon by consultation through diplomatic channels. The Chinese Government hopes that the Indian Government will give positive consideration to this proposal and kindly reply at an early date."

We are examining this note of the Chinese Government and we hope to send a reply to it at an early date. We shall keep the Parliament informed of developments.

CHINA USA INDIA PERU

Date : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on India-China Border Situation

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on August 13, 1962, on a motion "That the situation along the India-China border, particularly in the Ladakh region, be taken into consideration":

A week ago, on the 6th of August, I placed a new White Paper-No. VI--on the table of the House. This contained the notes and correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China since the previous White Paper was published. Separately I placed a letter which the Government of India had sent to the Government of China dated the 26th July. We received a telegram giving the purport of the reply from the Chinese Government, I think, either on the night of the 5th or on the morning of the 6th August. In the statement I made then, I quoted some portions of the reply of the Chinese Government. Since then, we have placed the full text of the Chinese note in the library of Parliament and have also placed copies in the Parliament Office for the convenience of Members.

Since then, no major incident has happened on the frontier. According to our information, there were three instances of firing by Chinese troops from a distance. These occurred, on the 27th July in the Pangong lake area when two shots were apparently fired towards our forces; on the 29th July also in the Pangong lake area, three shots were fired; on the 4th August, northeast of Daulat Beg Oldi, one shot was fired.

All these were from big distances and no damage was done. We have protested to the

166

Chinese Government about the first two incidents.

The Chinese have protested to us as, according to them, the Indian troops fired in their direction on four occasions: on the 27th July in Chip Chap river area, two shots were said to have been fired; on the 27th July also in the Nyagzu area, sixteen shots are reported to have been fired by our troops; on the 31st July in the Galwan Valley area, one shot is said to have been fired; on 1st August, also in the Galwan Valley area, seven shots are alleged to have been fired by our troops.

According to our information, these allegalions of firing by our patrols are not correct.

For the rest, according to our information some Chinese patrols have been moving about in the vicinity of the Galwan Valley area and have occasionally been observed digging in.

Otherwise, the situation remains the same.

Our aircraft have been visiting our posts and giving them supplies. The Chinese have protested against our aircraft flying over what they call Chinese territory. They have given a long list of such flights. We have replied that it is absurd to allege that they were flying over their territory as they have all along been over Indian territory.

The situation, therefore, on the frontier remains serious as it has been in the past and is likely to continue to be in the future.

Since I made the statement in the Lok Sabha a week ago, there has apparently been some misunderstanding and misinterpretation of what I said. Some people who ought to have known better, have had the temerity to suggest that we are going to take some action which would bring dishonour to India. I can only imagine that those who have said this are not very-well acquainted with the training and background we have had in the past. That past training and background as well as our present mood lead us to seek peaceful settlements of disputes with foreign countries and we shall try to do so to the best of our ability. It also confirms us in our decision to protect the honour of India and the defence of India to the' utmost of our capacity.)

But there has been apparently some misunderstanding about the two lines which the Chinese have claimed on different occasions as their alleged frontier in Ladakh : one is that which Premier Chou En-lai indicated while confirming the boundary line given in the Chinese map of 1956 and the other is the line which was indicated in the Chinese map which was given to our officials. These lines differ and the latter line is much more to the west than the former. We have pointed out to the Chinese Government that some of their posts have even gone beyond the Chou En-lai line. This was obviously a further aggression on India and something which could be easily verified by a reference to the maps. To this the Chinese replied that the two maps are more or less the same. This is very extraordinary. These facts are capable of easy verification. We drew the Chinese Government's attention to this matter. This has led some people to say that we accept Chou En-lai's line. This is utterly wrong. As we have

repeatedly stated, we do not accept any of their lines. We stand by the international frontier which is shown in our maps and about which so much evidence was produced by our officials.

The other question that is raised is about our proposal to have further discussions on the India-China boundary question on the basis of the report of the officials, as contemplated during the meeting with Premier Chou En-Jai in 1960. It was at that time understood that there would be such a consideration after the officials had done their work. We have not been able to do so owing to tensions and further aggression by the Chinese. We made it clear that such further discussions could only take place after the current tension had eased and appropriate climate was created. We had previously said that in order to ease tensions there should he withdrawals of both our forces to beyond the line claimed by the other. It seemed to us essential, and we laid stress on this, that any further discussions on the boundary question would be fruitless unless there was relaxation of tensions and the right climate for negotiations was created.

On the 6th of August, when I referred to the Chinese reply, I stated that it was a disappointing one. The Chinese Foreign Minister, in a broadcast in Europe made on the 3rd August, had stated that "to wish that Chinese troops should be withdrawn from their own territory is impossible. That would be against the will of the 650 million Chinese. No force in the world could oblige us to do something of this kind."

I realise that in public statements, Ministers often emphasise their claims in strong language, but, even allowing for that, what the Chinese Foreign Minister has said, means laying down pre-conditions which make it impossible for us to carry on discussions and negotiations. We had not suggested force being used to make the Chinese troops withdraw, but a proposal to 167

create a climate for peaceful discussion which was honourable to both India and China.

It is clear to us that any discussion on the basis of the report of the officials cannot start unless present tensions are removed and the status quo of the boundary which existed before and which has since been altered by force, is restored. The Government of India is prepared to discuss what measures should be taken to remove the tensions that exist in this region and to create the appropriate climate for further discussions. This would be preliminary to any further discussions on the basis of the report of the officials with a view to resolving the differences between the two Governments on the boundary question.

We have not yet sent a reply to the Chinese Government to their note of the 4th August. We hope to send it within two or three days. It will be on the lines I have indicated above.

CHINA INDIA USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on India-China Border Situation

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on August 14, 1962 in reply to the debate on a motion "That the situation along the India-China border, particularly in the Ladakh region, be taken into consideration" :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I followed yesterday with considerable interest and care the speeches delivered by various Members of this House on this motion. I, particularly, was interested in the oratorical efforts and the wide range of subjects covered by the speeches, most of which had little to do with the subject in dispute. One hon. Member in his vivid imagination saw heads rolling here. That itself shows that his imagination runs riot and leaves reality far behind. Another hon. Member delivered a speech which I found a little difficult to understand. It was not very coherent in various places.

He wound up by asking us to take certain remedial measures. His remedial measures are : to convene a conference of South-East Asian countries, to ask military aid from some countries to meet this menace on the frontier and various other like proposals. I wondered whether he or the group he represents really understands the position, has given any thought to it or merely thinks in terms of a cold war and wants India to jump in head foremost into it.

What a conference of South-East Asian countries will do is beyond me. And, who are these South-East Asian countries ? Which of them does he want to be called ? I should like him to make a list of them and show it to us. Which of them is going to help us or can help us ? It is best if they carry on themselves. We have recently had a case of a South-East Asian country which had given a great deal of trouble -Laos.

Fortunately, it has been decided by agreement of all the countries concerned including some great powers. What was the basis of that decision ? It was the Geneva Agreement made six years ago that these countries must not enter into any military alliance with any party and that they must remain un-aligned, uncommitted. That is the only safety for them. This has been accepted and admitted by the great leaders of the power blocs themselves.

So, the hon. Member, the leader of the Swatantra Party, is so ignorant of what is happening in the world, what is happening in India, what is happening on the frontier. I do not know what his party represents in this country except ignorance, ignorance in the social sphere, ignorance in the political sphere, ignorance in the economic sphere.

He told us that India is no longer a zamindary. Evidently, his mind still turns around to the question of zamindary. It is long past. India is certainly not a zamindary, and there are no other zamindary also in India.

We have discussed the question on the fron-

tier many times in the past, and yet whenever it is discussed we go back not to the- present situation and what we are to do but to what we should have done eight years ago or six years ago, that we should not have put forward China to become a member of the United Nations, we should not have said that China has sovereignty over Tibet and so on-facts which are long past. I have dealt with them in the past. I could deal with them again, but I do not wish to take the time of the House.

The point is, how we are to face a serious situation now. I do submit that this situation can be considered politically and militarily. It is no good talking about Mahabharata as it exists at the present moment. Although Mahabharata is a magnificent book from which we can learn a great deal but I do not think it will help us in resolving the frontier crisis.

168

Nor is it an; good to talk about our 450 millions of Indians standing as one. It almost reminds me of Marshal Chen Yi talking about his 650 millions of Chinese wanting this and that. This is, if I may say so with all respect both to hon. Members opposite and to Marshal Chen Yi, rather childish to talk in this fashion. The 650 millions of Chinese are great number and great power behind them, but in a context of this kind one does not talk, no responsible person talks in that way, neither he nor hon. Members here.

We have to deal with a difficult situation, a serious situation as I have often said and a situation that has been with us for the last few years and that is likely to be with us for many long years. We cannot solve it suddenly because of obvious difficulties in our way or in anybody's way who tries to solve it. We can increase our capacity to solve it militarily or other-wise. I do think and I am quite right in saying that our capacity to deal with this situation politically and militarily has grown in the last two years or so. It has definitely grown. I do not wish to exaggerate that; but it is much better. An hon. Member asked me whether our position was better now than a year or two ago. I say it is definitely better both militarily and

politically. But, nevertheless, I cannot guarantee.

I think an hon. Member talked about giving them a date when they should vacate. How can I give a date when we shall get the Chinese to vacate? We shall do our utmost to do that. We shall continue to do that and we shall not submit. But about one thing I can give an assurance-it is not necessary for me to give it -and I should think that that assurance would be welcomed by every hon. Member of this House and that is that nothing should be done in this matter, or in any matter, which will bring any kind of dishonour on India and that we would prefer to be reduced to dust and ashes before we are guilty of any such thing. That is the broad approach. But when you come to political and difficult problems, you do not talk in the air as, I regret to say, some of our hon. Members did. They made brave declarations and said, "We shall do this; we shall not do this." Responsible politicians or statesmen do not talk tall. They try to act as stoutly as they can.

In this world today, apart from the general question of war etc., in this changing world all kinds of things are happening. All kinds of new weapons are being forged. I have a feeling that many of the hon. Members on the other side who spoke have no realization of the modem world. They lived in some kind of a world of their own creation. Some people talked bravely of the 450 'millions of Indians; others asked us immediately to go under the wing or shelter of some other power and take its aid to defend us. That is not an honourable thing, I think. Personally, I do not think that we shall maintain our independence for long if we go about seeking military aid from others to defend ourselves. That is apart from its being fundamentally opposed to the policy we have pursued all this time of being unaligned-a policy which is not only being recognised everywhere as the right policy but which is spreading all over the world. Even those stout and big countries that are aligned have come to respect it.

Apart from any policy question, so far as India is concerned, situated where it is, that is the only possible policy that any intelligent man knowing the world today can possibly accept. Yet, vaguely and loosely the Swatantra Party leader talks about our asking the aid of South-East Asian countries what aid they can give us is beyond my imagination-or of great Powers having a concert for the defence of all this area. All this has nothing to do with reality. Any responsible person in authority, whether in the Government or in the Opposition, must deal with reality. Certainly, whatever be the difficulties, we have to face them. Whatever happens and however grave the crisis we must never lose our nerve. It seems to me that some hon. Members of the Opposition never seem to be able to control their nerves. They are always losing it. They talk about heads rolling and all that. That shows that their nerves have gone out of order whatever else might have happened.

We are in a serious position on the frontiers. It quite absurd to talk about China invading India and all that. China has committed aggression. That is bad enough. We should face it and try to get it vacated. But, imagining that she is swooping down the whole of India and swallowing it has, I submit, nothing to do with reality or possibility, even remote possibility of any situation. India is not so weak as all that. India is growing in strength, whether militarily or otherwise. Military strength does not today or at any time consist of large hordes of people. If anybody knows at all the history of India, we have never been lacking in courage. But, we have been lacking in wisdom, we have been lacking in modernity. Whenever India has been conquered or defeated, it was not because of any wonderful deeds of the conqueror, but because of our own feebleness, our lack of unity,

169

our backwardness, economic, industrial backwardnes, better weapons on the other side. That is more important. 450 millions do no good at all unless there is unity and they are trained up and they have a modern mind. I regret to say that the opposition does not even have an idea of what a modern mind is, much less possess it.

Every time we come up here, the arguments are, why did we recognise China 10 years ago, why did this happen 12 years ago. Why cast they come to the year 1962 and we what is happening in the world instead of repeating all this ? I think of every step that we have taken in the past : I mean the recognition of China 10 years ago. Our non-attendance at the San Francisco Peace conference. (Interruption) Our non-attendance at this conference had nothing to do with China : absolutely nothing. It had a great deal to do with Japan and it pleased Japan. We have been friendly with Japan. Many other things because of that; we did not participate in a cold war exercise against Japan and we made our separate treaty with Japan. All these things are of the past. The present has certainly grown out of the past. Our trouble in the frontiers have grown out of the past. We have to face the present situation.

I am not going into the past which I have dealt with so many times during debates in this House. But, in the last two years as we have stated, we have concentrated on increasing our strength, military strength, strength in communications, roads, etc.

May I draw the attention of this House, talking about Ladakh, to the whole of Jammu and Kashmir State of which Ladakh is a part? Rightly or wrongly, the Kashmir Government took Ladakh and the frontiers for granted. It had no posts there or measures for defence of them. Nor was there any fear in these days. They sent perhaps every two years a small deputation or some people some officers and others to some places to collect some little money, very little money which was more a gesture. Anyhow, they had nothing. Then came Independence to be followed immediately afterwards by aggression by Pakistanis on Kashmir which we resisted. Pakistani aggression went right up to Ladakh. In fact, the route to Ladakh, the Zoji La pass was captured by the Pakistanis, and that prevented us from getting to Ladakh; there was no way to get to Ladakh except a risky one by air. We then tried to go by another route to Leh from Manali, a very difficult route. However, our Army did get there. But something else happened. Meanwhile, our Army did something which deserves to be recorded in the annals of war-fare, that is, it went up to the Zoji La pass with tanks; it had widened the road, and went up to the Zoji La pass with tanks and drove out the Pakistanis from that position, and thereby opened out the route to Leh which is the heart of Ladakh. I

am merely mentioning that this happened right at the end of 1948, and the Pakistanis were driven out of a large part of Ladakh which they had controlled. But, ever since then, the House knows that we confront the Pakistanis who are in control of. one-third of Jammu and Kashmir State, and we are constantly threatened by all kinds of fierce deeds which the Pakistanis will commit upon us.

This was the position in the early fifties of this century. It was about that time that China took possession of Tibet, and nothing that we could have done could have stopped it; people seemed to think that if we had said 'No, you must not do it', they would have stopped it, or if we had said that we would not recognise them, they would have stopped it. That is rather a fanciful notion. Rightly or wrongly, they took possession of Tibet, and soon after, as their possession grew, their hold grew, and it was difficult for them from the logistic point of view to feed them, to send supplies etc. right across the Gobi desert, which is a tremendous desert. They have gradually made roads etc., and in the course of that road-making, in the middle of the fifties, they improved the whole caravan route which passed through the northern area of Aksai Chin into Tibet from Shinkiang. It is a caravan route being used from time to time. They used it because it was easier for them to go from Sinkiang to Tibet that way instead of crossing the Gobi desert. And later, a year or two later, they improved that route and made some kind of a road. Roads in Tibet, as the House will know, are not cemented roads, they are just levelled places, because owing to the extreme cold, the ground is so hard that it is as good as cement or anything of that sort. So, they used that. There was some difficulty about using that Aksai Chin road because of lack of bridges. I do not know; probably, they have built the bridges later. That was the first aggression of China on our territory, right about 1957; I do not know when the road was actually made, but we heard of it at the end of 1957 or 1958, I forget exactly when.

In 1959, while we were protesting against this to the Chinese Government-and their answer had not come, and we were waiting for it; and it came, in early 1958, I think..... Minister of estate in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture : in 1958.

Prime Minister : Just then, the incipient rebellion in Tibet grew in size, and as a result of it, the Chinese sent much larger forces to Tibet, which immediately fanned out to its frontiers. partly, may be, because they thought that help was coming to the Tibetan rebels from the frontier, from India and elsewhere they came to the Indian frontier partly because people were escaping; the Dalai Lama had escaped., In the same way, they spread out to the western side.

We who were fairly wide awake on this side, and right from the beginning, when the Chinese took possession of Tibet, had not expected it, but, anyhow, we were alert about our frontier on this side, the Sikkim and NEFA frontier and we had then put up a number of checkposts there. We added more to them.

On the western side, on the Ladakh side also, we thought it was necessary. It was the second priority; NEFA was the first priority. It was a much more difficult undertaking. The distances were big and the terrain was difficult. So slowly we were proceeding on the Ladakh side with our military posts. But we realised that the only way to do it was to build roads. Otherwise, the distance was too great and it took too long too. Even by air, we could not go there. We established an air field there in--I forgot the year- 1954 or 1955. All this was with a view to protect this against any possible incursion. The Chinese had not come into Ladakh vet. But at the back of our mind was also the risk of it.

I remember going to Chusul air field in-I forgot the year-1954 or 1955. But there were no Chinese round about anywhere. I went there because our air people were very proud of having made the air field. They called it the highest in the world. I do not know if it is--it is about 14,000 ft. high. I went there for a few hours and then came back.

I have been talking about my personal experiences. I knew something about Ladakh-

170

not very much-something by trekking over Zoji La in 1916-it is a long time ago. In 1916, 1 went there covering the distance, partly on pony and partly on foot. So I knew something of that place. I did not go far, but I had some fair idea crossing the Zoji La.

So from that time onwards, we were trying to protect this and make this an air base--the Chusul one. We tried to build roads. The first road that had to be built was to Leh itself which was the base. Unless we could reach Leh quickly, it was no good making roads elsewhere. This was a difficult piece of engineering, especially as the road itself was crossing certain bridges. That was made.

So initially the problem before us was the building of roads. We could not do anything without roads, and, where we could, some air fields. We built them. There was also the problem of getting aircraft which could be used for this purpose. We applied our minds to this. We had a special Border Roads Development Committee formed, which has done very well and built-I do not know exactly-thousands of miles of roads in very difficult terrain and rather fast. It has still not completed its work. Of course, there is no completion of it, because more and more roads come into our plan as we make them. But it has eased our situation considerably, both because of the Leh road and some roads which are going to Chusul and other places.

On the NEFA side too we built roads. In U.P. we built roads on the border. In the Punjab we have built roads.

But however rapidly we built roads, we could not reach our posts. Some we could, but most of them we could not. We tried to feed them from air and give them supplies. That meant aircraft. We got special aircraft for this purpose. Now apart from the supplies, the mere stationing of our troops anywhere in Ladakh, whether it was in Leh or whether it was in the interior, meant supplying them with everything conceivable that they wanted, because they could get nothing there, nothing to eat and so on. That required air supplies. We built up our air supply position by getting aircraft-big aircraft-from various countries. We have got some helicopters etc. But in the main it consisted of big transport aircraft There were some from the United States and some from Soviet Union. Those from the Soviet Union were the bigger ones, which were very helpful. Then having got them, we had the difficulty that these heavy aircraft landing on our temporary air fields there dug them up. So, we had to make the airfield more strong. All this, one problem after another. However, we proceeded and we improved our military position, our supply position, and we have got troops in various areas there with forward posts.

Somebody said that we have allowed nine new Chinese posts. That is true, and yet it gives a completely wrong idea of what the position is. If they have got nine posts we have got

171

22 or 23 or 24, I do not know how many, three times the number. These posts of theirs are projections, patrol projections of their own posts. They have not gone very far. In fact, it may be said that ever since we got there with our posts, it has been exceedingly difficult for them to advance further. They may advance a mile outside their own posts, a mile or two, that is a different matter, just as we can advance and we do advance, but broadly speaking, we have held them in check there, and there can be no further advance by them without a major conflict.

That is not enough, of course, obviously not, but that was the first step that had to be taken, to strengthen ourselves and prevent any kind of further advance taking place. So, that has been more or less satisfactorily done. That does not mean that we are satisfied with the frontier position. Apart from the fact that we have to get them, to vacate it, even otherwise it is not satisfactory, but I would not go into the military aspects, but it is certainly a satisfactory first step in which we have succeeded.

Therefore, I said that from a military point of view we are better off, better circumstanced, than we were a year or two ago, but if I am asked when I will get them to vacate it, that involves far greater preparation, far greater not only preparation, certainly preparation in the military sense, in the ration, air sense and certain political factors also. On the political field I think I am right in saying that the position is more satisfactory than it was. It is difficult to measure this. A military situation might be measured, a political situation cannot easliv be measured, but I think it is better, but ultimately and inevitably the position depends upon our own strength, military strength, and the strength of the people and their general response to face any crisis. Now it is very satisfactory to learn, to hear many of the brave statements made by hon. Members on both sides of the House, of how we shall face any crisis, of how we shall meet any danger. That is all right, and that feeling in the country is essential as a background. Nevertheless, we know from the history of India that all the courage of the Indian people did not protect them because they were lacking in military weapons and the military art, whatever it is. One of the simple things our ancestors were lacking was possessing even a physical map of India. Even till fairly recent times before the British came, they had no proper maps of India. They had vague drawings, while the British when they came, everybody knows, did not win by any major feat of arms, although they had better arms and that helped them, better trained soldiers-and small numbers of Indian soldiers might be utilised-and in the end, maps, and they had spies everywhere. Every Indian court had a British spy, often a Minister in the Court. That is how they won. By their information services, by their maps they know exactly where they were, where the other party was, while those who opposed them gallantly, full of courage, Rajputs, Marattas and others, had no maps-simple thing. Gallantry is a fine thing, but something more is necessary in warfare than gallantry. Now a days with modern weapons and other things, all this has become even more complicated.

It rather pleases us to compare India with China and say one Indian is equal to ten Chinese. I do not know. I think an Indian soldier is equal or more than any soldier in the wide world. That is true. I am convinced of that. They are very fine men, and I should like to pay my tribute not only to the soldiers but to our Army Headquarters, to the Defence Ministry and our Air Headquarters, for the fine work they have done in these two or three years especially in the frontiers.

But the point is, how are we to meet modern weapons, modern techniques with the resources at our disposal ? Of course, to the best of our ability, we try to develop the modern techniques ourselves here. That is why, our whole objective has been in recent years not so much to buy from abroad, but to build up, to manufacture machines here, aeroplanes, helicopters and other things, and that takes a little time. Yet, we have done well, and we hope that in another year or two our strength will grow to manufacture these. That is how we are facing it, and meanwhile we are taking such measures as we can.

An hon. Member on a previous occasion-I think I was not here then--objected to our military people keeping secrets; I do not know what particular secret, I think it was about helicopters, the question arose about it. in a matter of this kind we are governed almost entirely by what our military staff say. If they advise us this must not he disclosed, we abide by their advice. It is not I or the Defence Minister that lays it down. It is the General Staff which says this must not be disclosed. And the difficulty is that when we buy things from abroad or we are manufacturing we come to special terms with a foreign country. The foreign country tells us that we must not disclose these. We do not care, but we have given our word to them not to disclose it because they insisted; either they have given us on terms

172

which they do not wish to be disclosed--they are good terms for us, but they want to get better terms from somebody else-whatever the reason may be. So, these are the reasons why one cannot easily disclose these terms of our contracts with others or what we are building.

Anyhow, my point was we have concentrated on building, on manufacture. We have manufactured a very fine supersonic plane at Bangalore, but having manufactured the plane, it does well, in order to manufacture more, we have to get engines. We cannot get the old engines from the British sources, but we are getting engines, and that will be manufactured. We are manufacturing helicopters. They are so important in these hilly areas. We hope to manufacture other fighter planes.

I must confess that it hurts me for us to spend so much money on weapons of warfare. but circumstances being what they are, I think we would be failing in our duty not to possess them. It is not so much that one fights with these weapons, one may, but the fact of not having them itself is an encouragement to others. I feel that in the last few years occasions arose when if we had not been adequately prepared and we had not got adequate weapons and aircraft, we might have had to face a war. It did not come because we were prepared and they knew we were prepared. So, much as I dislike this, we have to get it. It is exceedingly important not to allow the enemy to have control of the air. It is an obvious thing. Everybody will realise that it is better to have self-control. If you have not got it, at least the enemy should not. And, if they had speedier and powerful aircraft the idea spreads that you have not got control of the air.

I do not know if hon. Members, how many of them, have any experience of bombing. I have not much experience. But I have little experience, seeing bombs failing all around you. Nothing is more frustrating experience, how aircraft comes quietly and puts bombs where it chooses and nothing to face it, no rival aircraft to face it. Because the mere fact that you are having rival aircraft partly drives it out and partly sends it up high in the heavens from where it is more difficult to bomb. Other things happen.

Of course, all this is rather old story, this bombing and aircraft. The next stage is rockets. But it is difficult for us to forget the intervening stages and jump over. And, even from the point of view of our technical skill developing, it is desirable that we should manufacture these things, these supersonic aircraft in this country.-So, we took all those steps and, in the military sense, roads were built, etc. We built a kind of rampart on this part of Ladakh and put up numerous military posts, small ones and big ones. It is true that these posts are in constant danger of attack with larger numbers. Well, it does not matter. We have taken the risk and we have moved forward, and we have stopped effectively their further march.

If anybody takes the trouble to read the numerous letters of protest that we have received from the Chinese authorities, he will see how angry they have been at our establishing these posts, how they have said, 'You are trying to cut us off, you are trying to encircle us.' The same thin,, that was said on our side about them are repeated by them about us. Some things have happened and much has happened on the part of our military there. If you see one of their telegrams, they say-I forget the period-they have mentioned the figure, over 300 air sorties by us. They say, 'You come into our territory'. It may

be 6 months. During the last 6 months, they say over 300 air sorties have come into their territory. And the obvious answer was, 'It is not your territory, it is our territory and we go as we like'. All this is happening.

People should realise what is being done. It is a fine job that is being done by our military and Air Force. It is not right to put it at a lower level. Nevertheless, we cannot suddenly press a button and declare that the place is vacated, the aggression is ended. That will go by our strength. We are gradually building up our strength and by political means.

An hon. Member asked me something about the atom bomb and that China has an atom bomb. I do not know when China, may have an atom bomb. Broadly speaking although we are not thinking of an atom bomb, I think we are more highly developed in atomic energy than China is. That does not mean that China cannot produce an atom bomb before us because we are not trying to. But, I shall not be worried in the least if they do.

People seem to think that if a country has got an atom bomb, it is bound to win in war. That is not so. If they have an atom bomb do you mean to say that after all effort they produce an atom bomb only to let loose on India ? They will keep it for other purposes. If they let it loose on India it is worse for them.

I do not understand our getting cold hands and cold feet because they may have an atom bomb or because they have a larger number of soldiers in Tibet who may shoot us down from the top. They can shoot down; they can create difficulties for us. They may. It is a possibility. If they want to they can overwhelm some of our military posts. That does not mean that we are defeated. We shall face them with much greater problems and face them much more stoutly. So, all these military factors and political factors have to be kept in view.

It is no good my talking tall or anybody else talking tall-'We will do this or that'. We should not do anything which, as I said, brings dishonour to our country because that is not an arguable matter. None of us should do it; and, certainly, no Government can be responsible for it.

Having said that, we should try every means to solve the problem, anyhow, it you like by military means or by peaceful means. The military means have to be conditioned by military factors, not by speeches here. And, therefore, that conditioning has to be remembered. In any event, I do believe that war is a bad thing. War between India and China will be a bad thing, bad for us, bad for China and bad for the world because it may become a world war. And, in the context of the world today, when so much is said and so many efforts are made for disarmament, for peace etc., it will be a particularly bad thing for us who stood for disarmament and peace to talk in warlike terms.

It may be, some people imagine, that this shows cowardice, kayartha, that we do not talk in warlike terms. I would again remind them that some of the bravest of the brave in India who talked in the most warlike terms, ultimately, were defeated because of the bitter strategy, and better thinking and beater weapons of the other party. It is better economy of the other party. Therefore, we have to think in modern terms and with modern minds.

Thinking in modern terms, the first thing is that everything should he done to avoid war because the consequences of that war will be very terrible for the world and for us especially. We

173

do not want to enter any war if there is a war in the world unless circumstances force us, unless there is an attack on us. So, let us not talk vaguely and rather lightly about war. But, at the same time, conditions being what they are, we have to prepare for that.

I have told the House just now that I hate spending our hard-earned money, money which is required for development, for war planes and others. Each war plane may represent, I do not know, how many factories, how many plants, how many hospitals, how many things. Yet, we do it because the circumstances are such. But we do it without an excessive desire to spend that way. So, I do not myself see what other policy we can pursue except to hold fast to what we stand for and prepare our strength.

A great deal has been said : we must not talk to the Chinese unless they vacate. I refuse to accept that statement. I am quite clear about it. I am not such a child as to be made to say something which I think is fundamentally a wrong thing ... (Interruptions). It is a childish and infantile position to take up. First of all, there is a difference between negotiation and talks. There is a world of difference, One should always talk, whatever happens, whatever the position and wherever the chances. If I have the chance to talk I will talk to them. It is quite absurd not to talk.

I sent for the Chinese Ambassador here. He was going away. I gave him a farewell lunch. He came to my house. And it was said, 'Oh, see how his relationship with the Chinese is; he has given lunch'. That is an advice which I am never going to follow so Ion-, as I am in authority. About that I am quite clear (Interruption) I make it perfectly clear. It is my practice to invite every retiring Ambassador to a meal. This Ambassador was a doven of the corps for sometime and I invited him and his wife to a meal. During the meal and afterwards I talked to him about the frontier situation. I did. Why should I be afraid of it? I told him that it was drifting badly and the least he could do was to avoid incidents. He could not settle it with me. I told him that otherwise it would be drifting to war. What effect it had, whether it had any effect on him is a different matter. He has no doubt reported to his Government. That is a

thing which is always done. The Defence Minister went to Geneva where there was also the Chinese Foreign Minister. It was his absolute duty, I told him so, to meet him and talk to him. He could not negotiate. There is no question of any negotiation. At that time some little firing had taken place in the Galwan Valley. I told him that he must tell them that this thing was drifting and if they were not careful there would be war. He (lid so, quit-. rightly; he told them this when they met. There is very little time; the only time they meet in these places is at lunch or dinner. In Geneva he met the Chinese Foreign Minister once at breakfast and once at dinner. The others were present in these meetings. I am sorry to say that hon. Members who make much of it know nothing about the normal practice in the modem world, especially

174

in western countries and more especially in the diplomatic world. They seem to think that we must bring about untouchability in our relations and unapproachability everywhere. That is not the way diplomacy is carried on. The main point is that we must not take a wrong step by committing ourselves to anything wrong. If our case is strong, as I believe it is, we should shout it out at every opportunity and should shout it out to the opponent also and make him see our views. I do not understand this approach; it is a dangerous approach because, it makes people feel that by our standing in a corner we shall solve the country's problems and our own problems. It is quite absurd; I do not understand how this kind of idea enters people's heads. We have to live in the world as it is. It is difficult enough to follow the basic policies for which any individual stands. We have sometimes to compromise those basic policies but we cannot follow our policies or do anything if we take up the stand and say : we will not talk.

Now, there is a good deal of difference between negotiatians and talking. Talking must always be encouraged wherever possible. Negotiation is a very formal thing; it requires a very suitable background; it should not be taken up unless a suitable background comes. That is what we have said. Talking is an entirely different thing. Talking may not yield any result; maybe; at any rate it helps in understanding, in probing other's mind. Maybe, the other probes your mind too. It helps in understanding. It may not yield any results. It is essential and preliminary for any diplomat to deal with each other or even in wartime. I wonder how many of you realise that the ambassadors of the two countries like the United States of America and China which do not recognise each other or, at any rate, the United States does not recognise China and is not at all favourably inclined to do it, have been meeting regularly for the last seven years in Warsaw and considering their problems. They have no ambassadors; there is no Chinese ambassador in Washington; nor an American ambassador in China. They chose Warsaw as the place where both the ambassadors talked and talked. Observe how they persisted in their talks for seven years. They have not become untouchables. I do not know and I cannot say but the latest I heard was that they were gradually approaching some kind of an understanding after six or seven years of talkof course not a daily talk, but once a month or even at longer intervals. This thing is normally done by countries which are even inimical to each other because the only other way is to brace the sword at every provocation, jump into the areana, sword in hand; that is childish' behaviour nowadays.

I have in the statement that I made in the beginning of this debate yesterday, made it perfectly clear as to what broadly our policy is and we propose to adhere to it and I should like the support of the House in carrying it out, as the House has been pleased to give it to me on previous occasions. But I want to say that this matter is obviously not a party matter, not a Congress matter. It is a national matter. Eveybody agrees to that. Yet, I regret to say that it is sometimes treated as a party matter, in a party way. Sometimes the mere fact that Government is responsible for it makes them run down the Government and that, I consider, is not justified. We may be wrong; anybody may be wrong. I welcome the Members of the Opposition or Members of this side of the House to point that out privately and publicly as they like. But it is the mentality that I object, the mentality of running down the Government in a matter of national in importance, which leads not to unity which everyone wants, but to disunity;

it leads to things like he cessation of production, etc. All these things are wrong. When we talk about the frontier we talk bravely about all of us being together, and all the 450 million standing as one man and facing it. When it comes to our normal activities, we are, 450 million constantly broken up into 450 million parts; if not so many, at least, to many parts. Unity or an attempt at unity does not mean not criticising at all; but still different approach is essential. Every country does that. It is not a question of socialist country or a capitalist country. I do feel that many of these criticisms that come from some of the opposite side, some Members on the opposite side, are based on a very radical difference in viewpoint. I cannot help it; they are welcome to have a different viewpoint. But when once I said that an hon. Member advocated our giving up the policy of non-alignment which I gathered from his speech, he said later that he did not mean that and that he was not for our giving it up. But whatever he has said even in his speech yesterday-it is a very forceful speech-was for giving up that policy; it will have no other meaning; it means that. And as for another hon. Member. he did talk about it. He did not use the word non-alignment'. But to get military aid is to become somebody else's dependant in that way. There was all the tall talk of courage of our 450 million men, when talking of getting military aid to defend our frontiers. If our country cannot defend itself and die, if necessary, in the

175

attempt then we are not either maintaining our honour or dignity or strength or capacity. we must be clear of the broad lines of the policy we pursue. It is clear that we must fight ever aggression, whatever it is; it is clear to my mind. What are the reasons for the Chinese Government doing like this? The reasons are still rather difficult to find out. Everybody who sees me and meets me, American or English or any Pressman here or a foreign Pressman asks me; why do you think China has taken this step against India, losing the friendship of India which is a valuable thing; at the most, in the hope of getting some rare mountains. I have no answer to give them. I cannot. I can guess about various things, what is happening in Tibet, this and that; their old policy of spreading themselves out and their imagining, according to their own maps, that this is ours; let us know we are strong to pull others into submission, whatever it may be; because it is extraordinary to- me. The more I think of it, I realise how and why the Chinese have acted in this way. It is not a small matter that they should lose the goodwill of India. It is not a small matter even for the 650 millions of China. It is a big thing, and they have lost it. For what ? They will continue in having it and as a consequence they are losing the goodwill of many other countries in Asia. They have lost a great deal.

A little territory by itself is neither here nor there except when that territory becomes a matter of honour. That is a different matter. What will they rain if they think that they can gain a little mountain territory from us ? They will gain perpetual conflict; it is no small matter; perpetually, they will, and it may spread out to other countries. I think--and I thought soperhaps they themselves will realise this : that they have gambled rather badly. Whatever their views may be, I am not able to find that out. But we in answer to that should refrain from gambling ourselves badly. We must act wisley; determinedly but wisely.

An hon. Member : Should we gamble at all?

Prime Minister : Well, all life is a gamble and everything that one does is a gamble. They are gambles which are wisely thought out. Everything is a gamble; our Five Year Plan is a gamble. Our future is a gamble. That is a gamble. That is a different matter. But have a well-thought-out thing and be prepared to take the consequences. We have to proceed in that way. On no account must we do anything which will bring dishonour to India or weakness to India. I do not believe in surrendering anything that one has, whatever the consequences. That is true. But let us not call every bit of thingif I take something -- a surrender. It is childish nonsense, if I may say so, and it is absurd for the Government if it is to be carried on in this way : do not talk; do not have tea with them; do not have lunch with them. Is this the way to carry on this great debate, this great argument, in this great conflict with another country? Are we to carry on by not having tea with somebody and not having meals with somebody else?

The whole thing is fantastic. What does it mean ?

But I can understand this : the hon. Members feel strongly about this issue, as all of us should. If they think it is necessary to remind me that I should not weaken. I have no objection. I want to be strengthened by your goodwill and your strength. But what I fear is, as I said, there is the basic difference of opinion between the policy we have been pursuing, not today but all these years, and the policy of some hon. Members, and this basic difference of opinion comes out in their speeches and in their amendments which they have moved, and it is this. Basically, whatever they may say, they do not like our policy of non-alignment. They want the cold war to come in here and the cold war is bound to come in if we join up with somebody. The cold war will come in here not only with its other evils, weakening us in our defence and in our military position but with everything. That is the choice which this House should make. Therefore, we should choose carefully. We all agree that we must stand up to the aggression and we must do our utmost to get it vacated. Therein we agree. But what follows is either said explicitly or implicitly impliedwe must join some military bloc to save us from this. That, I am not prepared to do. Even if disaster comes to us on the frontier, I am not prepared to do that, because I am not going to let India rely on foreign army to save its territory. That, I am not prepared, whatever happens. I do not think that that contingency will arise. I think we are strong enough to resist and to prevent anybody coming, and I do not think that it can arise because of the world situation on apart from our strength and many Other reasons.

In the mountains, in Ladakh, the situation has arisen and we face it and we will continue to face it and continue to get over it and to push them out. That is a different matter. It may last years. I am not thinking of this crisis being resolved suddenly. It may last years unless

176

some other developments take place and these internal or external developments, the world developments, take place. We must be prepared to face it for years. But that does not mean that we should leave our basic policies which I think are good and which have done us good and which are recognised to be good.

May I say quite clearly that there is, and there has been no question at all of our accepting the 1960 Chinese line or any other line. It is quite absurd But when some hon. Members talked about A deep interest in spiritual, religious and other matters-Kailas and Mansarovar-and therefore, we should take our boundary up to Kailas and Mansarovar, up to Brahmaputra. That kind of thing has no meaning to an intelligent man. Only the unintelligent can say so, I regret to use that word. It has no meaning. We respect, we honour Kailas and Mansarovar. It has been my desire -I wrote in my book 30 Years ago-and one great desire to visit Mansarovar. But there it is. But I do not make Mansarovar or Kailas a zamindary of India in order to visit it. This idea is essentially a zamindary idea-by possessing something as a zamindary and bossing over it.

The world is moving out. I think even couptries' boundaries do not count for much, not to speak of astronauts and cosmonauts who area going round and round. We live in a changing world. It is a little difficult for us to keep our minds up-to-date. It is difficult to understand what these cosmonauts mean. Two of them are going round and round, conversing with each other, conversing with the world. What do they mean to this changing world? They do mean something : a' mighty force has come into being, a mighty thing, both for peaceful purposes and warlike purposes. We do not keep up-todate. We still talk in terms of medieval ages. Most of us live too in terms of medieval ages. That is unfrotunate and we have to come out : whether it is for five year plans, whether it is for our defence or whether it is for our progress. we have to think in modem terms.

I regret I am unable to accept those amendments which have been moved. There are some things in those amendments to which I have no exception, but I am unable to accept the whole background of those amendments. I believe we have been Riven an amendment approving of this Government's policy. If you permit that being taken up, I should like to support it. An hon. Member : Most respectfully, I would request the Prime Minister to make a statement to clear the misunderstanding that is prevalent in the country : that there would be no negotiation so long as the Chinese do not vacate the occupied places in India.

Prime Minister : Yesterday morning I made a statement. I shall make no more categorical statement. I want freedom of action. I want 'to say it quite plainly. I say, first of all, that nothing can happen without this House being informed.

Secondly. we should agree that nothing should be done which, in the slightest degree, sullies the honour of India. For the rest, I want a free hand.

An hon. Member : The Prime Minister has made a reference to what he said yesterday. I have certain doubts about what be said yesterday. He said in one place about preliminary negotiations towards the relaxation of tension. May I know whether be proposes to have this on the basis of status quo ? In another place, be said about negotiations on the basis of officials' reports. May I know on what basis---on the basis of the garbled and truncated version of the Chinese or on our report?

Prime Minister : I cannot precisely say. I think the present situation in the frontier is such that we cannot have any serious talks with the Chinese. Therefore, I said, I am prepared to ask, whenever I have the chance to meet an important person, "If you are anxious, as we are, to have serious talks, a climate must be created for it." What is necessary for that climate, we may discuss.

An hon. Member : I just wanted to know for the enlightenment of the House and of the whole country, on the basis of which report negotiations would be held--on the basis of the garbled and truncated Chinese version or on the basis of our report?

Prime Minister : That is a subsequent step. When we talk about it on the basis of the reports-plural---obviously we do not discuss it on the basis of one report, but on the basis of both reports. Obviously we stand by our report and of course, no doubt the other party will stand by its report. We will discuss both the reports. But that question does not arise; that climate has not arisen. It is in order to facilitate that climate to arise that we may-I do not say that we will-have some talks.

177

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LAOS SWITZERLAND JAPAN PAKISTAN RUSSIA POLAND PERU

Date : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on India-China Border Situation

The Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in Rajya Sabha on August 22, 1962, on a motion "That the situation along the India-China border, particularly in the Ladakh region, be taken into consideration":

Sir, Coming to the subject of my motion, there is little that is new that I can place before the House. On the first day of this Session of Parliament I made a brief statement in this House as well as in the other and placed the latest White Paper on this question. That brought matters up to date so far as the giving of information is concerned. Subsequently, in the last few days there has been a debate in the other House also. Now nothing in the shape of incidents has happened since then.

The position remains much the same. There have been certain charges and counter-charges of firing taking place. But apparently if this took place, it took place at some long distance and it hurt nobody. At 'the present moment, therefore, the situation remains much as it was and I cannot say if it has definitely improved; it has certainly not grown any worse.

There are some indications-I do not know how far they are likely to be correct-that our post at Galwan may be reached by a column that we had sent by toad. Meanwhile they have been sent supplies by air regularly and there is no lack of supplies to any of our military posts. In spite of the fact that the situation has not grown worse, essentially the situation is a bad one. is a serious one by the mere fact that, according to us, a large part of our territory is under the Chinese occupation avid so long as that continues the situation is bound to be exceedingly serious.

We have followed in the last few months, and years in fact, the policy of trying to strengthen ourselves to meet this menace, strengthen ourselves in various ways more especially on the borders themselves, by building road communications and the rest and by putting up posts. and at the same time not giving up our hope that it may be settled by peaceful means. We follow this dual policy because we feel, apart from our general feeling, that war, as is usually undesirable, is peculiarly so in the present age with the development of weapons, and because of the fact that India and China are so situated, any war between them would be disastrous for both and would be a very prolonged war. We do not want a war as I have said often enough, nor do we want any occupation of our territory by a foreign power. We have, therefore, to proceed on these dual lines. It may be a little difficult to achieve our objective in the near future and we must, therefore, he prepared for some time to elapse before we achieve it.

Now the present position is that in the military sense we are much stronger than we were a year or two ago. We have put up a certain barrier to further encroachment or aggression and we, I think, in regard to these communications and other factors, will increase our strength in the future but we do not intend to bring about a major conflict on our part. Of course, if the other party takes some steps to that end, we shall face it naturally. I still think that our case is so good that under a proper consideration I do not see any adequate reply to it.

The Chinese make charges that we have

occupied their territory, that we committed air violations because of our planes flying over their territory. They say that they have always had that territory. I do not understand on what basis they say that, because it is quite clear that ten or twelve years ago, anyhow they were not there, not even in Tibet. It was after they went into Tibet and took possession of it that they reached these frontiers.

Now, the old Tibetan Government did not lay any claim to these wide territories in Ladakh. There were one or two points on our frontier about which there was some argument with the old Tibetan Government, long-standing arguments. They were small points here and there,. They never laid claim to it. Now the Chinese apparently are there, and the Chinese Government is a successor to the old Tibetan Government and they claim this as a part of China through its being part of Tibet. Obviously they were not there; they were not in Tibet at an. They came to Tibet about ten or eleven years ago and after that. But for some years there was no particular move on their part in this direction. Round about 1957 they are sad to have made that road in the north-east comer of Aksai Chin, that is, made road over a caravan track. And it was really in 1959 that they marched into eastern Ladakh in a big way

178

There can be no doubt that they were not there before. So, I do not understand the argument of the Chinese that they have been in possession of these areas in the past and continuously, as they say. May be, it is some metaphysical conception of the Chinese Empire which existed in past ages. Even that does not hold water as the report of our officials clearly demonstrated and the abundance of arguments and evidence that they have placed, which they have probably seen.

I need not justify before this House our claim because I think everybody realises, apart from the sentiment of it, and the proof that has been produced in regard to it, the validity and strength of our position in regard to these areas. The question arises, therefore, what we should do about it. As I have ventured to state, our approach is a dual one, one is to go on strengthening ourselves and holding as far as possible, the Chinese and at the same time to explore such avenues as we can find to achieve a peaceful settlement of this difficult problem. It is not an easy matter. I realise that. It may take time, but it is better for it to take some time than for us to plunge into war. The main thing is we cannot acknowledge, or in any sense bow to their aggression, surrender to it or acknowledge it and we must strengthen ourselves to meet them in any way that it becomes necessary. I had once said and asked them, in order to prepare for fruitful talks and negotiations, to withdraw. That is, I had suggested that both sides should withdraw to the line of the other side, to the map line of other side. That would have left a large area unoccupied by the military forces and there would be no question of any conflict and we could then consider the matter, consider the evidence and other factors, concerning this place. The Chinese Government at the time did not agree with that proposal because obviously it involved their withdrawing over a large area and our withdrawing over a very small area. I hope they will consider that because that, I think, is the fairest and the most reasonable request and it does not, in any sense, bring or lead to any, if I may use a popular phrase, loss of face of any party because it is obvious that while this major aggression exists, it is not possible to have any fruitful negotiations. We cannot negotiate when there is active tension, etc. Therefore, we have suggested or we are going to suggest to them that in order to prepare the ground for fruitful talks on the main subject, the first thing to consider is how to create a situation which will be free from tension and which will involve withdrawal and for that we are prepared to talk on this limited issue. If it leads to anything further, then further talks may be indulged in. That is our present position. I may say that the last Chinese letter came dated the 4th August. I have said the last but it is not the last because since then several have come-complaints-subsequent letters are complaints of our air violation on their space and one or two charges of our people in Ladakh firing at them and so on, but they are charges. The main letter came on the 4th of August. To that no reply has yet been sent by us. Probably, we shall send it on the lines I have indicated fairly soon.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Reply To Rajya Sabha Debate on India-China Border Situation

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on August 22, 1962 in reply to the debate on the India-China border situation :

Madam, Deputy Chairman, may I say that I welcome very much what an hon. Member, said about the approach to this question. He was good enough to say a good deal about me. I am not referring to that part of his speech. But rather when we are dealing with any serious problem--even when we are dealing as between individuals but more so when we are dealing with national problems, great nations opposed to each other-it is never right, if I may say so-we may fight, if necessity arises one fights----or wise to run down the other party, to curse it and to use strong language. It is obvious that by our strong language we do not frighten the other country or defeat it. If we have to gain what we seek to gain, apart from the field of battle, we have to do it by talking to itthere is no other way-by political pressures, military pressures or other pressures. There is no other way. And if we merely shut the door to any such approach and also when we create a position by our language or other acts-the other party or ourselves, it applies to the other party too using that language--when it becomes a tremendous question of honour and prestigethat is how language makes it a question of honour and prestige when the other party does not give in at all, when it might otherwisethat is entirely opposed to all the training I had

in the past. The hon. Member referred to the

179

Gandhian period of our struggle for independence. Gandhiji was not a weakling, nobody called him a weakling, but he was always soft in his language and tried to win over the other party. Take even our reactions to China. Why are our reactions so strong and angry ? Centainly it would be because they have occupied our territory. But I venture to submit that the real reason for our anger is not even that. It is the way they have done it and the way they have behaved and the way they have treated us, our country. It is conceivable that they could have claimed to a frontier revision or something and asked us for talks without occupying it. But after all that we had done for them it would seem a peculiarly ungracious thing for them to behave in this way. That has hurt us apart from the major hurt of their occupying the territory. They knew very well, I am not going into the rights and wrongs of this question, I am convinced that we are right, but apart from that they knew absolutely what our frontier was according to us, according to our maps. Our maps have not varied like theirs every few months or few years. Our maps have been there clearly defined, good maps which have been handed to them. Their attention has been drawn to them and for years past they never really challenged them. They did not accept them, I will admit that, and they said their own maps should be considered afresh, their old maps and ail that. But they knew very well what our maps were, where our boundaries were. I do submit quite apart from the merits of the question that it was utterly and absolutely wrong for them then to cross those boundaries without reference to us or without telling us that this is so and afterwards, when we raised this question, to produce maps which go on changing from year to year. So, my point is that we must be as strong as we like in our expressions but not use language which needlessly hurts national prestige, because that makes it frightfully difficult for any kind of talks or any kind of possible, if it is possible, settlement to be arrived at. This applies to every country. In other words, we must not indulge in what is commonly known as the language of the cold war. The cold war does not help. You may disagree with a person, you may even

fight him, but the language of the cold war is the language, if I may say so with all respect, of lack of civilization. We should behave in a civilised manner. Civilised manner does not mean behaving weakly, but it ultimately helps, and it is becoming for civilised countries to behave in a civilised manner.

Then there are one or two other matters. An hon. Member asked us about our publicity about this matter. I am sorry that our publicity has not reached him, but we have issued a number of pamphlets and books on this subject which have been widely circulated and often translated in French, Spanish, Arabic, Sinhalese, Burmese, Nepalese and Japanese among other languages. As for the All India Radio, the Radio broadcasts daily in Mandarin and separately in Cantonese, two broadcasts directed to China, one in Mandarin for 45 minutes, one in Cantonese for 45 minutes; one in Tibetan for 45 minutes; one in English but directed to China, Korea and Japan for an hour daily. In South-East Asia the daily broadcasts are : Indonesian or Bhasa as it is called for 1 1/4 hours daily; Burmese for 1 hour 35 minutes daily; English for South-East Asia for 1 /2 hours and French news for Indo-China etc. for 15 minutes daily.

An hon. Member : May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the Lok Sabha on June 11 ? I am reading from a newspaper report :

"All India Radio does not intend to launch any special broadcast to counter the Chinese broadcasts beamed to India and other Asiatic countries."

The Prime Minister: That I do not know. Presumably, it means a special broadcast about the frontier question. These broadcasts, as I said, are broadcasts generally putting the Indian viewpoint, Indian news, Indian everything, to China and South-East Asia in the course of which the frontier question also comes up. The hon. Member will appreciate that this kind of direct broadcasts for a particular matter have less effect, have less publicity value than in a general broadcast of news etc. something bring said relating to the frontier.

Then reference was made to our letter of the 26th. I really do not understand it. I have no doubt that some Members could have perhaps worded. it better, but I really do not understand why so much stress has been laid on the fact that it has said something else than what it was meant to do. Possibly, this is due to the fact, that some newspapers went on repeating without rhyme or reason that it did so. As an hon. Member quoted it, apart from that, the very next paragraph made that further clear. It is obvious that the whole point of reference to the Chou En-lai map claimed line was to show that they have been misbehaving still further. It had nothing to do with our accepting that line. That is absurd, to say that it conflicts with all that we have said or that we are likely to say. But

180

it was to lay stress that they are, even according to their own Prime Minister's statement, committing aggression. That surely does not mean that we admit the previous aggression.

An hon. Member, quoted a Burmese daily Chip Chap Valley or River. The Burmese daily -that is what he quoted from--it was a quotation in the Burmese daily of a Chinese newspaper. Subsequently, that same Burmese daily gave, when its attention was drawn to it, a full statement about the Indian position in regard to the Chip Chap Valley.

An hon. Member referred to my reference to South-East Asian countries. I should like to say that if any impression has been created in his mind or in any mind of any discourteous reference of mine of South-East Asian countries, I am sorry because I did not certainly mean it. I could not have meant it because we have very friendly and cordial relations with all these countries. But I did not mean it. Some of these countries and the SEATO are tied up with military alliances. And as the House will know, the SEATO has not done any wonders in South-East Asia. In fact, according to us, the coming of SEATO has made the position worse in South-East Asia. It has not helped at all. However, that may be, I was referring to this position that some are in the SEATO and others are nonaligned more or less. Others may, without belonging to any military alliance, incline one way

or the other. We may agree with them here and there, and in some matters we may not. But the hon. Member is quite right in saying that anything that might be construed as any discourtesy, any reference, is quite wrong, and I certainly did not mean it. Of course, we have very good relations with them.

Then, an hon. Member-I forget who it was -asked me : When I ask for a free hand, what kind of freedom do I want? My reference to a free hand was in relation to an amendment that had been moved which wanted to tie me up to that amendment. I said that I was not going to accept that amendment, that I wanted a free hand subject, of course, to the basic things that we stood for. But it is absurd to ask a person to deal with a matter and tie him up hand and foot. He cannot deal with the matter. He must have some freedom to manoeuvre.

Now, most of the speeches in this House, apart from stressing this aspect or that aspect, have not been radically different, and I think I may well say that broadly, the policy pursued by us has been approved, although an hon. Member's amendment is thorough disapproval of almost everything that has been done or may be done. That is my difficulty because hon. Members talk in contradictory languages sometimes. They approve of it and yet they put something in writing or in words which is not only disapproval but condemnation. I have tried to understand their mentality and all this leaves me to think that there is a fundamental difference in our approach which comes out. Even though it may overlap sometimes, it comes out. There is a fundmental difference in our approach. In spite of what the hon. Members of the Communist Party have said, there is a fundamental difference-not in this particular matter-in our approach to some of these problems. It comes out occasionally. (Interruption)

Some hon. Member suddenly in the middle of other things just put in one sentence : "Why don't you take military help from other countries ?", which, of course, is basically and fundamentally opposed to a non-alignment policy. Taking military help means practically becoming aligned to that country. So, at the back of their minds there is that thing lurking which leads them, I think, to utterly wrong conclusions.

An hon. Member : No, Madam, I would just like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what steps they are going to take to train people and strengthen our military defences, because in spite of these protests and our desire to settle these problems by peaceful negotiations the incursions are going on. Even the hon. Prime Minister had said two months back that he had some sort of a hunch that china desired some sort of peaceful talks and negotiations. But even then, there have been fresh incursions. Suppose, tomorrow also fresh incursions take place, what steps are they going to take to strengthen our defence and our military position ? Or should we allow China to make fresh incursions again into our country ?

The Deputy Chairman : Your statement is being interpreted.

Prime Minister : I am sorry that I have not quite understood what the hon. Member has said. It is my fault. But I should like to assure, first of all, that this question of our trouble with China on our border is a military question and a political question; there are many other aspects of it as well. Limiting it to the military aspect, I should like the hon. Member, if he has ever considered military matters, to consider as to what country, and how, can give us military aid in this particular matter. In one way, of course,

181

they can give it, by having a world war and diverting attention. But that is a different matter. About the defence of our frontier, how can any other country help us? They can help us in one way, if we are prepared to take it. That is they can give us free the things we want, whatever they may be, aircraft or other things. But otherwise, how do you expect any big country or small country to send their armies to our North-East frontiers to protect them? Obviously not. (Interruptions) That is what I have said. They may send us some equipment, may be some aircraft, if we are prepared to accept it. And the cost we pay for it, not in money but in other ways, will be far greater than its possible value. I am looking at it purely from the practical point of view, and the cost of it will be far

greater, and it will weaken us ultimately, weaken us actually in fighting on the frontier, apart from other ways. It surprises me that these patent facts are not obvious to everybody. Of course, the sympathy of the countries is always welcome, and it helps us. I think we have the sympathetic understanding on this issue of many countries. Some hon. Members have referred here and elsewhere to the countries of South-East Asia and to Nepal and said that we ought to be able to convince them to act differently than they have done in some matters. Well, I do not wish to go into each individual country's policy. That is for them to determine but it is not an easy matter. We either bring pressure on them which has the wrong results or we seek to make them understand our policy and, I believe, normally we succeed. But they have to deal with all kinds of pressures on themselves, sometimes the pressures may lead them in other directions. Broadly speaking, most countries, whether in Asia or Europe, understand our position in this and sympathise with us. But there are very few of them which can really help us except that it may be in regard to military equipment. We take military equipment from countries, we buy it. But the few crores that we may save if we got those military equipment as a gift would be far outbalanced by the tremendous loss in prestige, in position and even in sympathy that we may have from the rest of the world.

It is obvious. Therefore it is essential, so fat as I see, for us to maintain our non-alignment policy and retain the friendship of all nations on that basis. Now it is agreed and there is nothing much that I can say--about the broad features of this policy as applied to the frontier, that is, to strengthen our defences, and at the same time be always ready for any opportunity that might lead to fruitful results in the way a settlement. I must say, looking at it at the present moment, that the prospects are not good. But that should not lead to jump into a wrong direction. May be later, because of various things happening including our own position, as it improves, it may lead us to better results. We may have to wait for it. Again to say that we must not negotiate and not have talks seems to me very unrealistic. You may say that negotiation should come at the right moment-what the right moment is, you cannot exactly define.

broadly you may indicate it, that is all rightbecause negotiations at the wrong moment may injure us. That I accept. But you cannot rule out negotiations, much less can rule out talks. It is an attitude; it is a brave attitude but not a wise one. Hon. Members should remember that in our history there has been no lack of courage, tremendous courage, super human courage, but tremendous lack of wisdom, which has made that courage to lose in the conflict. That is our history. Whether it is the Rajputs or others, there was no lack of courage, but the Raiputs did' not win in the end because they did not understand things. They lived in a world of their own; they did not know that the world was progressing, and as I said in the other House, they did not have, and even the Mahrattas, gallant as they were, did not have a decent map of India, while a handful of Europeans, Frenchmen and others, in this country, had much better maps, had much better informers. In every Court in India they had their spies informing them, paid spies, and sometimes the Ministers of the Court were their spies, of the English people and the French, specially the English, apart from the fact that they had better weapons, modern weapons, and the other people simply talked about hordes. And the result was 'natural; with all the courage in the world they could not face the superior weapons and superior organisation and knowledge. It is extraordinary, if you read history, how you find it, how these people fought great battles-were fine persons-without a map even, without knowing where they have to go to and knowing little beyond their borders. So we have to look at the position today realistically. Certainly, the personal element is of the greatest importance--determination, courage, unity, etc. But in war we have to deal with modem weapons, not only modem weapons but other modem equipment, and in effect, today a war is something very different from a few armies fighting it. It is a war of peoples. Not that I want it-I am merely saying that; it becomes a nation in arms. It means the development of industry. the economy and all that, and therefore, preparation for adding to your strength means developing your

182

economy and industry essentially. It is not that we get a few guns or a few aircraft from another country and we defend our country. What happens if those aircraft are destroyed, or do not fly ? Then we are helpless. We have nothing to fall back upon. So it is better to have slightly second rate arms with a nation behind them and producing them than rely on things supplied from outside, which may or may not come at the right moment, or the spares may not be there in hand. That is why our policy has been to build up defence industries, to build up defence equipment, and ail that, and we have done that, not only in rather showy things, such as the supersonic aircraft, H.F. 24, that we have built at Bangalore-that is certainly a great feat for us to accomplish-but in hundreds of other things. The war-time equipment that we are making in our ordance factories today were not made before. We started at the time of independence practically from scratch, because the British policy previously was to supply everything to us, everything including ideas, including policies-policies and ideas were made in Whitehall-everything came. Only in the last War some kind of simple ammunition was made in this country, because they could not get it from elsewhere. So we started almost from scratch, and we have built it up and we have built it up well, and we have got some very fine specialised men, engineers, etc., in the Army, the Air Force and the Navy, so that we have to take all these into consideration.

Some hon. Member referred to Marshal Chen-yi talking about 650 million people not doing this or that. Well, with all respect to Marshal Chen-yi that does not impress anybody, that kind of saying, nor does it impress me. When somebody tells me that we have got 45 crores of men, that we will stand as a man, it does not impress me at all. That is a source of weakness, not of strength unless those people are well trained and well fed and the country's economy is good. That is a source of strength -not numbers. Numbers have always been a source of weakness to India.

Another thing : some of the Members have referred to what the Defence Minister is reported to have said, namely, that a great part of Ladakh was 'unoccupied'. Now I really am surprised that they do not understand what the simple phrase means. He was asked what part of Ladakh was occupied by the Chinese forces. And the answer was that a great part of Ladakh was unoccupied, that is, even where the Chinese are, they have got only military posts here and there. And you may draw an imaginary line and say that all the land behind them is occupied or not. It may, be, to some extent, under their, control, but it is not correct to say that they occupied all the land. In fact, since then, part of the area which, we thought, was under their control, has come under our control. Out of 12,000 or so, about 2,500 square miles have, in a sense, in that vague sense, come under our control because of our posts. So he said "unoccupied", not meaning uninhabited. Their posts are there-there of course it is uninhabited but not actually occupied by the Chinese, which is perfectly a Correct statement. (interruptions)

As I understand English, there is only one meaning and no other meaning of unoccupied-If people should pretend not to understand a simple phrase. The question and answer were given in the papers. It never struck me as anything else. But the fact of the matter is, as some hon. Members said, some people have got an allergy for the Defence Minister, and they try to exploit every little phrase, every word that he says, in an attempt to show off their allergy, As a matter of fact, the growth of modern arms and production in the Defence industries, the scientific progress in defence, is almost entirely due to our present Defence Minister, who has taken great interest in it. Naturally, it is due to the fact that we have good men, good engineers and others who ran do it; otherwise it is all his work.

I would like to say a few words about the background of this frontier trouble. As everyone knows, Ladakh is a part of Kashmir and Kashmir was a State under a Maharaja and the defence of Kashmir lay with the Maharaja except when necessity arose in the British times-the Government of India might be called upon to help. There was no fear in those days of any attack from the Tibet side or from any side in fact, on Kashmir. The only fear in the olden days was the fear of Britishers, that is, what the British felt was that Possibly Russia might come down through Kashmir to India or through Afghanistan to India. That is the fear in the old Czarist days. I am not talking so much of the later developments in Russia. Right through the 19th century, there was this fear

of Russia in the British mind. Anyhow, that has nothing to do with what I am saying. I say that the eastern borders of Kashmir and Ladakh with Tibet were never considered by the Maharaja's Government at all necessary to be protected from Tibet. There was some slight argument about one or two parts. In fact there were 3 or 4 villages in the heart of Tibet, far from the Ladakh border, which were the zamindari of 183

Kashmir and every second or third year the Kashmir Government sent a little. Mission to get some revenue. It was not very much. I think it was Rs. 100 of Rs. 200. Just to assert its zamindari right it sent them to the 2 or 3 villages and the thing was peaceful. No question arose of having any protective apparatus in that border in the Maharaja's time. Of course, as everyone knows, the border itself and all the territory was a very difficult terrain and hardly inhabited. Then came independence and together with independence, almost a month or two later, came the trouble with Pakistan over Kashmir-the invasion of Kashmir by the tribals and later by the Pakistani troops. During the whole fighting in 1948, part of Ladakh was occupied by the Pakistani troops. In fact they cut off the main access to Ladakh which is the main road from Srinagar to Leh, passing the big pass Zoji-La and we were compelled to use another route to reach Leh, a very difficult route from Manali in the Kulu valley over very high mountains in a round-about way, to reach Leh. We did reach Leh but it was impossible to do much if the main route was occupied by the Pakistanis. It was a remarkable effort of our army to drive the Pakistanis from the Zoji-La Pass. In fact they built the road. Some hon. Members may have seen it. It is a sudden rise of about 3,000 feet, 2,500 to 3,000 feet and you have to go in a winding way up the mountain and if you reach the top of the mountain, you see on the one side the wooded valley of Kashmir and on the other bare rocks, tree-less rocks of the uplands of Central Asia, the little Tibet as Ladakh is called and it goes on to Tibet. So they built a road there and took the tanks up there and thus drove out the Pakistani troops and gradually assured the protection of Leh and east of Ladakh. Even then a part of western Ladakh was in the possession of the Pakistani troops and even now the area occupied

by Pakistan in Kashmir is a bit of Ladakh also and when I say the northern part, I mean the border part about which they want to talk to China. So this is the background. There was no kind of defence or anything in the Maharaja's time and after that, for a year or two, we were busy fighting the Pakistanis there and we drove them out. Just about this time, the Chinese came to Tibet and without suspecting them of any evil intentions, we saw that the situation had changed. A great Power was next to us. It is not a weak Tibet and this would have serious con sequences in the future. Our judgment of the situation was that the danger lay from the NEFA part and therefore, from then on, we tried to Protect the NEFA border. Gradually we have built up outposts and much more than that, administration has gradually spread in NEFA, It was an unadministered territory. We also, even at the same time, thought of Ladakh too, not that we realised that they were going to come in such large numbers but still, we thought that this has to be protected, but it was a very difficult task to reach the place where now our posts are. It takes about 3 weeks' or a month's journey by road. We sent sonic small teams to survey and they did go several times, backwards and forwards from the actual frontier, crossed Ladakh and that is the evidence we have that no Chinese were there at that time. These repeated teams had crossed Ladakh and we established an airfield there not against the Chinese there but because we wanted to cover Ladakh and not leave it unprotected and I remember-I forget the year -about 6 years ago, I went to that airfield and flew there simply through curiousity because our Air Force were very pleased to have made an airfield. This they called the highest in the world. It is about 14,000 feet. You must remember that in the whole of Ladakh, practically speaking there are no trees because trees do not normally grow above 11,000 feet. You can grow them. In Leh there are some trees and we have a farm in Leh too but that is by very special efforts. Normally no trees grow. It is a bare rock or some very small shrubs and sometimes even flowers but no trees. So I went there and it was interesting and I told Mr. Chou-En-lai : "Yes, I can speak from my own evidence, apart from others. I went to our airfield then, you were not there anywhere near that and I went another time and I saw

your people, not at the airfield but at the hill-top nearby. So you have come since." To that he had no particular answer. That is the position. The main thing is, quite apart from any claims based on history, they were not there and they are there. It was a peaceful frontier, it is not now a peaceful frontier, not because we have done something but because they have come here. These are the arguments which we placed before them but I was pointing out how difficult it was for us to organise any defence system in Ladakh. We were doing it and we have gradually done it but you cannot simply put forward a defence post unconnected with the rest. It has to be in tiers, connected especially hundreds of miles from any base. The very first thing necessary was to build the road to Leh. There was not even a road to Leh. That was bulit and a good road exists now. Other roads have been built. Even now it is far. Roads are being built, but mostly our communications are by air and our Air Force have done a very fine piece of work in supply-

184

ing these posts by air. And of course, the actual military that are there at the posts, they are a fine lot of men and I should like to express our high appreciation of them.

This background may lead the House to understand that just before the Chinese came to Tibet, we could not hold them, I mean to say, we could not hold them at the frontier. There was nobody at the frontier who could help us to hold them. We are proceeding gradually. The one place which we adequately protected, mote or less adequately, was the NEFA border, There we succeeded. I am quite sure if we had not held them there, they would have walked in. They did walk in, more or less, on the Ladakh border. First of all they built that road in the Aksai Chin area, in the northern area of Aksai Chin. That was an old caravan route which probably had been used previously too. They made it a road and they used it for communication between Tibet and Sinkiang. That was in 1957, or may be, a little earlier. But the main advance came in 1959 which coincided with the Tibetan revolution, when large forces of Chinese came over to Tibet. So to say that we did not protect Ladakh is rather to ignore the

circumstances that existed in those times. in the Kashmir Maharaja's time and subsequently.

One thing which has been mentioned-a thoroughly opportunist adventure-is Pakistan and China trying to collaborate together in this matter. It is very surprising that Pakistan which is the champion standard-bearer against communism. and a member of CENTO, SEATO and all that, should now try to club up with China, and that China should, to some extent. appreciate this and meet it, in spite of their utterly different policies. Apparently, the only policy in common between them is a certain dislike of India. There is nothing else in common.

So we have to face this situation, and in. facing it remember that it is not merely a frontier incursion or aggression. That is bad enough. But it is something much deeper that we have to face. It is the future relationship of two of the biggest countries of Asia, namely, India and China. It means a great deal, what that relationship is going to be. An hon. Member said that some Chinese gentleman had told him that they would wait for centuries for a solution of this problem. Well, the world moves much faster now. Still it may be a long time and it may involve some years before we can solve this. But in this changing world frontiers may cease to have significance. Of course, we see these cosmonauts and others flying all round the world and no frontiers count. The world is changing very rapidly. But apart from this, it is an important matter for us to consider the future between our two countries, because continuing hostility for generations will affect us, affect China and affect Asia and have other farreaching effects. It will be a tremendous burden for all countries concerned. When this world is changing very fast to something different-I hope something better-for us to be tied up with these continuing wars, would be unfortunate. At the same time, it is obvious that no country worth its strain, and certainly not India, can submit to bullying tactics, can submit to force being used to take away its territory and otherwise to show that it can be treated casually, by any other country. It is impossible, whatever the consequences might be. So- we have to face this difficult situation with our courage and strength. And may I say, strength, of course,

depends on what we do on the frontier, but strength ultimately depends upon our unity of efforts in the country, and everything that comes in the way of that unity of effort is really weakening the country and our campaign or the efforts that we make on the frontier. I would particularly like to say this, because some people live in compartments. They talk about our unity in connection with the frontier and yet, in our work for economic growth and so on. they come in the way all the time, work for industrial growth, economic growth and all that. The two do not fit in. I do not mean to say that everyone should agree with the Government's policy. But there are certain broad features of it which we must keep in mind, features which go towards the unity of the country and the growth of our economy and industrial progress.

I am grateful, Madam, for the general support that hon. Members have given me. I regret I am wholly unable to accept the hon. Member's amendment which is a negation of all that we have done.

An hon. Member : On a point of information, Madam. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the latest claim has been staked by the Chinese for 3,700 square miles in the Pakistan-held part of Kashmir ? I understand that they nave now staked a claim for 3 700 square miles which is an area now occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir territory. I would also like to ask him whether this area has been shown in the 1960 map which the Chinese have prepared, or whether it is outside the 1960 map.

Prime Minister : I don't know exactly where their map line goes, but they have claimed part of this territory, I don't know how much. In

185

fact, it may interest the House to know that when I went to Pakistan two years ago, or maybe two and a half years back, I tried to profit by that occasion and I discussed China and the frontier issue with President Ayub Khan, because whatever our differences were on Kashmir or elsewhere, 1 thought it would be advantageous to have a uniform policy with regard to the Chinese aggression. And we showed them various maps and other things, even in regard to the territory occupied by Pakistan, the Kashmir territory, and they told us what their line according to them was. There was some slight difference between them and us. There was another question which related to the area which belongs to the Mir of Hunza. We discussed that too. But I am sure that the Chinese map claims some area which, according to us, even in the Pakistani-occupied territory, should be on this side.

CHINA INDIA USA JAPAN NEPAL KOREA INDONESIA RUSSIA AFGHANISTAN PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TUNISIA

Date : Aug 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Agreement with Polish firm on New Coal Washery

The National Coal Development Corporation August 18, 1962 signed an agreement at Ranchi with the Polish firm, CEKOP, for setting up a coal washery at Gidi in the Karanpura fields of Bihar.

Estimated to cost a little over Rs. 8,31,00,000, the washery will have an annual raw coal input capacity of 2.84 million metric tons. This will be the Corporation's second washery in Bihar, the first being at Kargali.

Expected to be commissioned by April 1965, the washery will produce 1.1 million metric tons of washed blendable coal, besides 1.1 million metric tons of washed steam-size coal, suitable for the railways.

Over half a million metric tons of middlings produced by the washery will be used by the Patratu thermal power station, being set up.

The raw coal for the washery will come

mainly from the Corporation's colliery at Gidi and the rest from its collieries at Bhurkunda and Saunda. Coal from the last mentioned two collieries will be transported by aerial ropeways.

In this composite washery coal will first be crushed to size and blended before washing. The washing will be by heavy medium separator and a magnetite preparation plant will be attached to the washery. It will have three bunders, each with a capacity of 5,000 metric tons for storing the different sizes of washed coal.

The agreement is in pursuance of the earlier agreement for economic cooperation concluded between the Governments of India and Poland in May 1960 providing for a credit of Rs. 14.3 crores. To the extent possible, equipment for the washery will be procured from Indian sources. The remaining items will be supplied by CEKOP who will also assist in erecting and commissioning the plant.

186

POLAND USA INDIA **Date :** Aug 01, 1962

September

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs RecordSep 01, 1962Vol. VIIISEPTEMBERNo.9

CONTENTS

PAGES

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Final Communique	187	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS		
Shri B.N. Chakravarty's Statement on peaceful uses of Outer Space 190		
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly in reply to South African Foreign Minister's allegations against India 192		
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in C Agreement	General Assembly on West Irian 194	
INDONESIA		
Prime Minister's Statement on Attack Embassy at Jakarta	a on Indian 196	
Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statemen Jakarta	t on Attack on Indian Embassy at 197	
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION		
Credit for Expansion of Telecommunica	tion 198	
INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUN	۱D	
Finance Minister's Statement at the A	Annual Meeting 198	
NIGERIA		
Prime Minister's Visit to Nigeria	201	
Joint 'Communique	201	
NORTH VIETNAM		
Trade and Payments Agreement	202	
PAKISTAN		
Intrusion by Pakistani Nationals	203	
Farakka Barrage Scheme : India's Pro	ess Note 203	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA (Continued Overleaf)

PAGES

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Establishment of Chinese Military Posts in Ladakh 204

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Supply of Equipment for Korba Workshop : Contract S UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC	Signed 204
Agreement for Indo-UAR Co-operation in Atomic Ene	ergy 205
UNITED KINGDOM	
Indo-U.K. Loan Agreements Signed	205
UNESCO	
Prime Minister's Speech at UNESCO Meeting in Paris	206
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
Shri Morarji Desai's Speech in the National Press Club	207
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION	
Dr. Sushila Nayar's Inaugural Speech at 15th Session of Regional Committee 210	of

(ii)

INDIA USA INDONESIA NIGER NIGERIA VIETNAM PAKISTAN CHINA UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

The following is the full text of the final communique issued on September 19, 1962 in London at the end of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference :

The meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers was concluded today (September 19).

This was the first occasion on which Sierra Leone, Tanganyika, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago have been represented, as independent countries, at a Commonwealth meeting, and the presence of their Prime Ministers, together representing 15,000,000 people who have achieved independence since the last Commonwealth meeting in 1961, was welcomed by the other Commonwealth Governments.

During the course of the meeting the Prime Ministers were informed that Uganda, with a population of nearly 7,000,000, will attain independence in October 1962, and they agreed that Uganda should then be admitted to membership of the Commonwealth.

They also noted with satisfaction the great progress made towards the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia by August 31, 1963. This would enable the State of Singapore, the territories of North Borneo and Sarawak and, it is hoped, the State of Brunei, with a combined population of about 3,000,000, to achieve independence as part of the enlarged Federation.

They were informed that Tanganyika would adopt a republican form of constitution in December 1962, and they agreed that Tanganyika should thereafter remain a member of the Commonwealth as a Republic. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

in the course of their discussions, the Prime Ministers have taken the opportunity to hold their customary review of international affairs and have exchanged views on the political situation in various parts of the world.

They took note, in particular, of the proposals relating to the Congo which were recently put forward by the acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, and they expressed the hope that these would prove to be the basis for a speedy and constructive settlement.

The Prime Ministers agreed that the need for disarmament had be-en intensified by the steady development of ever more powerful weapons. They reaffirmed the principles laid down in their statement on disarmament of March 17, 1961, and expressed their conviction that the 18-nation disarmament committee at Geneva should continue its efforts towards a treaty for general and complete disarmament in accordance with these principles.

They noted that discussions on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests had also been taking place in Geneva and expressed the hope that these efforts would be successful in bringing into being an effective treaty to eradicate this source of fear and danger to mankind.

BRUSSELS NEGOTIATIONS

The primary object of this meeting was, however, to review the progress made in the negotiations in Brussels about the conditions on which Britain might join the European Economic Community, and to examine the nature and prospects of safeguards for the trade of other Commonwealth countries.

The greater part of the meeting has been devoted to the discussion of this complex question. Although this discussion has disclosed many differences of viewpoint and many uncertainties, all the exchanges have been conducted in the frank and friendly atmosphere which characterizes Commonwealth meetings. This has reaffirmed the common determination to strengthen the links between the countries of the Commonwealth.

The Prime Ministers declared that in all the countries of the Commonwealth the constant objective of policy is to promote peace and economic progress throughout the world and thus to help to create conditions in which mankind can flourish in freedom, unfettered by poverty, ignorance or disease. In furtherance of this purpose, all Commonwealth Governments are resolved to do their utmost to foster the harmonious development and steady expansion of world trade.

187

TRADE POLICIES

They note with concern that trade and industry in the developing countries, as well as in some of the more developed countries which are large producers of primary products for export, have been adversely affected by widely fluctuating commodity prices and a progressive worsening of the terms of trade. They see this as a problem which calls for progressive policies in relation to international trade and finance so that demand for the products of those countries can be sustained and increased, and larger and more dependable trade outlets assured to them.

"To meet the needs of the developing countries they will support policies designed to raise the living standards of the peoples of these countries and to help them to achieve the economic, social and cultural progress to which they aspire. To this end they consider that improved opportunities and conditions for trade and even more important than financial aid. They recognize the need for the developing countries to have easier access to outside markets for the products of their industries as they become established and the desirability of the bring reflected in the policies of the more developed countries.

To meet the needs of the producers of agricultural commodities, Commonwealth Governments will support policies and initiatives designed to maintain and expand world trade in these commodities and to improve the organization of the world market in a manner fair alike to producers and to consumers. They will support a fresh and vigorous approach to the negotiation of international commodity agreements to this end.

In any such approach, principles of price, production and trade access would need to be applied, on a commodity by commodity basis, so as to encourage maximum consumption without over-stimulating production and to offer to efficient producing countries adequate access and stable prices at a fair and reasonable level. They believe that in the disposal of any surplus of agricultural products opportunity should be taken, to the fullest extent compatible with the legitimate interests of traditional suppliers, to meet the needs of those peoples of the world who are in want.

The Prime Ministers expressed the readiness of their governments to join in comprehensive international efforts by all available means to expand world trade in both primary products and manufactures. They recognized the important contribution which the European Economic Community and other regional groups could make in such efforts. They hoped that the general objectives st out above would be shared by the members of the European Economic Community. They also took note in this connection that legislation was at present before the United States Congress which could materially assist in this aim.

VIEWS ON E.E.C.

The Prime Ministers were informed of, and considered the stage reached in, Britain's negotiations with the European Economic Community, and discussed the arrangements which might be made to meet the special needs of other Commonwealth countries if Britain joins the Community.

British Ministers set out the broad political and economic considerations which had led the British Government to initiate the negotiations in Brussels. They emphasize that, in the view of the British Government, Britain's accession to the Community of satisfactory terms would have the result of strengthening the position of Britain, of the Commonwealth and of Europe.

They explained in detail the position so far reached in the negotiations in Brussels and emphaszied the principal points among the many provisional arrangements which had been worked out.

In the first place, an offer of association on advantageous economic terms was open to Commonwealth countries in Africa and the Caribbean and the majority of british dependent territories. Should certain of the countries not become associated, the provisional agreement reached in Brussels offered further discussion in the course of the negotiations with a view to the possible conclusion of other arrangements.

Secondly, the Community were prepared to negotiate as soon as possible trade agreements with India, Pakistan and Ceylon which would have the declared objective of developing mutual trade to maintain and, as much as possible, to increase the level of their foreign currency receipts and in general facilitate the imprementation of their development plants.

Thirdly, as regards temperate products, the enlarged Community would make, at the time of British accession, two important declarations. One would express their intention to initiate discussions on international commodity agreements for temperate foodstuffs on a worldwide basis. It would recognize the greatly increased responsibilities of the enlarged Community by reason of its predominant position amongst world importers. The second declaration would relate

188

to the price of the Community. While taking appropriate measures to raise the individual earnings of those engaged in agriculture in the Community, the Community world do its utmost to contribute a harmonious development of world trade providing for a satisfactory level of trade between the Community and third countries, including Commonwealth countries British Ministers considered that the policy which the enlarged Community intended to pursue would offer reasonable opportunities in its markets for exports of temperate agricultural products.

PERSONAL CONSULTATION

The representatives of other Commonwealth Governments welcomed this opportunity for personal consultation on this issue and for supplementing the exchanges of information and consultation which had already take place between ministers and officials. They took note of the considerations which had influenced the British Government in deciding to accede to the European Economic Community if satisfactory terms could be secured. They recognized that, after full and continuing consultation with the other countries of the Commonwealth and in the light of the further negotiations to be held with the members of the Community, the responsibility for the final decision would rest with the British Government.

The representatives of the other Commonwealth countries freely acknowledged the strenuous efforts which the British Government have made to ensure on the part of the six a full understanding of the safeguards required, if Britain's entry into the Common Market is not to be on such terms and conditions as to impair their vital interests. They expressed their hope that the members of the European Economic Community will wish to preserve ann encourage a strong and growing Commonwealth, in furtherance of their own ideals of an expanding and peaceful world order.

At the same time, the representatives of various Commonwealth Governments expressed anxieties about the possible effect of Britain's entry into the European Economic Community. They trusted that, should there be closer association between Britain and Europe, it would not be allowed, as it developed, to weaken the cohesion of the Commonwealth or its influence for peace and progress in the world. They drew attention to the difficulties to which these developments could give rise in relation to their trade both with Britain and with other countries. They explained the economic points of special concern to their respective countries and the extent to which their interests had not so far been met in the Brussels negotiations.

Some independent African countries considered that association with the Community under Part 4 of the Treaty of Rome would not be acceptable to them. On the other hand, the Government of Sierra Leone wishes to consider further its attitude towards association, after consultation with other African territories which are not members of the Commonwealth.

In the Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago will be willing to accept association, and Jamaica will wish to consider their attitude further. The Prime Ministers were informed that the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland is willing to accept association, and they were also informed that, after appropriate consultations, it seemed likely that the majority of the British dependent territories eligible for association would wish to accept it.

ASIAN COUNTRIES'S STAND

The representatives of India, Pakistan and Ceylon urged that, if Britain entered the Community, the trade agreements which the enlarge Community had offered to negotiate with their Governments should be concluded as soon as possible and that, meanwhile, no change should be made in their existing trade arrangements with Britain. They expressed their apprehension that if the treatment of their products in the United Kingdom was altered before wider trading arrangements had been worked but for the enlarged Community, their foreign exchange earnings and investment in expor industries would be adversely affected at a critical stage in the implementation of their development plans.

Importance was attached to the need for securing adequate safeguards to protect the essential interests of Commonwealth producers of temperate foodstuffs and other agricultural products, including tropical products, as well as certain raw materials for which zero tariffs had been requested. The importance for some Commonwealth countries of trade in a broad range of manufactured and processed goods was also emphasized.

The Prime Ministers took note that the negotiations in Brussels were incomplete and that a number of important questions had still to be negotiated. Only when the full terms were known would it be possible to form a final judgment.

189

It was agreed that, when the negotiations were resumed, British Ministers would take full Account of the views, both general and particular, which had been expressed on behalf of other Commonwealth Governments at this meeting and would continue their efforts to safeguard essential Commonwealth interests. The British Government undertook to continue to arrange for the closest consultation with other Commonwealth Governments during the remainder of their negotiations with the European Economic Community."

UNITED KINGDOM JAMAICA UGANDA MALAYSIA USA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE BRUNEI CONGO SWITZERLAND BELGIUM RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA PAKISTAN ITALY SIERRA LEONE TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Statement on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative in the U.N. made the following speech in the general debate on the peaceful uses of outer space in the United Nations Committee meeting in New York on September 13, 1962 :

Since our last meeting, further spectacular advances have been made in man's conquest of outer space. The Soviet spaceships Vostok III and IV, piloted by Major Nikolayev and Lt. Colonel Popovich respectively, broke all previous records and their performance evoked Admiration all over the world. The Americans have lately launched the Mariner 11 rocket, which is expected to pass near Venus. All these achievements will naturally further spur the desire for international co-operation in this field.

My delegation would like to express satisfaction that the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee is unanimous. We take this as a further proof that when the two super Powers make a sincere effort to co-operate with each other they can arrive at an agreement which is not only mutually satisfactory to them but also to others as well. We particularly welcome this agreement since we believe that co-operation in outer space may reduce international tension and create understanding and mutual confidence leading to co-operation in other matters on this planet of ours. Only the very rich and highly technically advanced countries can at present manage to conduct space research. The time may soon come when even the richest and the most technically advanced country would not find it possible to conduct such researches on their own resources. Pooling of resources by several countries may then become essential. Co-operation is therefore necessary if the world is to avoid duplication and wastage of resources.

Among individuals of nation States, there are often some internal disputes, but these are forgotten when the people of one country have to deal with those of Another. In dealing with outer space, I submit, men must forget ideological differences and close their ranks at least in their common efforts to conquer outer space.

The recommendations of the Sub-Committee closely follow the directions of General Assembly resolution 1721 (XVI). We attach very great importance to the dissemination of knowledge and technique and the exchange of information in this new field of science. This would be of particular benefit to the less developed countries. The report makes recommendations for the encouragement of. international programmes and suggests specific measures on which international co-operation could start, With the advancement of atmospheric science, man may ultimately have the power to influence weather and even climate on a large scale. We are happy to note that some of these programmes were mentioned in the exchange of messages between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev last spring.

We particularly welcome the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee in regard to the creation and operation of international equatorial sounding rocket launching facilities. These facilities would further the advancement of human knowledge and would provide valuable technical training for interested users. My delegation fully supports the recommendations of the Sub-Committee and would like to take this opportunity to express India's interest in being

190

the host State for the international equatorial sounding rocket launching facilities on the terms proposed by the Sub-Committee. Our offer to be a host State is, of course, on the basis that this would be a United Nations project in which the principal Powers concerned would cooperate. Detailed proposals in this respect would be made at the appropriate time after it had been decided that the facilities in question would be given United Nations sponsorship.

My delegation regrets that no similar agreement could be reached in the Legal Sub-Committee. It is, however, necessary to recognize the extreme complexity of the problem and the general difficulties of breaking new ground in this complicated field. The lack of quick agreement in the Legal Sub-Committee is, therefore, understandable and should not make us unduly pessimistic. In this general debate I do not propose to go into the details on the points in dispute. I should, however, like to make some general observations.

There have been objections that available scientific data is far too inadequate for a thorough examination of the whole problem and for the framing of detailed regulations. Scientific progress in the next few years may make obsolete any detailed regulations that we may now frame and regulations may have to be amended or framed anew in keeping with the data that may then be available. There is no doubt some force in this argument. On the other hand, if there are no regulations and we wait for further knowledge, many undesirable activities may be carried on wittingly or unwittingly and precedents may be established which may stand in the way of our efforts to make rules at a later date. While it is true that scientific data are by no means yet complete, the knowledge and data available on certain issues are fairly adequate to enable us to make a beginning. The principles set forth in the General Assembly resolution provided a good starting point. These broad principles now need elaboration. General Assembly resolution 1721 (XVI) commends the principle that international law, including the United Nations Charter, should apply to outer space and celestial bodies. International law is based on the concept of the sovereignty of States. Can this be applied without modification to outer space? Apparently not, because the same resolution goes on to say that outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty. It is therefore necessary to define to what extent international

law would operate and to what extent sovereign rights have to be waived. The concept of the sovereignty of States, if carried to outer space, would create many complications. International law as applicable to the high seas may give us some guidance. The Treaty of Antarctica could provide another example.

We should also like to emphasize that outer space should be reserved for peaceful uses. This has always been the view of my delegation. If Antarctica can be kept free from military use, it is all the more desirable that outer space should be reserved for peaceful use to the benefit of mankind. We would therefore welcome a declaration to this effect.

The dangers of carrying out earthly conflicts to outer space would be quite unpredicatable. The time to act for reserving outer space for peaceful purposes is now. In this connection, it may not be out of place for me to read out an extract from President Kennedy's speech yesterday:

"I do say that space can be explored and mastered without feeding the fires of war, without repeating the mistakes that man has made in extending his writ around this globe of ours.

"There is no strife, no prejudice, no national conflict in outer space as yet. Its hazards are hostile to us all. Its conquest deserves the best of all mandind and its opportunity for peaceful co-operation may never come again."

In conclusion, I would refer to the agreement reached in this Committee as stated by you, Mr. Chairman, on 19 March, that it would be the aim of all members of the Committee to conduct its work in such a way that the Committee would be able to reach an agreement in its work without need for voting. This was a wise decision because on solution which is not acceptable to the two space Powers can be implemented. At the same time, we, the other countries, are also equally interested, and it is therefore natural that we must press on these two Powers to come to some speedy agreement. We must concentrate our efforts to that end.

Within the time at our disposal it is not,

however, possible for the Committee to go into all the details and reach an agreed solution. The Committee can nevertheless indicate some guiding principles and ask the Legal Sub-Committee to make further efforts to reach agreement. In doing so, the latter would no doubt consider all the proposals that have already been made before the Sub-Committee and before this Committee. as well as other suggestions which may emerge in the course of further discussions.

191

INDIA USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly in reply to South African Foreign Minister's allegations against India

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement on September 24, 1962 in reply to South African Foreign Minister's allegations against India in the General Assembly

I would like to express the appreciation of my delegation of the fact that this matter of practice has been referred to the meeting of the Assembly itself and that a happy solution has been reached where, with the minimum that is required, we can express our opinions as we are doing now, which is the most appropriate time

The address made by the representative of South Africa to the Assembly consists of about 8,000 words and we have not had the opportunity to study it in full. It is not the intention of my delegation to traverse the whole of this document or, indeed, to reply to other representatives in the Assembly who have quoted words in context or out of context, as the case may be. I would refer at the present moment to certain general observations in the way of attacks, either veiled or unveiled, on my country and Government-indeed, even attacks on the United Nations. These are matters of general argument which any representative is entitled to make, and we shall answer them in due course.

The first of these is in regard to the conduct of the Indian delegation in 1946 in violating the Charter, particularly Article 2, paragraph 7.

We share your feeling and that of your country, Mr. President, that we have no apologies to make, that we are happy with our record that we have not allowed this crime against humanity to be protected by an interpretation of the Charter which was never intended at San Francisco or anywhere else.

I have no desire at the present moment to go into an analysis of Article 2. We have not touched, either in this debate or in any other, on any matter concerning any country which is essentially within the jurisdiction of that country, The crimes against humanity, the treatment of Indian peoples in South Africa, the violation of treaty obligations, the cruelties practised---these are not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of South Africa; and what is more, this Assembly, not once or twice, but, I believe, eight or nine times over, by overwhelming majorities consisting not only of people from one part of the world or of one persuasion in political or economic matters, has supported this view. Therefore we have nothing for which to apologize for having attempted to persuade the Assembly to violate the Charter or for having submitted to the Assembly proposals involving violations of the Charter.

On the other hand, we have always reliedand I am happy to say the great General Smuts did---on what has been written into the Charter in the second paragraph of the Preamble. where it says :

"to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights"--human rights-"in the dignity and worth of the human person"-not only of nations--"in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small".

It goes on, in paragraph 3 of Article 1, to speak about "encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

It fell to the delegation of India at San Francisco, even before her independence, when she was represented by the nominees of the British Government, to introduce this amendment, including the reference to racial discrimination, into the Charter. And General Smuts, on behalf of the Union, accepted it and, what is more, quite rightly appropriated to himself the credit for the virtuous action in agreeing to it.

We now come to what has been called "double standards". It is very difficult to answer these allegations because some of them are veiled and some of them are directed against us. But, broadly speaking, what has been said or implied is that in our country there are instances of discrimination. I do not deny this. I would not be so hypocritical as to deny it. There is not one nation--there are not many nations--in the world where social, religious, racial and, even more, economic discrimination against people does not prevail. But the Government of the Union of South Africa is the only one that makes a virtue of it. We try to get away from it. Our Governments do not advocate, practise, permit or exclude from penal provisions the practice of discrimination. But the policy of the South African Government is not only to live with this sin but, far from trying to eliminate it, to state to the world that racial discrimination is right. It is established as a virtue and, what is more, it is carried forward as a pattern for other people

192

to follow. This is rather different from the lapses that occur in human society in many nations. Therefore, when one speaks about double standards, and refers to social evils in one country or another, our country is no exception to the general rule. But we have strenuously tried to overcome these evils and we have condemned their existence both in our country and elsewhere. Then there is a reference to our role-not by name, but by implication-in Korea, a very thinly veiled reference to the fact that some countries, though they subscribed to it, did not participate in regard to the United Nations action in Korea.

First of all, the United Nations Charter does not impose any obligation upon any country to take up arms unless it wishes to do so. That is purely a voluntary action. But, over and above that, my country's record in regard to Korea will stand examination. We made our contribution toward peace in that area at considerable sacrifice to ourselves. Perhaps we did not do it in the same way that South Africa did: some countries do it in one way, and other countries do it in some other way. Therefore, our record in regard to Korea will stand examination. And perhaps it is to be noted that we did not volunteer, that the United Nations itself invited the Government of India to assume this role. Therefore, if we are condemned, the whole of the Organization is condemned.

Then there are two other matters. One is in regard to Goa. I have no desire to argue this question all over again, because this is really not a history lesson. Nor am I going to enter into discussions of what Lord Home is supposed to have said. We can settle affairs with Lord Home in other places, and I am not going to permit myself to be dragged into an argument with my good friend, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom. I have no doubt that, if he did say this, he has had enough time to think things over and probably has different views now. But, so far as Goa and Kashmir are concerned, to use the word "aggression" is very strange: you cannot commit aggression on your own country. You can only commit aggression in other places. We have not committed aggression. We have not violated the sovereignty of Portugal or any other country. What we have done is simply that, after very patient efforts put forth in other ways over a long period of time, we have finally used such strength and determination as we have in order to end colonialism. And, what is more, this was after the United Nations had decided that colonies have no place in the world. Goa is not Portugal. It is India. As has been repeatedly said in this Assembly, even the British, who were with us in one way or another for I two or three

hundred years, never insulted us by calling us Englishmen. That was left to the Portuguese.

Therefore, in regard to these two chapters, Goa and Kashmir, while this is not the time or place to speak about them, the position is that this is Indian sovereign territory, which was defended at the appropriate time by such strength as India had and which will continue to be so defended if the occasion should arise.

Therefore, the whole of this tirade against India arises from the fact that since 1946 the Government of India, not particularly for its own selfish reasons, has drawn the attention of this Assembly not only to the problem of Indians in South Africa but to the larger problem of what has been called apartheid. Perhaps the name does not fully indicate what is involved. It means real racial discrimination-not discrimination in a small way, but regarding people who do not belong to certain races as not belonging to the human family and as being outside the context of the Chapter.

It is not my intention, in answering these allegations, to use language of the type, that has been used in attacking us. We do not have any apologies to make in regard to the various resolutions that have been moved. I am glad that, in order to make this criticism, the representative of South Africa was at least compelled to study them. There have been resolutions moved here in regard to what has been called coexistence and neighbourly relations, resolutions which have been accepted by the entire Assembly. If those resolutions were wrong, then the entire Assembly is wrong.

If we have sometimes, like other people, failed to live up to the highest principles set forth by the Charter in any particular, we may be guilty in that particular. But nothing has been brought against us.

It is true that we have said that war is no longer useful as an instrument for deciding issues between nations. That was said in the context of world disarmament. That is still our position. I do not know why we come in for criticism in this regard.

I conclude by saying that South Africa is the

only State in is Assembly which is guilty of flagrant violation of the Charter. What is more, the State is based-insofar as it accepts apartheid --on this violation. South Africa makes a virtue of apartheid, and it prescribes it as a remedy for

193

the world's ills. Fortunately, the world is too sensible to accept that.

There are other matters referred to in the statement by the representative of South Africa which my delegation will take up at the appropriate time.

I ask the President's forgiveness for having interrupted the proceedings this morning. But we did not begin it: It is necessary that, when calumnies of this kind are delivered, the answers should be given before the issue is forgotten, and also the replies are perhaps briefer in that way than they would otherwise be.

I thank the President again very much for the opportunity he has given to my delegation to explain its position.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC KOREA PORTUGAL **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly on West Irian Agreement

Following is the text of the statement made by Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, leader of the Indian delegation, in the General Assembly on September 21, 1962, on the agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands on West Irian : Coming as I do to this rostrum for the first time during the 17th session of the General Assembly, 'it is my pleasant duty, Mr. President, to offer you my congratulations, on behalf of my delegation and myself, on your elevation to this high office.

From the procedural point of view, we are here at this moment to explain our vote. I want to make it quite clear that, so far as we are concerned, it is not a vote that we are explaining, because my Government does not consider that it is for. us to decide whether this Agreement should have been signed or not signed. It is an agreement reached between two Sovereign countries, and we have no right of interference. We welcome it, and we welcome the Secretary-General's role in it-it has been registered, no doubt, with the United Nations, and therefore, we recognize his presence. We also support paragraph 3, which authorizes the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him, again by the Agreement between the parties. I would also like to say that we come here to express our good wishes to the Indonesian Government and people, as well as to the Netherlands Government and its people for the termination of a situation which has not been very happy for either side. We hope that the Agreement now reached, although it does not complete the processes by which the enforced isolation of part of Indonesia from the rest of the mother country will be ended, will see those processes satisfactorily completed.

I have been asked by our immediate neighbours, Ceylon and Nepal, to speak on their behalf in offering these congratulations and whatever we say on this platform.

These are matters of public significance, and we want to make our position very clear in regard to the status of West Irian. The interest of my country and its participation in this matter go back to when the-Government of India, with the co-operation of the Government of Australia, rallied the Governments of that part of the world, in order to focus public attention on the subject of the status of Indonesia and its attempt to free itself from thraldom to the Netherlands Empire. Since then, our position has been that Indonesia is one and sovereign, and we have repeated that year after year in this Assembly. That has no relation to either our geographical closeness or the personal relations that obtain between the Indonesian leaders and ourselves; but, rather to our approach to the whole problem of colonies. As late as November 1961, I told this Assembly, "West Irian, so far as the Government of India is concerned, is an integral part of Indonesia. The position of the Government of India is that West Irian is a colonial territory administered by the Netherlands, colonialism not having been terminated." We are familiar with this problem in which there is a bit of unfinished business-and you finish it, one way or another. With regard to the text of this Agreement, it is as I said, an agreement between two sovereign nations; and it is part of the sovereignty to have the capacity to deal with it one way or another. However, I want to make certain observations on this matter. The United Nations has assumed for itself a role in this matter very ably sponsored in this instance by the acting Secretary-General. We congratulate him on the success of this effort, in so far as we have an agreement of this kind. But the role of the United Nations-and let there be no misunderstanding about it -- is not the conversion of this area into a Trust Territory. Secondly, while it is true that the Secretary-General, as one of the principal organs of the United Nations and its spokesman, has successfully intervened here, it does not mean accountability to the Assembly in regard to what happens during the period of its stewardship or whatever the office-this ad hoc position they have adopted, and the United Nations assumes many ad hoc roles in many different places. Under the previous Secretary-General we used to have a very common feature

194

here, what is called the "presence of the united Nations, not provided for in the charter. But, whatever it is, this is not a Trust Territory. There is no question, therefore, of creating independence in this area. Indonesia is one and independent. By the enforced separation of this part through the non-completion of the agreements reached at The Hague, at the Round Table Conference, this territory has remained separate, under adverse possession. That is our position. She has remained tinder adverse possession, and the rightful owners, for the sake of peace-I will not say the rightful owners, but the rightful sovereign power-for the sake of peace, and also in order that the culmination of this business may be in I peaceful way, have come to certain

arrangements which suit them, and we congratulate them in so far as, on the one hand, the conclusion of the objectives of the Round Table Conference at The Hague is now in sight, and, secondly, that while a certain amount of waiting way take place, it will still take place under the ausplces of the United Nations so far as the practical part of it is concerned. We also want to say that this period of the Presence" of the United Nations is in no sense a period when its authority will be exercised as a kind of superauthority in the place. It has very limited functions. In our view, this period should be as short as possible. The period of 1969 that is prescribed as a maximum, and there is no reason why it should remain a maximum. The role of the United Nations, consistent with the Charter. would be to harmonize the various interests as far as possible without being a superauthority over the sovereign authority of Indonesia.

We are very jealous of the sovereignty of our neighbour over its territories; over 3,000 islands and its territorial seas, because if this is not fully stated there are other implications. It is open to any sovereign government to provide for any form of internal arrangement. Some countries axe sovereign and do not allow people to have anything to do with their government. Of course, when they come here they speak about the will of the people. But there are large- numbers of governments who are sovereign over their territories, so far as we are concerned, but there is no opportunity for the people to express themselves.

It is entirely up to the Indonesian Government to decide how this enforced partition and the historic conditions created thereby, all the trends of personality that develop, can be overcome. And it is much to the credit of yourself, Mr. Secretary-General, and the others concerned that this has been brought about. Our own Government, in this matter has always asked for direct negotiations between the Indonesian Government and the Dutch Government. Last year there came before this Assembly three resolutions. As regards one of the resolutions, the Government of the Netherlands, I am happy to say, showed its wisdom in withdrawing it. That resolution aimed at the creation of a commission and thereby an International Trusteeship over this Sovereign territory. We would have resisted it even if we

were the only delegation which voted against it. My delegation, along with a number of other governments, submitted a resolution at that time which obtained a majority but which did not obtain the necessary two-thirds majority. The purpose of it was that the Indonesian Government and the Netherlands Government should directly negotiate with the good offices of the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. To our regret at that time, A large number of countries, forty of them, mainly belonging to the Western, group of-countries, did not find it possible to support it. But soon after the conclusion of the Assembly session, the same arrangement was made by the two countries, talking to each other, with your good offices; Mr. Secretary-General. So all is well that ends well, and we have now a situation where colonialism in that area, in the Pacific, is we hope ended, with perhaps the exception of a small place called Quemoy. We shall deal with that in some other way, at some other time. Therefore, what has been accomplished by this Agreement is that once and for all without any reservations there is the termination of Dutch Authority, factual or otherwise as claimed, for good of all.

I share with the Indonesian and a lot of other colleagues the hope that in spite of the difficulty that has prevailed in the past, the relations between the Dutch and Indonesians will now develop. It is our experience that once the empire is removed, there are closer relations. Were are more Englishmen in India today than when the British occupied it. We are no longer afraid of them and they are no longer afraid of us. Actually the Indonesians have had a long, period of tutelage under the Dutch educational system and so on, and the benefit of Dutch Low --all kinds of things in that way. Since independence they have come under the influence of other countries. They are our close neighbours and we wish them well. And we hope that all these arguments about various theories will now disappear and that the unity of Indonesia and the termination of colonialism in that part of the world will be accepted and that there will be no attempt to revive it by one way or another.

INDIA INDONESIA THE NETHERLANDS USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEPAL AUSTRALIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Prime Minister's Statement on Attack on Indian Embassy at Jakarta

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on September 4, 1962, on a call attention notice regarding "the attack on the Indian Embassy at Jakarta on 3rd September, 1962, by a crowd of 20,000 Indonesians resulting in extensive damage to property" :

The facts relating to this attack on the Indian Embassy have been adequately reported in the Press. I do not think it will be necessary for me to repeat them. I shall state some other facts connected therewith.

The trouble started when the Israeli and Formosan delegations sent telegrams to Mr. G. D. Sondhi early in August, as be is the Senior Vice-President of the Sports Federation whatever it is called. These telegrams stated that the Indonesian President of Games had failed to send them identity cards. Mr. Sondhi, in his capacity as Senior Vice-President, issued a statement criticizing this action. This created resentment in Jakarta and we informed our ambassadors of the legal position. They were also informed that during the earlier Asian Games held in Delhi, Manila and Tokyo in 1950, 1954 and 1958, respectively, Formosa and Israel had been invited, but UAR had not taken part, because they were not supposed to be in Asia.

On arrival at Jakarta, Mr. Sondhi actively spoke about the Indonesian action and suggested that the name of the Fourth Asian Games be changed to merely Games. This angered the Indonesians and there was violent criticism. We asked our ambassador in Jakarta on August 30 to impress upon Mr. Sandhi the desirability of toning down his criticisms. To this, we got the reply that he conveyed our viewpoint to those concerned, that is, the Indonesian officials and they had appreciated our position. It was explained to them that Mr. Sondhi was not in any sense a representative of the Government and did not speak on behalf of the Government. The Sports Federation here is a semi-independent organization and he was elected as Vice-President not by us, but nominated by that Federation. We were, therefore, surprised to see the Indonesian Trade Minister's statement on August 31, in which the Indonesian Trade Minister expressed his resentment at India's attitude in this matter and said something about trade relations being affected thereby. A spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs clarified the position and pointed out that Mr. Sondhi was in no way connected with the Government of India and we had no control over the Asian Games Federation. of which he was Vice-President. He also emphasised our friendship with Indonesia and expressed the hope that the games will come to a peaceful conclusion. Our regret over the statement was communicated to the Indonesian Embassy here on the 1st September while out ambassador met the Indonesian Foreign Minister, who assured him of his country's friendship and goodwill for India. This was on the 1st.

The Indonesian Trade Minister's statement on August 31, however, indicated that the Indonesian authorities were actively associated with criticising Mr. Sondhi's stand and its culmination in the incidents of vesterday, when the Indian Embassy was attacked and some damage was done to the property. There has been no report of any injury to persons. Our concern over this was communicated to the Indian Embassy yesterday evening. Our ambassador was not present at the time when this happened in the Indian Embassy. As soon as he heard of it, he came back from his house or from wherever he was, to the Embassy. The people had gone by that time. He immediately sent a note to the Foreign Office. He later met the Foreign Minister and told him that he was greatly surprised that after his last interview with him only a day or two earlier, which was most cordial and after which he had issued a statement, this shocking incident should take place.

Secondly, in Indonesia, no meeting or procession can take place without some kind of knowledge or permission from the Government. It is not quite clear; some official there must have had knowledge of it.

An Hon. Member: It started from the Presidential Palace.

An Hon. Member: They were escorted by the police.

Prime Minister: It was called the National Front-people in some kind of a semi-uniform who went.

An Hon. Member: Volunteers for the libration of West Irian also were there.

Prime Minister: The Foreign Minister apologised to our Ambassador profoundly and said that all Members of Parliament of Indonesia had been deeply shocked by this incident as well as by Dr. Soeharto, the Trade Minister's statement.

196

This is the, position. It is highly deplorable that this kind of thing should happen. We are not concerned with the merits of the matter, which was raised by Mr. Sondhi about the games. Neither were we consulted nor had we any say in the matter. But whatever that may be, to encourage the attack on the Indian Embassy in this way is extremely distressing and deplorable as also the statement made by the Trade Minister, over which the Foreign Minister subsequently expressed his great regret.

I feel very sad about this, because our Ambassador in Djakarta, is one of our very successful and experienced ambassadors. Wherever he has been he has done good work and he is very popular with the people. In fact, in Indonesia, he is exceedingly popular. He gets on very well and he has the habit of identifying himself with the country where he is. He has made a study of Indonesian history and culture and all that. It is particularly surprising and distressing that this incident has taken place there.

An Hon. Member : In the light of the repre-

hensible attack which has taken place on our Embassy, all I would like to know is whether Government has obtained the full texts of the various statements alleged to have been made by Mr. Sondhi while in Djakarta, in order to verify whether they contain anything which could be construed as an affront to President Soekarno in particular or to Indonesian national sentiment in general, because that is the allegation being made?

Prime Minister: I do not think we have received the full text of the statements. Summaries of them have come-brief accounts in the press and otherwise. I doubt if the full text has come. I do not think there was anything in what Mr. Sondhi said, which could be construed as an affront or discourtesy to President Soekarno.

INDONESIA INDIA ISRAEL USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN PHILIPPINES

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Attack on Indian Embassy at Jakarta

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, made the following statement in Rajya Sabha on September 5, 1962, regarding incidents in Djakarta :

The trouble started when Israeli and Formosan Delegations sent telegrams to Mr. G. D. Sondhi, in his capacity as the Senior Vice-President of the Asian Games Federation, in early August, that the Indonesian President of the Games had failed to send them the identity cards. There were also reports that an invitation had been issued to U.A.R. who was not a member. Mr. Sondhi issued a statement criticising this action. This created resentment, and we informed our representatives of the legal position. We also informed them that during the earlier Asian Games held in Delhi, Manila and Tokyo in 1950, 1954, and 1958, respectively, U.A.R. had not taken part, while Israel and Formosa were invited.

On arrival in Djakarta, Mr. Sondhi criticised Indonesian action on technical grounds, and wanted the name of the Fourth Asian Games to be changed to merely Games. This angered Indonesians, and there were violent criticisms. On the 30th of August, we asked our Ambassador in Djakarta to make it clear to the Indonesian authorities that Mr. Sondhi was acting in his capacity As Vice-President of the Asian Games Federation, over which we had no control, and that be was only pointing out the correct legal position. We also asked our Ambassador to impress upon Mr. Sondhi the desirability of remaining within limits. To this we got a reply that our view point was appreciated by those concerned.

We were, therefore, surprised to see the Trade Minister's statement of 31st August. However, a spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs clarified the position once again, and pointed out that Mr. Sondhi was in no way connected with the Government of India. We also emphasized our friendship with Indonesia, and expressed a hope that the Games will come to a successful conclusion. Our regrets over this statement were communicated to the Indonesian Embassy here, while our Ambassador met the Indonesian Foreign Minister, who assured him of his country's friendship and goodwill for India.

The Indonesian Trade Minister's statement of 31st August, however, showed that the Indonesian authorities were actively associated with elements criticizing Mr. Sondhi's stand. Its culmination was the ugly incidents of 3rd September when Indian Embassy was attacked, and some damage done to property. Our concern over this was at once communicated to the Indonesian Embassy here, while our Ambassador protested to the Foreign Minister in Djakarta. The Foreign Minister apologized for what had happened, and expressed his regrets in no uncertain terms. He said that Members of Parliament and others were greatly shocked over this, and promised to pay compensation for the loss sustained.

These happenings have distressed us a great

deal, and our feelings have been communicated to those concerned.

197

INDONESIA INDIA ISRAEL USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN PHILIPPINES

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Credit for Expansion of Telecommunication

The International Development Association (IDA), an affiliate of the World Bank, on September 14, 1962 extended a development credit equivalent to \$42 million to India. The funds will be used by the Posts and Telegraphs Department for the purchase abroad, during the next two years, of equipment to expand and improve telephone and telegraph services.

The allocation for investment in telecommunications during the Third Five Year Plan has been set at Rs. 1345 million. Of this, about \$ 100 million will be in foreign exchange. The programme will be carried out by the Telecommunication Branch of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. The Branch has substantial earnings. In addition to covering its own operating expenses and depreciation charges, it expects to provide from its own funds the equivalent of \$ 120 million towards the expansion programme. The remaining funds required including the proceeds of the \$ 42 million IDA credit will be made available by the Central Government in accordance with normal practice as a permanent investment on which the Posts & Telegraphs will pay the Central Exchequer an annual charge of 4 1/4 per cent.

Under the expansion programme during the Third Plan, urban telephone networks are to be expanded by increasing the subscriber sets from 461,000 to 761,000 and by increasing the capacity of the central exchanges from 412,600 to 758,100 lines. The inter-urban telephone network is to be strengthened by increasing the coaxial cables from about 300 miles (494 km) to 4,350 miles (7,000 km), by expanding the trunk exchanges and by introducing long-distance dialing on a large scale. In addition, the network of pole lines will be extended considerably, and the number of channels on these lines increased through the addition of more carrier equipment.

The telegraph service will be improved by building new telegraph offices and considerably expanding the teleprinter service. Telecommunication facilities of the railways are also provided by the Posts and Telegraphs Department. In connection with the railway electrification programme, some 1,500 miles (2,432 km) of specially shielded underground cables and related carrier equipment will be installed.

Equipment to be financed by the IDA credit will be procured on the basis of international competitive bidding. The IDA credit is for a term of 50 years. Repayment of the principal will begin on March 1, 1973. Thereafter, 1% of the principal will be repayable annually for ten years and 3% will be, repayable annually for the. final 30 years. The credit is free of interest, but a service charge of 3/4 of 1% per annum on the amount withdrawn and outstanding will be made to meet IDA's administrative costs.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Finance Minister's Statement at the Annual Meeting

Shri Morarji Desai, Finance Minister of India, delivered the following speech at the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund held in Washington on September 19, 1962 :

Mr. Chairman, I am happy once again to have in the Report of our Executive Directors a record of continued good work by the Fund. The year under review registered a new high level of Fund transactions; purchases, stand-bys, as well as repurchases, exceeded substantially the last year's totals. If the growing volume of business done by the Fund may, in a sense, be taken to indicate how far the world still is from achieving a stable and satisfactory payments situation, it is also, undoubtedly, an index of the growing sensitivity of the Fund to the emerging imbalances and the increasing readiness of member-countries to regard. resort to Fund borrowing-as well as repurchases-as suitable and legitimate rearrangements between the first and their second line of reserves rather than as reluctant responses to an exceptional situation.

198

The Managing Director, Mr. Jacobsson, has in his scholarly and forward-looking address outlined the salient developments in the world's payments situation and has also pointed the directions of further advance. The Fund has gone forward with good judgment and flexibility. I share Mr. Jacobsson's opinion on the whole, although I am keenly aware of the difficulties that developing countries will continue to face for many years to come. There has been, over the year, considerable improvement in the relative payments positions of the industrialized countries, thanks to the willingness both of countries gaining reserves and of countries losing them to follow appropriate corrective policies and to the growing co-operation among central banks. Despite this improvement in the situation, pressures developed from me to time in respect of one currency or another notably and understandably in respect of major reserve currencies. I am glad the follow-up process on our deliberations in Vienna last year, difficult as it inevitably was in some respect, was carried through expeditiously and in a manner that will enhance the efficacy of the Fund in the field of international monetary relations. The participating countries as well as the Managing Director deserve to be congratulated for this outcome.

The United States has made steady progress towards a stronger basic balance in its external account, and it has achieved this, be it said to its credit, along lines fully consistent with its accepted policies regarding long-term capital outflows and economic assistance to developing countries, The United Kingdom has been able to reverse its last year's drawing and has also made significant advances towards a better longer-term balance on external account. The U.S. and the U.K., and to an increasing extent, the more industrialized European economies, have the problem of creating and maintaining surpluses in their external accounts adequate to sustain their lending and assistance abroad. All available evidence points to larger, not smaller, needs in this respect in the coming years. A policy for each country of trying to add to its reserves so as to achieve a state of perfect freedom from uncertainty or speculation cannot, by definition, succeed all-round; nor does it fit in with the requirements of a sound and progressive international system.

It is, therefore, not to be expected that the Fund can rest an its oars. Certainly, our defences against speculative attacks on-any major currency are now stronger, and the stability of the world's payment system is to that extent assured. The backing of the Fund's resources available to member-countries represents a valuable element of strength, as the recent developments in respect of the Canadian dollar clearly show. The readiness of central banks to assist one another in times of difficulty augurs well for the success of efforts to evolve a more elastic and less inhibitory system of international payments. Nevertheless, it is clearly not enough to have machinery that would avert or mitigate crises in balances of payments. A situation in which almost every counter has to try, perhaps

by turns and with a few breaks, to coax into its vaults, through deflationary measures at home, a bit of the other countries' gold and foreign exchange reserves is not conducive to maximum growth either of output or of trade. The task, therefore, is to build up an international system of payments that will secure better fulfilment of the wider objectives of policy, viz., full employment and rising levels of income for all members of the international community. It may well be that some of the apparently radical solutions that have been put forward in this field and have not yet, for understandable reasons, been found practicable, offer valuable pointers to the direction in which further moves ought to be considered. My colleague, the U.K. Chancellor, indicated in the course of his observations this morning a possible approach. The Executive Directors and the Fund staff will, I hope, continue to give careful thought to the underlying issues and the ways and means of tackling them.

Discussions on the world payments situation run, inevitably and for valid reasons, in terms of major currencies, and the relative movements of reserves as between the more industrialized countries. But, the imbalances in external accounts of primary producing countries and of countries in the early stages of industrialization are A no less vital problem. As the Fund Report points out, the primary producing countries have found themselves in difficulties and have drawn more heavily on the Fund. Few of them can hope to build up foreign exchange reserves to any great extent, save by postponing vitally needed investments and reducing the growth rate of their economies. I am glad the Fund follows a reasonably liberal policy in regard to requests for accommodation from countries that have suffered adverse turns in the terms of trade or have other short-term problems to get over. In this connection, I am happy to note that the problems of mitigating the losses on account of sharp falls in commodity prices are under examination in the U.N., F.A.O., and O.A.S., and that the Fund is associated with these studies. I need not dilate on these problems, as you, Mr. Chairman, have already emphasized them

199

in your opening address. I was particularly happy, if I may say so, to note your stress on the adaptation of the Fund's policies to the needs of the underdeveloped world. This adaptation will need continuous study on the part of the staff and resourcefulness on the part of the Management. In that context, it is, I suggest, important that the Fund continues and pushes further its accepted policy of ensuring adequate representation to the newly developing countries, both on the staff and at the higher levels of

Management.

On policies regarding the use of the Fund's resources, the Annual Report has brought the position up-to-date. The Fund has developed a tradition of helpfulness and adaptability which, I am sure, is fully appreciated by all. I made last year a few suggestions regarding the use of the gold tranche and the unnecessary distinction being made between drawings per se and drawings against stand-bys. I do not propose to repeat these points, but I must mention that I regard them as sound and feasible. If one looks back over the last fifteen years or so of developments in the international monetary field, one realizes what contribution co-operation under the auspices of the Fund has made to the re-establishment and maintenance of stability and orderliness. I have every hope that the problems that remain and the new ones that are emerging will be solved if they are approached in the same broad and progressive spirit.

I need say only a few words about the special problems of developing countries, including my own, although I believe these problems are an integral, not a peripheral, part of the economic and payments system we are discussing. I find the discussion in the Annual Report on the importance of financial stability in relation to growth objectives entirely acceptable. Inflation is no answer to the inadequacy of real resources. In no case can it be a substitute for effective mobilisation of savings for investment. Fiscal and monetary policies have, at the same time, a developmental role. Briefly, financial or monetary stability is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for development. Efforts along many other lines are essential, and it will, I am sure, be recognized that they are being made in increasing degree in a number of countries. The major tasks, both national and international, of what has aptly been called the Development Decade have been outlined admirably in the recent report of the U.N. Secretary-General. no developing countries have to raise the maximum of resources they can domestically. They will also need substantial external assistance. All of them will have to concentrate in increasing degree on enlargement of exports. I think the time has gone by when an increase in the levels of trade as between the more industrialized countries could be taken as a satisfactory index of the growth of the world economy.

The emphasis has, obviously, to change in favour of promotion of trade between the more developed and the less developed countries-and, undoubtedly, as between the less developed countries themselves as their economics get more and more diversified and the overheads of foreign trade such as trade organizations, transport and banking facilities develop. In this context, let me reemphasize the need, admittedly by all in theory but not yet fully reflected in practical policies, on the part of the industrialized countries to throw open their markets more widely to the products of developing countries.

Finally, a word on the Indian situation. We are now in the second year of the Third Five Year Plan. Our balance of payments has been continually under strain, and although we have been able to secure a significant proportion of the external assistance needed for the implementation of the Plan, there have been difficulties because of the insufficiency of untied or freely usable aid. It would hardly be proper for me to go into the details of our requirements or of what has already been agreed to or authorized. In the situation we are facing, a certain proportion of external assistance has to come in the form of nonproject aid or commodity assistance to enable as without excessively elaborate procedures and consequential delays to meet out payments for imports of developmental commodities needed for utilizing effectively the growing production capacity in the country. Non-project assistance is also needed to enable us to meet our repayment obligations without having to impose crippling restrictions on maintenance imports. Faced with a paucity of such free resources, and in a situation where some of the assistance available would be disbursible only later, we had to approach the Fund for a stand-by this July. I greatly appreciate the assistance the Fund has given us. We, on our part, have been exerting our utmost to improve our export receipts. We have made a substantial tax effort towards the realization of the Plan target on additional resources. We have raised interest rates as part of the same effort. The price situation has been relatively stable, and we are determined to take whatever fiscal or monetary measures are felt to be necessary to ensure growth with stability. Our import policy has been stringent and we have recently tightened it further. The tasks of export promotion are being attended to with earnestness and vigour. Where the claims of domestic consumption and of exports compete,

200

The latter got due priority. There are developments or possible developments in Europe which might affect our export prospects, adversely. I touched earlier on the lines along which the interests of developing countries in the sphere of world trade need to be safeguarded. I have every hope that with continued effort on our own part in India and with the goodwill and co-operation of international agencies and members or the world community, we shall find the tasks of the Third Plan manageable, despite all their inherent difficulties.

I should like, Mr. Chair-man, before I conclude, to express my appreciation of the valuable services the Deputy Managing Director, Mr. Cochran, has rendered during his term of office. Mr. Cochran has intimate knowledge and understanding of the problems of the East, and he brought to bear on his tasks so much goodwill and co-operative spirit. I wish to extend to him my best wishes on the eve of his retirement from the Fund. I should also like to say a word of welcome to the incoming Deputy Managing Director, Mr. Frank Southard. Mr. Southard has for long been a part of the Fund scene, if I may put it that way. I have no doubt that the Fund will be stronger for his association with it in this new capacity. I extend to him my warm good wishes.

INDIA USA AUSTRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NIGERIA

Prime Minister's Visit to Nigeria

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of Nigeria, Prime Minister Nehru paid a visit to Nigeria from September 23 to 27, 1962. This was Prime Minister Nehru's first visit to Nigeria and he warmly welcomed the opportunity of seeing something of the country. During his visit, Prime Minister Nehru had frank and friendly talks with the Governor-General of the Federation of Nigeria, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the Prime Minister of Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa and other Nigerian personalities. He addressed a joint session of the two Houses of the Federal Parliament of Nigeria. He also visited many centres of interest which gave him a glimpse of social and cultural life of the people and of the efforts that are being made to raise their standards of living and to develop the country.

Prime Minister Nehru was deeply moved by cordiality with which he was received everywhere. His visit marks a further stage in growth of friendship and co-operation between India and Nigeria.

The Prime Minister of Nigeria expressed his appreciation of the services which are being rendered by the Indian personnel employed in various statutory corporations and departments of the Federal Government and of the training facilities which are being provided for the Nigerian defence and other personnel in India. The Prime Minister of India assured the Prime Minister of Nigeria that India will be glad to assist Nigeria to the full extent of her capacity.

NIGER NIGERIA USA INDIA **Date** : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NIGERIA

Joint Communique

The Prime Minister of Nigeria and the Prime Minister of India issued the following Joint Communique on September 27, 1962, at the end of the five-day visit of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, to Nigeria

The two Prime Ministers discussed a wide range of matters of mutual interest. They agreed that the most important question facing the world is the question of disarmament. They expressed their concern at the deadlocks which have arisen in the Disarmament Conference. They noted with satisfaction, however, that the Conference is continuing and there is a general desire that it should succeed. A further matter for satisfaction is the close co-operation in the Conference between India and Nigeria. Both are represented in the Conference as non-aligned countries and the Prime Ministers expressed the hope that the two countries would continue to make a constructive contribution with a view to bringing about an agreement on the banning of

201

nuclear tests and on general and complete disarmament.

The Prime Ministers bad an exchange of views on the problems of the developing countries. Both India and Nigeria, is developing countries, are deeply interested in the preservation of peace. This is an essential condition for economic and social progress and for meeting the expectations of the people for a better life. The Prime Ministers affirmed their view that every effort should be made, by the developing countries in particular, to help in bringing about a relaxation of international tension and the strengthening and safeguarding of peace.

The Prime Ministers directed their attention to the growing disparity between the rich and the poor nations. It was their view that if this disparity is allowed to persist, new tensions will be created in the world. The extremes of wealth and poverty are not conducive to the maintenance of social stability in any country. Similarly, the division of the world into rich and poor nations is also a cause of instability. In order to ensure a peaceful world, it is vitally necessary that the developing countries should be helped to achieve more rapid development. This is being done by means of loans and credits and other forms of financial aid. The Prime Ministers, however, felt that not only should aid be more adequate, but facilities should be given for the expansion of trade. The developing countries need these facilities both for servicing the loans and for accumulating resources for economic development. The Prime Ministers expressed the hope that more developed countries would bear these considerations in mind and would not take any step which might come in the way of the export trade of the developing countries.

The Prime Ministers exchanged views on the new developments which are taking place in Africa. They expressed the view that colonialism in all its forms and racial oppression are a threat to peace. They noted with deep satisfaction that in Africa, in Asia and elsewhere, the old order is now changing. Many nations of Africa have in the last few years achieved independence. The Prime Ministers welcomed these developments which have reduced the threat to peace and given fuller stability to Africa. However, the threat has, not been eliminated as colonialism and racial oppression continues in certain parts of Africa. In other parts, there are special problems which are creating instability and causing international tension.

The Prime Ministers considered the question of the Congo where both India and Nigeria, at the request of the United Nations, have sent some military contingents. There has been instability in the Congo which has been aggravated by outside pressures and other forms of interference. New proposals have now been made by the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, to remove the causes of instability. The Prime Ministers expressed the hope that these proposals would provide a basis for a speedy and constructive settlement and that all parties concerned would respect any decisions at might be reached in the United Nations.

The two Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction that there is cooperation in many fields between India and Nigeria. They expressed the hope that friendly relations and cooperation between the two countries will continue to grow. The Prime Minister of India renewed to the Prime Minister of Nigeria an invitation to visit India. The Prime Minister of Nigeria stated that he was greatly looking forward to the visit and hoped that he would be able to visit India at the earliest possible opportunity.

NIGER NIGERIA INDIA USA CONGO

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

NORTH VIETNAM

Trade and Payments Agreement

Letters were exchanged at Hanoi between representatives of the Governments of India and North Viet Nam, extending. the validity of the trade arrangement for a period of three years commencing from September 22, 1962.

Letters regulating the trade between the two countries, first exchanged in September 1956, were originally valid for a period of three years. The validity of these letters was last extended for another period of three years ending September 21, 1962.

202

It has now been agreed that trade relations between India and North Viet Nam should continue to be governed by the provisions of the original letters exchanged in September 1956 for another period of three years commencing from September 22, 1962.

VIETNAM INDIA **Date** : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Intrusion by Pakistan Nationals

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Mellon, Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on the 3rd September, 1962, in reply to Calling Attention Notice about the killing of two person by Pakistani raiders near Peasbari, eight miles from Malda :

On the 30th August, 1962, the Government of India received information from the District Magistrate, Malda that about 22 Pakistani nationals armed with deadly weapons bad intruded into Indian territory on the 28th August, at about 5.30 hours, and had removed 19 head of cattle from village Majhaghar, PS. English Bazar, Distt. Malda. The report said that the intruders assaulted one Deben Ghose and his brother, Biswanath Ghose of Peasbari, who were grazing their cattle, near the Indo-Pakistan border. This assult resulted in the death of Biswanath Ghose and serious injuries to Deben Ghose. The District Magistrate, Malda, reported that he had lodged a strong protest with the Deputy Commissioner, Rajshahi (East Pakistan).

The next day, i.e. on the 31st August, the Chief Secretary. of the Government of West Bengal, telegraphed to the Government of India the text of a protest that had been filed with the Government of East Pakistan over this serious incident. The protest called for immediate inquiry, deterrent punishment to the offenders, restoration of cattle to the Indian owners and adequate compensation to the family of the, deceased.

Newspaper reports, have stated that two persons have died as a result of the assault. According to information received from the Government of West Bengal, there was one fatal casualty only and not two. No reply has been received from the East Pakistan Government to the protest Notes filed. Our Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca has been informed of the incident. He has been advised to lodge a protest at the diplomatic level.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA BANGLADESH

Date : Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Farakka Barrage Scheme : India's Press Note

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to reports carried by the Pakistan Press that the Prime Minister of India has agreed to it proposal made by the President of Pakistan that a Minister-level conference should be held for talks over the Farakka Barrage scheme of India.

It transpires that the matter was mentioned by President Ayub Khan to the Prime Minister in London as they were both leaving the Marlborough House after the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference. president Ayub Khan said that the engineers of India and Pakistan had met and that they had collected and exchanged necessary information and data. President Ayub Khan went on to suggest that the time had now come for the matter to be considered at the Minister-level.

The Prime Minister of India replied that he was not sure that the engineers had finished their work. Prime Minister Nehru said that it was for the engineers to make the recommendation which could then be considered by the Ministers.

The position of the Government of India in this matter has not changed since the Prime

Minister wrote to President Ayub Khan last on this subject. In his letter dated 6th July, 1961, which has not been replied to, the Prime Minister of India had stated that be was agreeable to a conference at the Ministerial level, but that such a meeting could only be useful if it had a suitable practical agenda and after a full exchange of technical data between experts of the two sides. This was what the Prime Minister had said in an earlier letter also to the President of Pakistan,

203

viz., that until technical data had been fully exchanged, a Minister-level conference would be of no use.

It may be stated that the engineers of the two sides have not exchanged the necessary technical data so far on the basis of which an early Ministerlevel conference could be usefully held.

PAKISTAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Statement on Establishment of Chinese Military Posts in Ladakh

The Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, made the following statement in Lok Sabha on September 3, 1962, regarding Chinese Military Posts in Ladakh area

White Paper No. VI published by Government gave some details of Chinese military posts established up to 26th July against which we had lodged protests.

Since the publication of White Paper No. VI,

we protested on 22nd and 24th August against the establishment of some more posts. The total number of these posts established by the Chinese since May 1962 comes to 30.

On 28th August, we protested against the establishment of four more posts. Our information is that one of these Chinese posts has since been withdrawn. But there is some evidence of the establishment of two more such posts in the neighbourbood.

I have had occasion to mention earlier in the House that a large number of these posts, particularly those established in recent months, are extensions of old posts a few miles further and generally within the defensive perimeter of the earlier posts. This is the case particularly in the region of Daulat Beg Oldi and the Chip Chap river valley where the Chinese posts are separated only by a short distance from each other.

In Galwan river valley there are a number of Chinese posts that are close together and are interconnected. These, as I have said before, hamper our line of supply to our post by the land route. Another attempt to interfere with our supply line was made by the Chinese by the establishment of a Chinese post on the 23rd August in the Pangong lake area. We have protested against this and taken necessary measures to prevent interference with our line of supply in the Pangong lake area.

In regard to the incident on August 14, the factual position is that there was an exchange of fire between our post in the Pangong lake region and the Chinese detachment. No casualty was suffered by our post. We protested to the Chinese against this incident on the 15th August.

CHINA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Supply of Equipment for Korba Workshop: Contract Signed

Contract for the supply of equipment for the Central Workshop at Korba in Madhya Pradesh was signed in New Delhi on September 6. 1962, between the National Coal Development Corporation and Messrs. "Tjazhpromexport", Soviet trade organisation.

The contract is in pursuance of an earlier 500 million rouble credit agreement signed between the Government of India and the USSR Government in November, 1957.

In addition to the equipment the USSR will depute two specialists in mechanical and electrical

204

engineering each to assist in the erection and commissioning of the workshop.

The Korba workshop--the second Central Workshop of the National Coal Development Corporation-is estimated to cost Rs. 20 million. It is designed to carry out overhaul and major repairs to the mining machinery in the Corporation's collieries in Madhya Pradesh. It will also

manufacture spare parts. The value of repair work to be done at the workshop is estimated to be of the order of over Rs. 9.9 million annually.

The Corporation has four working projects in Madhya Pradesh with production capacity of 5.8 million metric tons per annum. Eight new projects with a target capacity of 7.3 million metric tons are also being developed.

INDIA ITALY USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Agreement for Indo-U.A.R. Co-operation in Atomic Energy

The Government of India has concluded an agreement with the Government of the Unite Arab Republic for co-operation in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Letters to this effect have been exchanged between Dr. H. J. Bhabha, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, and Mr. Salah Eldin Hedayat, Minister of Scientific Research and Chairman of the Atomic Energy Establishment of the United Arab Republic.

The details of the agreement, which provides the broad framework for collaboration, are to be negotiated between the atomic energy organisations of the two countries. The agreement covers exchange of unclassified information and documents, exchange of scientists of the two countries, of facilities for the purchase of nuclear materials and equipment required by either organisation and the training of U.A.R. scientists in India.

Two scientists of the U.A.R: have already commenced training under fellowships offered by the Department of Atomic Energy to the International Atomic Energy Agency. The department has also offered two fellowships direct to the Government of the U.A.R. under the agreement. Candidates for these fellowships have been selected and are expected to join the Atomic Energy Establishment, Trombay, very shortly. Arrangements are under way for the training of additional U.A.R. scientists.

INDIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-U.K. Loan Agreements Signed

Agreements were signed in New Delhi on September 4, 1962 for two more loans from the British Government to the Government of India to finance economic development under India's Third Plan by Mr. R. H. Belcher, the Acting British High Commissioner, and Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

The first loan for œ 13 million (Rs. 17.3 crores) is to provide finance for a number of important Third Plan projects, including equipment for the Heavy Electrical Plant at Bhopal, a ropeway system and other equipment for the coal-mines, and supplies for the River Steamer Companies operating in Eastern India. The second of L 5 million (Rs. 6.7 crores) is available for spending on a wide range of essential imports from Britain, in a way that will afford some relief quickly to India's foreign exchange reserves. Both loans are to be repaid over 25 years, including a grace period of 7 years before repayments of principal begin. The rate of interest will be the same as that applied by the British Government at the date of issue to loans for a comparable period from its domestic Consolidated Fund, plus an administrative charge of one-quarter per cent.

205

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNESCO

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement at the UNESCO meeting in Paris on September 21 :

Mr. Director-General, Excellencies, Distinguished delegates, I am deeply greateful to you for having invited me to address this distinguished assembly and for the kind words you have spoken about India and me. You have quoted something I said about UNESCO many years, ago. That represents our thoughts still and we attach the greatest value to the purposes and the work of UNESCO. It represents something which is of deeper importance than the political approaches to our problems.

You have also referred, Sir, to the great effort we are making in India through our five-year plans to raise the standards of our people and we are thankful to UNESCO who are helping us in this great task.

In the preamble of UNESCO it is said that "since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed". The main object of the United Nations and of UNESCO is to put an end to wars and to establish a peaceful world. Even in a peaceful world conflicts of opinion may take place as well as other tensions. But the question is whether those conflicts and tensions can be resolved in a peaceful manner without resulting in violent conflict.

If there is a way to resolve them peacefully, then why should we not try that method now to resolve the tensions and conflicts of the present day world.

The UNESCO Preamble rightly referred to the minds of men which give rise to wars and conflicts. It is then the minds and hearts of men 'that have to be approached for mutual understanding, knowledge and appreciation of each other and through the proper kind of education. That is essential, But we have seen that education by itself does not necessarily lead to a conversion of minds towards peaceful purposes. Something more is necessary, new standards, new values, and perhaps a kind of spiritual background and a feeling of commonness of mankind.

That commonness of humanity is already being brought about by technological progress, but the minds of men have not grasped it or kept pace with technological progress. So, we see that science and technology which have brought so many benefits to the world and gradually tend to go towards the formation of one world, are also used for the manufacture of terrible weapons of mass destruction. At the base of it all is fear and hatred.

How then can we get rid of this fear and hatred and use modern scientific progress in the cause of peace and tolerance?

The world is full of variety and that is good, for if there was a dead uniformity it would be a poor place to live in. But variety does not mean that we should interfere with others and try to impose our will upon them. We must recognise the right of other people to live their own life and be tolerant of differences and of those who do not agree with us.

The world is changing rapidly, but our minds often remain in the same ruts even though the old, context has changed. There is the great conflict between the capitalist structure of society and the Communist. Yet, every thinker knows that capitalism has changed its face in many ways and is continually changing. So also Communism is developing into a new direction. In a sense it may be said that there is a certain lessening of the gap between them.

But even so, the old slogans continue to befog our minds and produce fear and hatred. How can we get out of these ruts of thought and look at the world without prejudice and fear?

During the terrible days of the last world war, my great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, said: "Let us look at the world with clear eyes and not with bloodshot eyes". It is difficult to do so when we are full of passions and prejudice and even more difficult when fear oppresses us, for fear is a bad companion.

Strenuous efforts are being made to bring

about disarmament all over the world and there is no greater need today than disarmament. If We succeed in that, these fears will undoubtedly lessen and enable us to think straight and more clearly. But disarmament itself will come when these fears are less. How then are we to get out of this vicious circle? Perhaps step by step we may advance towards our goal, each step creating conditions for the next step.

We in India do not pretend to know the answer to these questions and do not presume

206

to tell others what they should do. But men of my generation in India have had a unique experience. We achieved freedom of a great and militarily weak country against a powerful empire by peaceful methods and without shedding blood. That was a unique example in human history and it was largely due to the leadership and example of Gandhi. Perhaps also to something deep in the spirit of India which fitted in with Gandhi's teaching. In the main that teaching was always to think of the means and not merely of the ends, for means fashion the end. If the means are right, then the ends will also be right and will not have evil consequences trailing behind them.

We did not fully understand Gandhi; we could not do all that he told us and we failed him in many respects. But we have felt the warm glow of his presence and have had the joy of working under his leadership for a great cause through methods and means which seemed to us to be right. We were trained to cast out fear and hatred and not to wish ill to anyone. We did not come up to his expectations but still the change he brought among millions of his people was an amazing one.

We in India, as in many other countries of Asia and Africa, are trying to develop ourselves so as to put an end to our poverty and raise the standards of hundreds of millions of our people, ultimately aiming at the good life for all. This cannot be done, we think, without the help of science and modern techniques. The problem before us is whether in adopting the methods and techniques of science we might not create a society full of internal conflict and the urge for power which brings it into conflict with other groups. Can we succeed in bringing about a synthesis of modern science with something of the spiritual background which has ennobled life throughout the ages ? Without science and modern technology, we cannot better our lot or indeed even maintain our freedom, but without a spiritual background also the minds of men turn into wrong directions and conflicts occur resulting in great destruction and the delegation of man.

The UNESCO has set the right ideal before it to try to turn the minds of men and the way it is trying to do so is not the direct method of facing our many problems and conflicts but the indirect way of creating appreciation and understanding of art and culture. Presumably this is a surer method of dealing with these problems than the direct political method, though of course both methods have to be tried. In any event it is of the utmost importance that the purposes and objectives of the UNESCO should be remembered and we should always also remember that wars and conflicts begin in the minds of men and peace therefore has to be established there. In the measure that UNESCO succeeds in this high endeavour will it help in the establishment of peace and rid humanity of the danger of war, and all the fears that encompass it.

I would again Eke to thank you, Mr. Director-General and the distinguished delegates of this great organisation for the honour they have done to me by inviting me to address them. In a world which has many and ever-lengthening dark shadows, rays of light come out of this peaceful approach to men's minds. However great the darkness may be, the light remains and will ultimately pierce the gloom.

FRANCE INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Shri Morarji Desai's Speech in the National Press Club

Shri Morarji Desai, Finance Minister of India, delivered the following speech in the National Press Club, Washington, on September 20, 1962:

May I start, Mr. Chairman, by saying how happy I am to have this opportunity of meeting you and the members of this Club once again? I had the pleasure of addressing the Club two years ago. I took that opportunity to place before my audience my thoughts on the "Economic Development of India". I have chosen as my theme this time a more general title: "India Today", but my observations will relate to the self-same problem of India's economic development. This, for us, is the most absorbing problem.

The Second Five Year Plan ended on March 31, 1961, and we are now in the second year

207

of our Third Plan, which covers the period April 1961 to March 1966. In the time available, I can sketch only briefly the objectives of the Third Plan and some of our problems in that context. The achievements of the last ten years or so in the sphere of development are, of course, of vital significance to us in India, and the further tasks ahead are uppermost in our minds. But, they are, I know, of no less interest to you. The United States has taken and maintained a lead in assisting economic development abroad,, and although occasionally one hears sceptical or even defeatist talk on this subject, the case for planned economic development and the role of advanced countries in this regard are well understood in this country. I need not go over that ground. I feel heartened by the fact that the American people and the American Government have, despite difficulties on the balance of payments, adhered to their liberal and constructive policies in regard to supply of capital and aid to countries abroad: I am glad these difficulties are being overcome, and that the dollar is getting stronger. The United States assistance towards

economic development, both directly and through international agencies, has been substantial and will, considering all facts, have to be substantial in the years to come. It is also a welcome sip of the times that the industrialized European countries, too, have begun to play a more active part in assisting economic development.

To come back, then, to India and to India's problems: What, one might ask, are the outstanding features of the Indian economy today? Has it advanced significantly over the last few years? Are the current programmes of development wellconceived and what are the prospects for the future? These are crucial questions and, by no means simple ones. Perhaps, they are not capable of being answered briefly. But, I shall try. . I am happy to note that the more industrialized countries are also becoming more growthconscious and are endeavouring to discover ways and means of achieving satisfactory growth rates. This is excellent from the point of view of the world economy as a whole. But, I must say that the problem of securing rapid and all-round. development in the underdeveloped countries in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America continues to be the major challenge of our times-a challenge to the countries themselves and to the international community. The disparities in income levels as between the more developed and the less developed countries are very large and so far they have tended to widen. It is not these disparities as such that we are worried about. What is important for us is to reach certain minimum standards in terms of consumption and of the basic amenities of life, such as education, housing and water supply.

The last ten years or so of development activity in India mark the beginning of an economically and socially most significant period. Striking advance has been made in several directions. Of course, despite this advance, India remains a poor country with per capita income at around \$ 70. There is, clearly, a long way to go before a reasonable standard of living can be assured to the 440 million of our people, and we have to bear in mind that this number will, despite family planning and the rest, rise at a rate of some 2 per cent per annum for some time to come. In the First Plan period (1951-56), national income increased by 18 per cent; and in the Second Plan, it went up by 20 per cent.

As against this increase of some 40 per cent over the decade, the rise in per capita incomes comes to about 18 per cent, as much as 22 per cent being absorbed by the increase in population. So, in a sense, we are just on the threshold.

And yet-to come now to my second pointit would be a mistake to under-estimate the importance of the new direction and tempo of. change. The Indian economy has overcome the inertia of many decades, and it is poised for further rapid advance. Investment in the economy was around 5 per cent of national income when our First Plan began. It is now 11-12 per cent. In the course of our Third Plan, we intend to take it up to 14-15 per cent. But, perhaps, even more important than these figures is the fact that the industrial base of the economy has been greatly strengthened over the last few years; irrigation, power and transport facilities have been expanded rapidly; a rising trendthough not a sufficiently and steadily rising one -in Agricultural production has been established; and, above all, there is in the country a sustained spirit of hope, endeavour and dynamism. Nowhere, of course, is the new build-up of production and of basic facilities adequate. More is needed in every direction. But, that is the very nature and essence of the development process.

It is against this background that the Third Plan has to be viewed. Its broad aim is to take the country forward significantly towards what is called 'self-sustaining growth. This synoptic phrase has wide implications. In financial terms, it means progressively more reliance on domestic savings and less on external aid. In real terms, it means more rapid progress towards more adequate levels of agricultural and industrial production, with special emphasis on increase in the country's capacity to produce domestically the

208

machinery and, equipment; needed for sustaining on a continuing basis, high levels of capital formation. (The Plan envisages a 30 per cent increase in national income. It involves an investment outlay of over \$ 22 billion. We hope to raise, on our own, some 75 per cent of this amount. The external assistance required is of the order of 25 per cent.

The Third Plan is by no means an easy one to implement. It calls for a very substantial effort to raise domestic resources; it postulates the availability of adequate external assistance,' both in terms of quantum and of timing; it also involves a great deal of organizational effort. On, the side of domestic resources, the present situation as well as the outlook for the Plan period as a whole are, I should say, satisfactory. The Plan has an additional taxation target of Rs. 11 billion. This for a country like India is a massive effort. Yet, we have already put in a substantial effort. The measures already taken in the first two years will provide some 75 per cent of this amount. In the face of this effort, no one could say the Indian people are sparing themselves. The flow of investible funds both by way of public loans as well as subscriptions to new capital issues has been reasonably satisfactory, and we have recently raised interest rates with a view to enlarging savings.

Our major problem is foreign exchange. Apart from PL-480 assistance, the Plan estimated that external resources of the order of \$ 5.5 billion over the five year period would be needed. Thanks to the Consortium organized by the World Bank and the assistance from the international agencies and friendly countries, the assistance authorized so far comes to about \$ 3 billion. I am hopeful that the efforts we are making to secure the further amounts needed, will evoke friendly and sympathetic response. There are some difficult problems in this field, such as the tying of aid to particular projects, and the reluctance. of some of the assisting countries to provide the finance needed for general developmental imports or for meeting the maturing external obligations. But I do not propose here to go into these aspects of detail.

I should like to stress two points in this connection. First, that we, in India, are exerting our utmost to raise domestic resources. And, second, that we are anxious to minimize the period of reliance on external assistance. This latter raises issues relating to export and import policies. We have to keep all but the most essential imports out and we are doing this as part of the austerity and discipline unavoidable in developmental planning. We am endeavouring also to increase exports. This latter is an uphill task, and it is well known that we am Worried about some of the regional trade groupings that are emerging. Our success in enlarging exports depends considerably on the trade policies the developed countries follow. The restrictions on imports many of them have are, frankly, an anachronism in the present word context.

The external assistance needed by India may seem large in terms of the total amount, but in per capita terms, it is smaller than the assistance most other countries have been receiving. I am not trying to institute comparisons or to suggest that there is any norm to which assistance from abroad could or should be related. My object is to emphasize that the relatively large totals involved when aid to India is considered should not leave a wrong impression on anyone. The fact simply is that India means a very large proportion of the underdeveloped world. India's population is larger than that of Africa and Latin America put together and the fact that the area of the country is much smaller makes the problem of development all the more difficult.

The Indian economy is at present functioning under considerable strain. The pressure of demand is rising-which, by itself, is a good and healthy sign. But, while production has been going up, shortages and bottlenecks have been emerging in some lines. The pace at which industrial investment is rising, both in the public and in the private sectors, is causing is strain on power and transport. Other problems of coordination among sectors are arising. It would take me too long to go into them. But, I wish to say that we are aware of these problems and are trying diligently to overcome them.

This adventure of development is not without risks, but it is, I dare say, Worthwhile, both from the national point of view and in terms of the needs of a healthy world community. Science and technology are advancing fast, and the conquest of space is within sight. One cannot but marvel at the potentialities of the human intellect. Is it too much to hope, then, that part of mankind's energies will be devoted--continuously and with zeal-to the great task of abolishing poverty and want on this planet? I am sure members of this Club do not need to be reminded of the importance or urgency of this problem and, I am sure, too, they will do their part in creating and fostering the night climate of public opinion.

One final thought before I conclude. Rapid economic development is vital for maintenance and growth of democracy in the underdeveloped world. It is only if our progress towards better living standards is rapid can we hope to preserve

209

and strengthen the democratic values and institutions that we in India cherish so much. There are, after all, people who regard democracy as a secondary ideal or objectives which could be sacrificed for the pursuit of material welfare. I disagree with this view; and I am happy to say that this view which considers democracy expendable is shared today by only a small segment of public opinion in my country. But, it has to be recognized that the material base is important and that if large masses of people do not have the hope of securing better living conditions, if not for themselves, at least for the younger generation, the whole social fabric could be in jeopardy. In many ways, Mr. Chairman, India today is a pointer to the world of tomorrow -in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America, and I am hopeful that, despite difficulties and maybe occasionally setbacks, we. shall find satisfactory answers to our problems.

USA INDIA LATVIA FRANCE PERU **Date :** Sep 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION

Dr. Sushila Nayar's Inaugural Speech at 15th Session of Regional Committee

Following is the text of speech of Dr. Sushila Nayar, Minister of Health, Government of India, inaugurating the 15th session of the World Health Organisation's, Regional Committee for SouthEast Asia, held in New Delhi on September 18, 1962 :

I am glad that we are again meeting in India and in New Delhi to devise ways and means to tackle health problems and attain a better standards of health. Today the world membership of the W.H.O. stands at Ill member States and four Associate Members. In South-East Asia, the countries of our region-Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Nepal and Thailand-have during 1962 been joined by another member-The People's Republic of Mongolia. We are happy to welcome our new member.

As one of the various specialised agencies of the United Nations, the World Health Organisation is engaged in the most important task of helping all peoples to attain the highest possible level of mental and physical health and social well-being. It has dedicated itself to serve mankind and is prepared to help wherever need exists. At the outset, I would like to pay my tribute to this Organisation for the good work that it has been doing for the promotion of health among the people of the member Countries. Year after year, I am happy to note the progress that has been recorded in every branch of its workwhether it is in. the sphere of training of personnel or in the control of communicable diseases.

The countries represented in the Regional Committee have many problems in common, particularly in the field of health. A vast majority of their population fives in rural areas. Prevalence of a large number of communicable diseases, low standards of environmental sanitation and lack of adequate and wholesome water supply are responsible for a lot of ill-health and consequent misery. It is, therefore, most appropriate that this Committee should concentrate on the special problems of the area and endeavour to deal with them effectively and encourage the peoples of the various countries in the region to strive their best to remove the causes of ill-health. It is a vicious circle that "sickness breeds poverty and poverty breeds sickness" and therefore it is being increasingly appreciated that the measures taken for the promotion of health and the eradication of diseases should go hand in hand with the development of a country in other spheres so as

to raise the living standard of the people.

The World Health Organisation has played an important role in the expansion of its programmes for the control of major communicable diseases, improvement of medical education, promotion of vital health statistics and health education in collaboration with the Governments in the region.

It is gratifying to observe that about 3.5 million dollars which is more-than half the total expenditure during 1961 was devoted to the control of communicable diseases, the most urgent problem of the region.

In spite of the magnitude of the tuberculosis problem and the limited nature of public health resources the countries of the region are putting up a strong fight against this disease. Studies undertaken by the T.B. Chemotherapy Centre,

210

Madras, a joint undertaking of our Government, Indian Council of Medical Research, World Health Organisation and the British Medical Research Council, have firmly established that pulmonary tuberculosis can be effectively treated at home without special risk to family contacts. This will go a long way to help countries in formulating suitable control programmes with their limited resources. The next venture of the Centre is to find out the cheapest form of effective chemotherapy most suitable for community use.

With a view to enabling effective integration of tuberculosis control work with rural and urban health services, the National Tuberculosis Institute, Bangalore, is trying to devise, on the basis of epidemiological and field research, model urban and rural tuberculosis control programmes suitable for application throughout India. Excellent work with far reaching potentiality is being carried out there with W.H.O./UNICEF assistance.

The W.H.O. has played a major role in the field of training and education. Besides the large number of projects directly related to training and education of medical and paramedical personnel, practically all the W.H.O. projects have significant elements of training and education. Recently with a view to upgrading medical education, teaching and research, a new approach has been made by providing a broad-based assistance to a selected medical college in India for a number of years.

In my country great emphasis has been placed on the expansion of medical education. The number of medical colleges has gone up from 15 in 1947 to 65 in 1962 and the number of admissions has gone up from 1.200 to over 7.000 per annum during the period. It is heartening to note that other countries in the region are also expanding medical education and the number of medical colleges in the region now totals 81 with nearly 9,000 admissions every year. Institutions for training of different types of para-medical personnel have similarly gone up. institutions for training nurses, auxiliary nurses and midwives etc. have gone up in India from 337 in 1947 to 781 in 1961 and the annual Output of these categories of personnel has gone up from 1,568 to 7,883 during the period.

Our rapidly growing population has been posing a serious challenge to our socio-economic progress. Our main concern has, therefore, been to bring about in as short a time as possible an impact on population growth by the vigorous expansion of our family planning schemes. Rs. 270 million has been provided for this programme during the Third Plan. I am sure some member countries are confronted with a similar problem. Others may have to face the problem sooner or later. Population problem is a world-wide problem re-suiting from two conflicting factors, namely the growth of population under favourable socio-economic and political conditions and the limitation of space and resources.

The UNICEF which is another important agency of the United Nations is also co-operating in a number of health schemes especially those relating to maternity and child welfare, and in the matter of distribution of skim milk to illnourished children and supply of vitamins and other drugs through the Maternity and Child Welfare and Primary Health Services.

As the annual report of the Regional Director will show much has been done to implement the objectives of the World Health Organisation within the brief span of 14 years. A great deal of success in the various technical fields is due to the able and experienced guidance of our Regional Director, Dr. S. Mani under the able leadership of the Director General.

I have mentioned earlier some of the spheres in which with the aid of the W.H.O. we have made noticeable progress in the field of health in this region. We are, however, conscious of many gaps to be filled and are aware of our deficiencies in trained man-power and money and materials. We are still-far from achieving for our peoples the standard of health which the W.H.O. has defined as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being". But we have taken definite steps forward and I am sure that the deliberations of the Regional Committee shall give us guidance to make still further progress towards our goal.

In your endeavours for promoting healthphysical as well as mental, and eradicating disease in the South-East Asia Region, you have my very best wishes. I wish you all success. You have every reason to be proud of your work, for man prizes health as the noblest gift of God.

211

USA INDIA AFGHANISTAN BURMA INDONESIA NEPAL THAILAND MONGOLIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1962

October

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record		Oct 01, 1962	
Vol. VIII	OCTOBER		No.10

CONTENTS

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Prime Minister Nehru's Banquet Speech welcoming Malayan PrimeMinister213Reply by Malayan Prime Minister215Malayan Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet in Honour of PrimeMinister Nehru216Reply by Prime Minister Nehru217Malayan Prime Minister's Farewell Broadcast217

FEDERAL PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

New Trade Agreement Signed N, 218

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON Goodwill Mission from Cameroon : Joint Communique 219

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U.N. Day Broadcast	219		
Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Reply to Pakistan Foreign Minister's			
Criticism	220		
Shri Arthur Lall's Statement on Suspension of Nuclear Tests 224			
Shri Azim Hussain's Statement on U.N.	Budget Estimates 230		
Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Speech in Poli	itical Committee 238		
Shri J. N. Khosla's Statement on Southe	ern Rhodesia 243		

ITALIAN REPUBLIC

Extension of Trade Arrangement 249 MEXICO

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Mexican President 249Reply by the Mexican President251Joint Communique253Talks for Expansion of Trade254

(Continued overleaf)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(ii)

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

PAGES

prime Minister's Broadcast to Nation on Chinese Aggression 254

REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President of Cyprus 256 Reply by Cyprus President 257

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Rumanian President 258				
Reply by Rumanian President	259			
Rumanian President's Speech at	Banquet in Honour of President			
Radhakrishnan	260			
Reply by President Radhakrishna	in 261			
Joint Communique	261			
Exchange of Letters regarding Technical and Economic				
Collaboration	262			
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS				
Agreement for Exchange of Goo	ds Signed 263			

YUGOSLAVIA CAMEROON INDIA PAKISTAN USA MEXICO CHINA CYPRUS **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Prime Minister Nehru's Banquet Speech welcoming Malayan Prime Minister

Speaking at the Banquet given by him in honour of His Excellency Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, Prime Minister of the Federation, of Malaya at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 27, the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru said :

Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : We are very happy to have you here Prime Minister as our guest and with your gracious lady, I do not remember how many times and for how many years we have tried to get you here-we had invited you but you were busy with your work and you could not come. The first time we met, rather long ago, quarter of a century in Malaya, I went there when both of us were functioning in different capacities. We met subsequently in London at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences and now that you have come here, it gives us much happiness.

Malaya and India have had many contacts in the past for hundreds of years, in fact almost thousands of years as we have all bad contacts with countries of South East Asia. We are not only geographically near each other but also historically and in some ways culturally, we have many common things and in the present, our contacts are growing because it seems natural that the countries of South East Asia should pull together, should cooperate because most of these countries are engaged after achieving their independence in the task of bettering the conditions of their people in development and generally in making the countries happier and stronger. We have been so much engrossed in our work ever since we became independent about 16, or 17 years ago. I believe we have made some progress. We have big ideals, big objectives and step by step we are trying to realise them. But we also realise, as I suppose you do, Prime Minister, that it is easier to have ideals than to implement them and to make them a reality; and the task of building up a nation is not an easy one. However, it is the inevitable fate that has descended upon all these countries which for various reasons were left behind in the race for progress, and they have now to make good.

We have our difficulties and so have you, but we have the satisfaction and joy of working for a worthy cause, just as many years ago we had the great joy of working for another worthy cause, the independence of India. Now, Independence has come to us and to you, and we face other problems; and at the same time, while we have to face these problems, we cannot, however much we may wish to, ignore the major problems of the world, because the world shrinks and becomes narrower, and practically each country lives on the threshold of another country. Of course, nearer countries are on each others threshold, but distant countries have also become very near because of the technological improvements and the speed of travel and communications. And so, the question of peace and

war affect's all countries.

If, unhappily, a war starts, no country escapes its influence; so also, in the case of freedom it is difficult to keep the world half free and half unfree. And, therefore, ever since we became free, and you became free, Prime Minister, we have thrown our weight in favour of the freedom of those countries in Asia or Africa which are not yet free.

Meanwhile, we face tremendous problems, world problems-I am not for the moment referring to our internal problems which are heavy enough but to-the question of peace and war. We have been devoted to peace even in our struggle for independence under our leader Mahatma Gandhi, and we have tried to pursue the path of peace in India and in our policies outside, and yet such is the curious fate that has pursued us that at the present moment we are engaged in military operations, not of our choosing, but it has been thrust upon us, because much as we like peace-we shall labour for it and continue to work for it-some things happen which endanger the very foundation of peace in another way, because there can be no peace, as I said, if there is domination of one country by another, or there is aggression or there is an attack on the freedom of a country or its territory. And so we have to face today a major aggression on our country from a neighbour country with whom we tried to develop friendly relations, whom we considered as friends, whose cause we pleaded outside in the councils of the world, and

213

yet by some uahappy fate today we have to suffe. aggression and invasion from that very country.

However much we may like peace, and we are passionately devoted it, a peace which is based on surrender of one's territory or one's self-respect is not worth having. There are some things worse even than conflict, and that is the surrender to aggression because that is neither peace nor freedom.) We have to face that, and you have come, Prime Minister, at a time when we are very much occupied with these problems, and when we have to fashion our lives somewhat different to meet, these are novel problems for us because we have not been conditioned to ways of war and military conflict. Yet since fate has brought them before us, we have to face them and face them courageously because one thing we learnt in our peaceful struggle against British Imperialism and that was however much the pressure may be exercised over us we did not submit to anything we considered wrong. For vears our struggle went on till we attained victory in a sense of freedom for our country and it came to us in a good way i.e., by agreement ultimately and, therefore, it left no traces of bitterness behind and we are friends with those who were in conflict with us previously. And so we are not framed to war, thinking of war or in preparing for war. Naturally as Independent nation we have our defence forces to protect our country but there is no such a thing as a country being habituated to the idea of military conflict and preparing for it. We have not been so habituated in the past and perhaps we have deliberately tried not to think of it, devoting ourselves to peaceful development. Now it is thrust down upon us and we cannot refuse to accept the challenge and so we are very much involved now and I feel sure that not only you, Mr. Prime Minister and your country, but many other countries will give us their sympathies and possibly their support because it is not merely a matter of our own troubles but there are some principles involved. In this certain international standards have been broken and it will be an evil day if international standards are broken without impunity and therefore the matter has a larger interest not only for us and our neighbouring countries but for those in the world who wish to help in strengthening these international standards. There is this immediate issue before us and we have to devote all our strength to meet it and solve it in a proper way. The larger problems remain, problems of peace in the world. We have tried for peace and worked for it. Now in this nuclear age more specially without peace, there is no hope for mankind and therefore we have aimed and struggled hard for disarmament. Not that our voice means very much in regard to disarmament because we are not one of the heavily armed countries or countries possessing modern weapons of mass destruction. But nevertheless, however big or small we may be, we have a certain duty not only to ourselves but to mankind and we have sought to discharge it and here comes the tragedy that we who spoke for peace so much and fashioned ourselves for the works of peace and

development have to meet a condition, a situation which is far from peaceful, which is military, which is warlike. Well, I suppose, we shall get over it and however long it takes, we shall get over it. There is no supposition of it. We will get over it but it is an anomaly and a bit of a tragedy that we should be drawn away from problems that- consume our attention, the development of our country and to some extent giving our service to international cause of peace and disarmament, something which is exactly contrary to that. I hope you will not mind my mentioning these matters at this time because my mind is full about them. I could not very well suppress myself on such an occasion or on any other occasion. Nevertheless, I want to assure you that however much preoccupied we might be because of these developments on our borders and frontiers, we are very happy that you have come to us and you have our warmest welcome from not only I and my Government, but our people. You have been to some places in India, some parts of India, and many other parts would welcome you if you went there. And wherever you have been, our people have been happy to see you and meet you and welcome you.

I hope that the rest of your stay in India will be agreeable and pleasant, that when you go back you will return with pleasant and abiding memories of your visit and that your visit here will strengthen the old ties that bind us together, that have brought us near repeatedly in history and have brought us near again in the present stage.

So, may I ask you, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the health of the Prime Minister of Malaya and the Gracious Lady Puan Sharifoh Rodziah.

214

USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA **Date** : Oct 01, 1962

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Reply by Malayan Prime Minister

Replying to the toast by the Prime Minister of India at the banquet held in his honour, His Excellency Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Hon. Ministers, ladies and gentlemen : This is indeed a most memorable evening for me and members of my party to be here at this banquet given by the Prime Minister whom it has been a great pleasure for me to meet on this trip. I have looked forward for a long time to visit India. There has been a standing invitation open to me, but unfortunately, owing to unforeseen circumstances and events, it has had to be postponed from time to time.

The wonderful reception the Government of India and her people gave to our King and Queen last December had made me even more keen to come and convey to you, Sir, and to the people of India the thanks of my Government and people of Malaya for that wonderful expression of friendship shown to us through our King. Now that I have arrived at last in New Delhi, the pleasure of being here is very great. In fact, I feel quite overwhelmed-first by the cordial welcome given to me and to my wife and to the members of my party this afternoon, and now by my gracious friend, Mr. Nehru whom it has been my privilege and honour to remember ever since he first visited Malaya in, I believe, 1936. That was many years ago, and I was then a young man. I was on the platform as a member of the reception committee when he addressed a rally in Butterworth, Penang. Sitting there at that time, I never dreamt that one day I would come here and would be sitting at the same table as here, here in this capital of India, with him as the Prime Minister of a great country and I the Prime Minister of a small South East Asian country. Perhaps it was destined even at that time that this should be so for what made the reception committee invite me then to represent the Malay Community, I can see that

clearly now and I give thanks to God for that tryst with destiny.

In the years that followed since then Mr. Nehru always a vital inspiration to all who love freedom and democracy, has become one of the most Outstanding statesmen in the world-respected abroad and respected and loved by his own people in India. And now when I look back on that first meeting in Malaya and glance around me now at this gathering in India I cannot help but be pleased with myself.

Now the second occasion on which I met Mr. Nehru was just after the war. He came to Malaya in 1946, ten years after his meeting me, after India had become a free nation. He came as a Congress President to look into the conditions of Indians in Malaya following the end of the war. Mr. Nehru came there to help them, to save them from either persecution or pressure by the British. He thought of his people in his hour of triumph. While I was in Malaya he visited my own state of Kedah, yet in spite of the passing years he remembered me. And of course since the achievement of Malaya's independence he has been a source of inspiration to me. Whenever I have had occasion to ask for his help he has never failed to give it. We have received help from India under the Colombo Plan and in other ways; whatever our request might be, I have never yet been refused help.

In one short week I have come to know in the course of my journey the vastness of India and the warm hearts of people first in Madras, a province with long associations with Malaya over generations past. From Madras thousands of Indians have gone to Malaya, to make a home there and come back here as friends of Malaya.

Then to Hyderabad to see a little of Andhra Pradesh, to Poona to visit the National Defence Academy where with Mr. Nehru's help my son received his training; next to Ajmer as a pilgrim to honour a vow I made some years ago and then to Jaipur to admire its beauty. Wherever I have been to I have been surrounded by friendship, showered with hospitality and kindness, garlanded in welcome so much so that it is a journey I shall always recall. with. great happiness. By sheer coincidence I have come to India at a time of national crisis, a time of serious and grave concern to all her people, when her leaders and people are engaged in a national struggle in defence of their country's honour and prestige against an act of aggression by a supposedly friendly neighbour. Each day I have read in the press or heard over the radio of how the people of India in all walks of life are rallying to the

215

call of their President and their Prime Minister in the cause of national defence.

As if it is fated that I should be here at this hour of her trouble and it must perhaps for some purpose and that to give an indication of my feeling. I would like to say here that in people and I are in full sympathy with India. We in Malaya, and our neighbours in South-East Asia have had to go through all this trouble before. So we know what your feeling is. These hordes of people have no respect for man or God. Your national crisis should be considered by every right-thinking person, by all lovers of freedom as a danger sign to themselves.

So, I am sure that everywhere. the free people of the world are bound to have the warmest sympathy for India in this period of great trial and stress. The aggression of the Chinese communists cannot just be regarded by sensible people as any other a wrong committed by a friendly nation. I have no doubt at all that right will triumph over wrong in the end.

You may well ask if sympathy is enough. Of course, my answer is that it is not. But thew wishes or sympathies are the seeds from which the fruit will burgeon. I would like to say more, but at this stage, you can rest 'assured that I personally will be following events here very closely and so will my people.

Malaya and India have much in common. 'We are two countries in Asia that believe most strongly in the parliamentary system of democracy. It has served our peoples in our two countries well. In order to defend this democracy we have to go all out to fight the common enemy in whatever form his aggression takes. In India today you have an invasion. In Malaya, we a battle with them. Though we. knocked them out, yet, because of what is happening in India today, they might be tempted to start again. But we are prepared to meet them, as I know you are prepared to repel them. So, for these reasons and for many others, our sympathies are with you. I pray to God that everything will turn out in your favour.

I would like to say, as I said, a lot more on this subject, but because you will understand my position, you can take it for granted from me, that we are absolutely behind you.

Further, I wish to take this opportunity. Mr. Prime Minister, to thank you personally and through you the great nation and people of India for the many kindnesses you have already shown to me on this journey of good-will and friendship.

Of one thing I can assure you, that all your officials and all your friends have looked after me absolutely well and as you would have wished them to do. My stay here unfortunately is short, but I look to the time when I shall be able to come back here again and stay longer. Every one of us is enjoying every moment of his stay here. The warmhearted people of India have done everything they possibly can to make us welcome and feel at home. All these are memories I will treasure. I am most happy indeed to have been able to come here at long last and our being given the opportunity of meeting you, Mr. Nehru, in your own country. For me and for all the members of my party, I say thank you very much indeed. My wish and prayer is that may God bless India and her people.

May I ask you Your Excellencies, Hon. Ministers and Ladies and Gentlemen to drink to the good health of my friend, Mr. Nehru?

INDIA USA SRI LANKA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Malayan Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Prime Minister Nehru

Speaking at the Banquet given by him irk bonour of the Indian Prime Minister, on October 29, 1962 His Excellency Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, said

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before I give you the toast this evening, I would just like to say how grateful I am that you have all been able to come to this dinner this evening and in particular to the Prime Minister who, as we all know, is so occupied. This evening is my last evening in India and to me this visit has been much too short. Naturally I would have liked to stay longer but unfortunately I have got other work to do but the little time that I have spent here has been most interesting and most enjoyable. I would like to say how grateful the Members of my party, my wife and myself feel about the way we have been received and the kindness that has been showered upon us. We would go away from this country feeling happy and it is a memory that I will treasure for the rest of my life. I visited places of interest, historical places. I have made many friends and I think the time that we had spent here has been most profitable.

216

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Prime Minister for all the trouble he has taken, his colleagues, the Ministers, his officials who have attended to us, to our every need and as I said before I have come at a time when India is facing one of the biggest national crisis since India has been independent. With regard to the feeling of the Malayan people I would say we are absolutely with India in this matter. Though I have had no time to consult my colleagues or to assess the feeling of my own people in. my country, nevertheless, when I express my views here, I feel that I am expressing the views and the feelings and the sentiments of my people and of my Government. I am leaving India, happy in memory that I have at least done my little bit by saying what I feel and what perhaps my people would have liked to say. I leave here with memories which I would treasure for the rest of my life. I thank very much indeed the Prime Minister, his colleagues and the people of India.

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like you to rise and drink with me the toast to the President of India.

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Reply by Prime Minister Nehru

Replying to the toast by the Prime Minister of Malaya to the President of India, Prime Minister Nehru said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I have not risen to deliver a speech. I am going to propose a formal toast to the King of Malaya but Since you, Mr. Prime Minister, have said a few words, I should also like to say how much we have enjoyed your visit, the visit of Madam and your colleagues.

We are near Malaya. I visited Malaya and enjoyed it, but your visit, I have no doubt, has brought Malaya very near to large numbers of people in this country. The memories of your visit and your friendship would linger long. So I hope and I must thank you for what you have said on more than one occasion of your sympathy and solidarity with us in our hour of crisis. I wish you and Madam, your wife, a happy return and pleasant memories of India to carry back and all our good wishes for the future of Malaya and the Malayan people.

I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to drink the health of His Majesty the Yang-di-Pertuan Agong, King of Malaya.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

Malayan Prime Minister's Farewell Broadcast

In a broadcast from the Delhi Station of All India Radio on the eve of his departure from India, on October 30, 1962 the Prime Minister of Malaya, Tenku Abdul Rehman said:

Friends in India: I am leaving New Delhi today. Very shortly I will. be on my way home to Malaya with many happy memories of India and her people. My wife and I and all the members of my party have enjoyed ourselves very much indeed during our journey through your country. I wish to thank the people everywhere not only for the-great kindness and hospitality to me but also for the opportunity to realise for myself how warm and strong the ties of affection and interests are between your country and mine. I came to India on a mission of friendship and goodwill and I have found both of these awaiting me everywhere in abundance. I came because, I always wanted to see and know India and I return to Malaya happy indeed, that at long last I have had the chance to do so.

I have been with you here at a momentous

moment when India is faced with a grave and serious situation. A matter of such national concern that the country is now in a state of emergency. It is just as well for me that I happen to be here at this time as I have been able to guage for myself the deep feelings of the nation in crisis, the warm patriotism of the people when their land is in danger. By being here at this time, I had the chance to study the situation for myself on the ground instead of having to picture it from my own country abroad. It also happened that I arrived in India on the day a serious news on the border was published. From the beginning of my tour I have mentioned on more than one occasion that the

217

Federation of Malaya has the warmest and strongest sympathy and support for India. I have given you my views quite frankly and gladly. Well, I know the Malayan people are with me. I am sure, I am expressing the feeling and sentiments of all Malayan people, when I said, what I did say.

Malaya as you know is a land of many races. Half the population is Malay, almost as many are Chinese and 13 per cent are of Indian origin. But the war India is fighting in defence of her honour, her soil, is not against the Chinese but against the communists or I would call it in Malaya the communist terrorists. We in Malaya know very well what you are facing because we had to fight armed communist terrorism in 12 long years of emergency in our own country and during that emergency the communists killed as many Chinese as others.

You know what the communists did in Korea. They raped Tibet and are the cause of war suffering in Viet-Nam. They caused trouble and concern in Laos, and now they are raiding your own country of India. They have done all this and I don't-know whether I am correct in saying so but I think they intend to do more unless the free people of the world are ready to stand up and resist them.

At the moment, the trouble is confined to the border of India and is regarded as such by India and perhaps by all the rest of the world. Nevertheless, the free nations of the world must be prepared for the worst. We pray to God that the crisis may not develop any further than now and that India would soon redeem her honour and prestige.

In leaving Delhi today, I wish to express my warmest thanks to everyone who has been so kind and helpful to me and my party during this visit to India. Hundreds of officials in many parts of the country have taken great trouble. Many of them giving more than a little time at this moment of national crisis, when they quite rightly feel so much anxiety and concern and have so many matters of national importance to attend to. I can assure you that all the people of Malaya will appreciate very much indeed everything you have done. I am taking back with me to my own country a great treasure, indeed, the knowledge that I have met and understood the people of India in their own country and the privilege and pleasure of meeting once again and renewing my friendship with your beloved President and much beloved Prime Minister.

I shall always remember India and her people's affection and I can assure you that everyone in Malaya will be following the course of events here with a closest attention, interest and regard. Thank you very much, indeed, for everything that you have done to make me and members of my party comfortable and happy in India.

INDIA USA KOREA LAOS

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

New Trade Agreement Signed

A long term, Trade and Payments Agreement between India and Yugoslavia was concluded in

Belgrade on October 13, 1962. The Agreement was signed by Shri S. Vohra, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of India and Mr. Kapetanic, Leader of the Yugoslav Trade Delegation, signed for the Yugoslav Government.

The Agreement will be valid for a period of five years with effect from January 1, 1963. The new Agreement envisages possibilities of developing trade at a higher level than the quantum of trade transacted between the two countries in the past years.

218

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON

Goodwill Mission from Cameroon : Joint Communique

Following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on October 3, 1962, at the conclusion of the visit to India of a Goodwill Mission from the Federal Republic of Cameroon:

A Goodwill Mission from the Federal Republic of Cameroon led by His Excellency the Deputy Foreign Minister Mr. Nzo Ekhah-Nghaky arrived in New Delhi on 30th September, 1962. The Delegation was received by the President of the Republic of India to whom they handed over a personal message from the President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon. During their stay, they called on the Prime Minister of India, with whom they exchanged views on the general, political and social 'situation in the Federal Republic of Cameroon and met the Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, the Minister of International Trade, the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs-and other important Government personalities.

The Cameroon Delegation had discussions with the representatives of the Government of the Republic of India on matters relating to the development of cultural and commercial relations, as well as technical and economic cooperation between the two countries.

The Cameroon Delegation submitted draft agreements on commercial, economic and cultural cooperation for the consideration of the Government of India. Both Delegations agreed that detailed negotiations and conclusions will be pursued through diplomatic channels.

The Cameroon Delegation indicated its wish to conclude a special protocol within the framework of the cultural Agreement governing the entry and stay of Cameroon students in India. It was agreed that the draft of such a protocol be prepared and submitted to the Government of India for their consideration.

The two Governments have agreed to establish Diplomatic relations at ambassador-level. The discussions were held throughout in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

The Cameroon Delegation left India on October 3, 1962.

CAMEROON INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U. N. Day Broadcast

Broadcasting from All India Radio on the eve of the United Nations Day, the President,

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said on October 23, 1962 :

"Friends, The United Nations Organisation is the symbol of a new world and the hope of humanity. If the world, made one through science and technology, is not to be led into confusion and chaos, if it is not to remain politically anarchic, this organisation should be strengthened, made fully representative and helped to function properly.

Among the many causes which lead to wars may be mentioned colonialism, racial oppression, economic distress of large parts of the world. These constitute a threat to world peace. The United Nations Organisation is striving to remove these sources of conflict by peaceful means. It is not its aim to freeze the status quo. Peace will be precarious if we persist in maintaining things as they are.

Dependent territories are becoming independent in Asia and Africa though there are still. many parts which are not independent. There are some countries which are still expansionist. We have a glaring example of racial oppression in South Africa. Even in other independent countries racial discrimination prevails, and it is a constant source of irritation. Economic inequalities among nations are injurious to political stability. They lead to political frustration and resentment. The advanced nations of the world realise their responsibility to the less advanced ones and the United Nations is assisting by peaceful means to end colonialism of every

219

type, remove racial oppression and diminish the economic sufferings of the poorer nations of the world.

From dependence we move on to interdependence through independence. Independence does not mean isolation. Through membership of the United Nations we are realising the interdependence of nations.

Our bewildered generation knows that the greatest enemy of mankind is not disease, not famine but nuclear weapons which, in war will destroy civilisation and in peace inflict grievous damage on the human rare and its future. Our worst enemies are those who move heedlessly towards nuclear warfare as a means of satisfying their ambitions and desires. The United Nations is convinced that the use of nuclear weapons constitutes a violation of its Charter. The threat to use these weapons is equally a violation of the Charter. The resolutions of the U.N. on nuclear tests reveal the strength and depth of international feeling in the matter.

Those who realise the political implications of the nuclear age are deeply concerned about the present division of the world into two groups which are piling armaments and carrying out nuclear tests under water, on land, underground, and in the atmosphere. This is being done with a cynical disregard of the rights and interests of ordinary people.

Armaments are not the main source of war. They are the sign and symbol of the persistence of the old relationship of sovereign states, which accepts force as the principle by which international disputes are decided. Nationalism is a disease which, even if it does not erupt into war, corrupts the ideals and poisons the relations in the world family.

The division of the world into two groups contains in it all the ingredients of classic conflict which has led in the past two wars. The so-called ideological conflict is also one between two rival blocks, which suspect each other, distrust each other and fear each other. Both groups are confident that they, have just claims which are opposed to each other. For vindicating their claims in the traditional way, both groups are piling up armaments. Dismay and fatalism are widespread among those who wish to prevent wars. We need not, however, lose hope.

There are trends developing which may lead us out of the present confusion. There is more understanding between the two groups, more talks, more exchanges of visits. Scientists and technologists of the Soviet Union are visiting the great intellectual centres in the non-communist world. In the United Nations they have an opportunity of knowing each other, and clearing many suspicions, prejudices and misunderstandings. In the Committees and in the Assembly they are able to argue, disagree, joke and above all to feet that the issues on which they agree are vastly more important than those on which they disagree. They both know that the solution of victory is denied to them. Khrushchev rejects the inevitability of war and insists on peaceful co-operation. There is a convergence of interest among the great powers. There is a meeting of extremes. The Erivan radio in Soviet Armenia in its Quiz hour said in answer to a question. What is the distinction between capitalism and communism, 'Capitalism is man exploiting man, and Communism is the opposite of it.

If our mind is peaceful and loving, peace and bliss will follow us. If it be hateful and aggressive, trouble and distress will cloud our path. Grief and disaster will come out of ill-will; health and order will come out of good-will. Let us break with the sterile thoughts of the past and break new ground ! Let us get together, create the nucleus of a world authority to assure the safety of nations from attacks by their powerful neighbours.

The presence of the U.N. with its peace machinery, however limited in scope, is exerting a power on the world scene that is not adequately understood.

A world without fear, without hunger, may seem. to be impracticable. But all historical experience confirms the view that man would not have attained the possible unless time and again he reached out for the impossible. What man has achieved so far is immense, yet it is very small compared to what he may yet achieve. History has many surprises in store for us."

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SOUTH AFRICA ARMENIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri. B. N. Chakravarty's Reply to Pakistan Foreign Minister's Criticism

Replying to the Criticism of India, made by Foreign Minister of Pakistan in the course of his statement in the United Nations General Assembly, on 3rd October 1962, Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative said :

I very much regret the necessity for this intervention, but since the Foreign Minister of

220

Pakistan, who also happens to be a personal friend of mine, has chosen to refer to certain points, I have to explain and to clarify those controversial points.

Listening to the speech of the Foreign Minister, I marvelled at his courage and, if I may say so, at the somewhat audacious criticism of our policy towards our minorities. I was reminded of a quotation from Mark Twain to the effect that if lies were lilies, this would be a beautiful landscape.

I must first of all take this opportunity to deny categorically the facile allegation made by my friend the Foreign Minister of Pakistan regarding the so-called expulsion of Indian Moslems. He has, unfortunately, raised religious issues to which, since we are a plural society, we are particularly sensitive. We are a multi-religious society, containing persons of all faiths and all races, including 50 million Moslems and about 12 million Christians, as well as several millions professing other faiths. We are particularly proud of the fact that ours is a secular state and that under our laws any citizen, irrespective of caste, creed, religion or race, can enforce his fundamental rights in a judicial court of law.

Since partition, what has happened is that a large number of Pakistanis from East Pakistan have infiltrated into the neighbouring areas of Tripura, Assam and West Bengal. The infiltration was at an almost alarming rate and took place because of the comparatively better economic opportunities-I say "comparatively better" because it is a question of one poor country and another-in these areas because of the development projects there in hand.

As may be known, the Indo-Pakistan boundary between Fast Pakistan and the Adjoining Indian States of Tripura, Assam and West Bengal is thousands of miles in length, and the artificial dividing-line cuts across provinces, towns, and villages and sometimes even houses. You can therefore well understand that in these circumstances border check forces cannot control illicit immigration. So what we have been tying to do is to deport illicit immigrants from Pakistan We are doing so after the most careful verification of antecedents. Doubtful cases have been completely disregarded; only proven Pakistan nationals were served with notices under . the Foreigners Act of 1946-and incidentally, this Act is a legacy of our British days and probably still applies in Pakistan as well-and they were given ample time. and opportunity to dispose of their possessions before deportation and were permitted to carry proceeds of sales with them and provided with transport up to the border.

Pakistan is carrying on a campaign to misrepresent the deportation of proven cases of Pakistani infiltrators with a view to covering up the widespread stabbing, rioting and looting in different parts of East Pakistan which took place a few months ago. These disorders and killings were the result of irresponsible and inflammatory statements made by Pakistani leaders, including the Foreign Minister himself and the Law Minister of Eastern Pakistan. They have completely misrepresented the perfectly legal deportation of proven Pakistan nationals under the Foreigners Act. These deliberate misstatements and incitements to disorder and violence may be contrasted with the extremely moderate statements repeatedly made by the Prime Minister of India in Parliament on the most serious communal incidents in East Pakistan. One of these was the dastardly attack by Pakistani armed police on Santhal refugees who were trying to run away from Pakistan.

There has been an allegation that we have been brutal in turning out these people and that the methods used were extremely uncivilized. Here I crave your indulgence to read an extract from a speech by Sardar Attaullah Khan Mengal in the National Assembly of Pakistan on 19 June 1962. This was soon after the basic democracy started to function. Incidentally, I may say here that Sardar Attaullah Khan Mengal has now been put behind bars. I quote from this speech :

"Through you, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of this House to what happened-in Baluchistan. This is a matter of such vital importance that it has invited the hatred of the Baluch. After the 8 October, 1958 so-called bloodless revolution', the Government ordered the Army to invade the privacy of our homes and for six months 15,000 jawans"-jawans means the privates-"of our army had been engaged in testing out the weapons of the American military aid openheartedly on the hungry and miserable Baluch people. They, the Army, were using bullets, shells, cannons, bombs and aircraft without any hesitation or second thoughts. ...

"But this was not all. After this military operation wholesale arrests were made." The following was the condition of the prisoners

"They were hung by their hair and a fire would be burnt under them. For twenty days and nights at a stretch they would be kept standing until their leas were swollen to such an extent that their shalwars would have to be torn off them"--shalwar means a tight pyjama -"Many of them due to blood pressure and other causes had their flesh burst open around

221

their loins. One prisoner's testicles were crushed completely and after his release he committed suicide."

This is the statement made by one of their elected members of the Pakistan House.

I would now refer to certain factual things, instead of making statements which are not supported by indisputable evidence. Pakistan claims to be an Islamic State where non-Muslims are at best second-class citizens who are statutorily debarred from holding the highest offices in the State. It is Pakistan's policy to squeeze out non-Muslims from the State by political and economic discrimination and by creating a sense of insecurity among the minority community. In the western wing they have succeeded in getting rid of practically all non-Muslims; in the eastern wing, even after the initial mass migration of the minority community, some 9 million nonMuslims were left. They are, however, continuously being squeezed out. If by arousing communal passions the minority community in Pakistan suffers, that Government could not care less. I am not asking the Assembly to take my statement without indisputable evidence. The evidence I offer is the Pakistan census figures.

The 1951 census figures show about 9.24 million Hindus in Eastern Pakistan. The 1961 census figures show the same number, although the increase in population of Muslims in Pakistan during this decade was 26 per cent. Why has there not been this natural increase in the number of non-Muslims, which would have led to an increase of well over 2,250,000? The answer is that they have been all squeezed out during this period. If the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has any other answer, let him come out with it.

Now I have to also talk a little about the matter of Kashmir. I very much regret that this, matter has been brought up again so soon after the prolonged deliberations in the Security Council. Immediately after independence, Pakistan put economic pressure on Kashmir by cutting off essential supplies even after signing a standstill agreement. When that failed, armed invasion by tribal people from Pakistan followed. There was no talk then of self-determination. How can anyone take Pakistan's solicitude for self-determination for Kashmiris seriously when, as late as December 1959, President Ayub said that :

"Kashmir is vital for Pakistan, not only politically but militarily as well. Kashmir is a matter of life and death to us."

What is Pakistan's right in Kashmir anyway? It is perhaps not known to many people that the partition of India that created Pakistan was confined to the old British India,. The British Government made it clear that this partition was of British India and that it did not apply to those States, such as Kashmir and several hundred others, which were ruled by Indian Princes. These Indian Princes had entered into treaty relations with the British Crown which exercised suzerainty. The British Government took the view that with the withdrawal of the British from British India paramountcy lapsed.

The status quo ante having been restored, the Princes were given the right to accede to either Dominion and the founder of Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah, himself agreed that the accession should be decided only by the Prince ruling the State. This decision was incorporated in the Government of India Act as amended by the Indian Independence Act-an Act of the British Parliament-which created the Dominions of India and Pakistan. None of the provisions of this Act can be questioned, at least by India, Pakistan or the United Kingdom. In fact, this Act of the British Parliament has the same validity as an international treaty, as the provisions of the Act were the results of agreement between three Member States.

India went to the defence of Kashmir only when the Ruler of Kashmir acceded to the Dominion of India. After accession, Kashmir became an integral part of India and it had not only the right but the obligation to defend it. It was India which brought the Kashmir case to the Security Council requesting it to call upon Pakistan to put an end immediately to giving assistance to the tribal invaders coming across miles of Pakistan territory. When the Security Council took up the matter for consideration, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan said that the Pakistan Government emphatically denied that they were giving aid and assistance to the so-called invaders or had committed any act of aggression against India.

When the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan went to visit India and Pakistan, the truth could not be concealed any longer, and the same Foreign Minister had then to admit that not only were Pakistani nationals fighting in Kashmir but that regular units of the Pakistan Army were also fighting there. Pakistan thus came to Kashmir clearly as an aggressor since it had no other right to be there.

In accepting the United Nations resolutions of August 1948 and January 1949, the Prime Minister of India made it quite clear that if Pakistan did not act up to these resolutions by withdrawing its troops and tribesmen from Kashmir, the Government of India's acceptance of these resolutions should not be regarded as binding in any-way on them. Despite this clear reservation, Pakistan chose not to comply with those resolutions. These facts have been forgotten with the efflux of time and Pakistan is now talking about respect for law. Where was this respect for law when Pakistan illegally moved into the territories of Jammu and Kashmir by force? Why did not Pakistan comply with the United Nations resolutions promptly'? They tried to stall them because they knew that the memories of arson, plunder and rape were still fresh with the Kashmiris and a plebiscite at that time would have been specially disastrous for them.

Now we come to this question of self-determination. We all know and we have all been talking about self-determination which is, no doubt, a very good principle. But it ought to be applied to all those countries where by force of arms, by the vicissitudes of history, people are held under an alien power. It is not, however, applicable to sections of a people. If the policy of self-determination were to apply to parts of constitutionally created States, most of them would be broken up. The plea of selfdetermination in a plural society could mean disruption. And may I add that most of the new States in Asia and Africa fall into this category. That is why, I venture to suggest, the United Nations is trying so hard to prevent the secession of Katanga on the plea of self-determination. Even the older States would not be safe. For example, must the United Kingdom allow self-determination to Wales and Scotland, France to Brittany, the United States to some of the Southern States, Canada to the French community or Belgium to the Walloons or to the Flemish population? Numerous other cases could be cited. If religion is the criterion for self-determination, are we to separate Catholics from Protestants in Europe and in America, or Muslims from Christians in the Near East or in Africa? Self-determination cannot be merely a process of disintegration or fragmentation. When self-determination is applied to minorities in a nation-State, often new minorities are created. It is interesting that Prime Minister Suhrawardy of Pakistan declared in 1956 that the creation of Pakistan, despite the presence of 9 million non-Muslims in the country, put an end to the two-Nation theory on the basis of which Pakistan was

created. He said : "all of us, Muslims and non-Muslims, are Pakistanis first and last". This illustrates that now either Pakistanis do not believe in the two-nation theory or that selfdetermination is not the right of a new minority.

Now, we do not wish in any way to interfere with the internal affairs of a neighbouring State, and I would take this opportunity to reiterate the policy of the Government of India which is to seek all possible ways of making our relations with Pakistan not only friendly but truly neighbourly and fraternal. I am glad to see that the same expressions were made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan when he assured us :

"We want to live in friendship with India, and we want to be friends with India, if only it will do so on honourable terms." (Supra., page 81.)

Yet, he raised these issues. And may I crave vour indulgence, Mr. President, to draw the attention of this Assembly to certain facts relevant thereto? Did Pakistan permit the people of the Princely States in Pakistan to exercise the right of self-determination after the Ruler acceded to Pakistan? As was disclosed in the West Pakistan High Court a few years ago, the accession of Bahawalpur had been forced on the Ruler of that State. The Khan of Kalat revolted against accession and was arrested and detained in 1958. In neither case was the principle of self-determination applied. When Pakistan purchased the territory of Gwadur from the Sultan of Muscat, what happened to Pakistan's solicitous regard for people's right to self-determination? No opportunity was given to the people of Gwadur to say whether in the second half of this, the twentieth century, they wished to be bought like. chattel. Is Pakistan prepared to grant the right of self-determination to the Pakhtoons?

Self-determination is a democratic process. There has not been a single general election in Pakistan itself ever since its creation in 1947, even on the comparatively limited franchise which was obtaining in the British days. The President of Pakistan has repeatedly said that the people of Pakistan are not fit to exercise such democratic rights, and after fourteen years of independence the people are now being-educated on basic democracy. It is gratifying to find that Pakistan considers Kashmiris to be 'fitter for the democratic right of self-determination though its own citizens are not considered yet fit for such democratic self-expression, even though they had experience of it in the British days.

It is indeed a sad commentary on Pakistan that during these fourteen years the Pakistanis have forgotten what they learned in British days, while Kashmir during the same period has learned to practise democracy, though Kashmir had none of it in the pre-independence days. Pakistan having blocked a plebiscite, the people of Kashmir framed their own Constitution through a Constituent Assembly elected on a universal

223

adult franchise and ratified the Ruler's accession. This is certainly a much more widespread exercise of democratic rights than has ever been practised in Pakistan.

The solicitude of Pakistan for the self-determination of Kashimiris might have been much more appreciated had self-determination been practised by Pakistan in regard to territories under its own control. It is indeed ironic that a Government that has denied the democratic rights of universal and direct suffrage to its own people, a Government that says that democracy is not suited for the genius of its own people, should advocate self-determination for the people of a neighbouring country which has had elections on a universal adult franchise at least three times since its independence.

One may well ask why Pakistan, if it sincerely believes in the principle of self-determination, had to invade the State in the first place. The demand for the self-determination of Sudden Germans was followed by an attack on Czechoslovakia. Pakistan chose to follow the reverse procedure : only when aggression in Kashmir failed did Pakistan become a champion of self-determination for the Kashmiris.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE CANADA BELGIUM OMAN NORWAY SLOVAKIA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Arthur Lail's Statement on Suspension A Nuclear Tests

Speaking on the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, Shri Arthur Lail, Member of Indian delegation, made the following statement in the Fourth Committee of the United Nations on October 10, 1962 :

May I first associate myself with the remarks which you, Mr. Chairman, made welcoming our colleague from Algeria. It gives us great pleasure indeed to see seated here, as a tangible result of wise statesmanship and of efforts which were made in this Organization for many years, the representative of Algeria. We ourselves have participated in these efforts over the course of the last eight years or so, and we join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming the representative of Algeria.

I turn now to the item before us, which, as the Committee is aware, has been inscribed as a result of the initiative in the first instance of the Government of India. Of course, this item was inscribed unanimously, and we are glad that this is so because it indicates that there is no difference of opinion whatsoever that this is a matter which must involve our attention now and must do so at the very beginning of our work in the First Committee.

Not just for historical reasons, but so as to make a point to which I will come in a few moments, I would like to remind this Committee that the first time the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests was brought to the United Nations was as a result of the initiative taken by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, who asked the then permanent representative in April 1954 to address the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to enclose Mr. Nehru's statement which he made in the Indian Parliament on 2 April. Mr. Nehru then made these remarks in the context of the beginning of the testing of hydrogen bombs in the Pacific area :

"A new weapon of unprecedented power, both in volume and intensity, with unascertained and probably unascertainable destructive potential in respect to time and place, that is, both as regards the duration of the extent and the consequences, is being tested, unleashing its massive power for use as a weapon of war. We know Chat its use threatens the existence of man and of civilization as we know it.

"These are horrible prospects that affect nations and peoples everywhere, whether we are involved in wars or power politics. or not."

That was a statement made more than eight years ago, when very few of these massive weapons of great destruction had been tested. Until the end of 1953, only forty-nine weapon tests had been conducted. Since then, there have been almost 350 additional weapon tests, and the period of the greatest acceleration of these tests has been the last thirteen months, that is to say, since September 1961, when there was a recrudescence of tests. We are, therefore, clearly faced with the problem of survival in a much more acute form than existed when the Prime Minister of India addressed the Secretary-General of the United Nations on this matter.

Then it was acute enough, then it was engaging not only the imagination, but it was eating into the hearts and minds of men who were disturbed and concerned about the effect that nuclear war would have on the whole world and on our civilization.

224

Since then we have witnessed not only the continuation of these tests, the failure to end something which was pointedly brought to the attention of the United Nations-with all goodwill, with all the authority-if I may say so-and with wisdom from the Prime Minister of India, but the acceleration of this menace under which we live.

There have recently been explosions which. we are told, have approached 100 megatons. We are also told, and this is common knowledge and an open book for all of us, that when a test takes place in the fifty megaton range, this means that weapons can be developed, on the basis of the results of that test, up to about ten times that size. namely, 500 megatons. Similarly, when tests take place in the region of 100 megatons. then weapons in the order of 1.000 megatons can be developed.

That is the situation which we are facing today. It is not our intention to read horror stories into the record today, but I think it is only right that we should get this matter into perspective because it is sometimes suggested that, well, these weapons are not very destructive after all. want to indicate, from writings in this country, what would be the effect of what I might call "baby" weapons if they were exploded in this city in which we are now meeting.

Mr. Stonier has written very recently that if one 20 megaton weapon were to be dropped on Colombus Circle, then the effect would be that 6 million out of 8 million New Yorkers would die in the first two days. and that if there were 900,000 commuters in the city, of course there would be death for them also. That, I would point out, would be the effect of a baby bomb, of a mere infant in comparison with the size of weapons which are being developed now..

Then, the United States Atomic Energy Commission has stated that if a fifty megaton burst took place at a depth of 2,700 feet in deep water, it would develop waves of fifty feet high against a shore-line 100 miles away. A 100 megaton burst in 4,000 feet of deep water would generate waves of 70 feet high against a shore-line, 100 miles away. The United States Atomic Energy Commission has also stated that a fifty megaton burst in the lower atmosphere on a clear day would produce bums on the human retina up to 250 miles away.

These are some of the effects which are authoritatively stated as being certain to occur if some of the smaller weapons were detonated in a war-But we have been told that if a certain quite small number of weapons of 1,000 megatons or 500 megatons were exploded on one of the greatest countries, such as the United States, and God forbid that there should be any such explosions over the United States or over any other country, that if a few of these weapons were exploded, say, six or eight, then that would mean the end of all life in the United States. Not only would there be the effect of the blasts and the fire storm which would be created, and of radiation, but the whole oxygen mantle of the lower atmosphere would be burnt, and whether one was living in a shelter, underground or anywhere else, one would die from the lack of oxygen, and all life would cease in a country such as this.

That is the nature of the problem which faces us. That is why we have reached a point where action to end weapon tests must be taken extremely urgently. The fact that the pace and concentration of testing is what it is today does not merely mean that there is a significant addition in a numbers game and that we can say that there have been well over a hundred tests in the last thirteen months. In fact, there have been over 135 tests in the last thirteen months. That is not the point. The real point is that this acceleration and concentration of testing means that we have 'glaring evidence of the acceleration to a pace of insanity, if I may say so, of the arms race itself and of the race for destruction. It also means that the pursuit of new weapons and new systems of weapons is being undertaken without regard to any possible limitations of size or of the location of applicability-not excluding, of course, outer space.

It is clear from these tests that are taking place that the arms race has reached a much more aggravated stage than ever before. But there is a striking feature to which we would draw attention in this connexion, and this is the counterpoint, the extraordinary counterpoint. While great countries are engaged in this race with increasing speed and with increasing preoccupation, still-and we are grateful for thistheir leaders tell us that this is the course of destruction and that no security can be found by the perfecting and developing of armaments.

When the Eighteen-Nation Committee met at Geneva in March of this year, the Secretary of

State of the United States, Mr. Rusk, read out a message from President Kennedy. It was a very. inspiring message, and I would like to quote very briefly from what Mr. Kennedy said. In talking about the development of weapons, Mr. Kennedy said

"For men now know that amassing of destructive power does not beget security." Mr. Kennedy said that there was no security to be obtained now from the developing of the

225

power of destruction. Well then, the question arises : Why is the power of destruction being developed? If the President of the United States sees in the development of the power of destruction no security, then why is the power of destruction being developed? This is a serious question.

I would like to draw attention to statements in a similar vein of thought from Mr. Khrushchev's speech in Moscow on 10 July 1962. Mr. Khrushchev said :

"Those who are balancing on the brink of war maintain that nuclear rocket weapons are in themselves a sufficient guarantee that peace will prevail. This concept, known in the West as the balance of terror, is contrary to commonsense."

Mr. Khrushchev went on to say

"The question is whether the people today have the resources to Stop the race towards death, towards a new war."

Both leaders, therefore, say that the development of weapons and the war which would result from the development of weapons is a suicidal course, is a course which does not beget security and, of course, it does not beget happiness because it takes away from the resources of the world and devotes them to the production of the means of destruction when they could be devoted to purposes for which the world is crying out in most parts of our globe.

How is it then that we are in this state and that the leaders tell us we are pursuing a course of destruction, and yet under their guidance, we take it, this course continues? . I suggest that we have the right and the duty to say clearly to each other-not trying to apportion any blame on any country-that we have reached the point where the sanity of our leaders and the results which our leaders wish to obtain for themselves, for their countries and for the world are not being expressed in the policies which are being followed by the amassing and developing of weapons of destruction. That is the extraordinary position in which we find ourselves--a dichotomy between the expressed views of the leaders and the expression which is given to those views when it comes to the implementation of policies by governments today.

This is indeed a sad state of affairs and we hope that it is of such a character that all of us will see that from it we cannot but conclude that it is essential to stop the development of weapons of mass destruction. and therefore essential to stop all tests of nuclear weapons.

In these circumstances, is there any wonder that the eight nations, which, as a result of the efforts of the two sides and with the endorsement of the General Assembly, collected with the countries of the two sides in Geneva-eight nonaligned countries-struggled hard ever since reaching Geneva to deal particularly with the problem of the cessation of all nuclear tests. We studied carefully, quietly and fully the position of both sides in this matter. We found at that time that one side said that there must be obligatory on-site inspection in order that there should be a properly safeguarded treaty for the cessation of nuclear tests. The other side said : "Not on your life; we will not allow anyone to enter our country in any circumstances because in world conditions today we think the entering of our country will be espionage, and we will not agree to any inspection on our territory."

We considered these two points of view very carefully. The eight nations unanimously, with the approval of their Governments-Governments drawn from Europe, that is to say Sweden; from Latin America, that is to say Brazil and Mexico; from Africa, that is to say the United Arab Republic, Nigeria and Ethiopia; and from Asia, that is to say Burma and India--drew up a position which we put down in a memorandum and presented it to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on 16 April 1962.

I would like to say that in presenting that document we not only had in mind the necessity to find a compromise solution which could break the deadlock between the two sides, but we were impelled in this direction from, I would say, a selfish motive, the motive of protecting our peoples and protecting the world from destruction. We did not look upon this as an academic exercise in the preparation of a paper which would meet a theoretical position to bring the two sides together in a dispute in a court of law. That kind of compromise also is. practised and has to be practised on occasion. But we were dealing with the question of survival, with the question of the survival of our own peoples and of the peoples for whom we felt we had a right to speak and. in a wide sense, to represent,

I want to make this point insistently, because there was nothing academic about our paper. It was a paper which arose out of our concern for the world, because we felt it was our duty to express that concern and to try to find a solution for the situation which was facing us and which continues to face us, Our paper is a clear paper. It is before this Committee, contained in document DC/203 of 5 June 1962, which is the communication of 31 May 1962 from the CO-Chairman of the Geneva Conference and which is, in fact, the first report of the Geneva Conference; the paper I refer to is found towards

226

the end of that large volume, shown as document ENDC/28. I am sure that representatives have had time to look at it; it is a brief paper.

I Now I would like to say-and I wish to pay a tribute in this respect to both sides-that both sides agreed that it was desirable to conduct negotiations on the basis of our memorandum They put this in different ways. The ways in which they put it, again, are stated in this document. In the body of the report itself, the first report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, it 'is put in this way :

"..the Soviet Government expressed its willingness to consider the proposals set out in the memorandum as a basis for further negotiations. The United Kingdom and the United States accepted the Joint Memorandum as one of the bases for negotiations." (DC/203. ENDC/42, page 4)

That is what the. report-which was, of course, an agreed document-states.

Ever since last April this document has held the field and it has been looked at by both sides and they tended to approach it. Unfortunately, they have not quite got there. That is the pity of it. Have they really made progress in this matter? Yes; fortunately, we can point to progress in this matter of a very substantial nature. for example, last year the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States were the authors of a resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly and which is now-on the books as resolution 1649 (XVI). I would draw attention to the fact that in operative paragraph 2, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), this resolution says that

"The treaty should have as its objective the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests in all environments under inspection and control machinery adequate to ensure compliance with its terms;", and then it goes on:

"International control machinery should be organized so as to be representative of all parties to the treaty...", etc.

Now that is to say, one of the direct parties to this situation created by nuclear tests thought, one year ago, that it was essential to have certain international controls and inspection for the stopping of tests in all environments-in all environments. It is a measure of the progress which has been made--and I think it would not be impertinent for us to say that the effects of the eight-nation memorandum are to be seen in this progress-that in three environments, namely, in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater, those same delegations, the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States, on 27 August 1962 presented to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament a treaty which in effect says, and says clearly, that tests in these three environments should stop without any means of control or inspection at all.

I think we can agree then that there has been some effect of the work which has been going on and also that there has been a spirit of compromise and a spirit of movement.

Now, what about the other side, the Soviet Union? As I said, the leaders of the Soviet Union had stated that in no circumstances would they allow people to come onto their territory or enter it for purposes of inspection. But fortunately, we are in a position to tell this Committee that at Geneva there was movement from that position, and I would like to draw the Committee's attention to that movement. On 9 May 1962, Mr. Zorin-whom we are glad, I am sure, to see in our midst again; he left us at Geneva for a rest and I hope he has come back fully rested--Mr. Zorin said, in effect, that in certain cases it would be possible for the Soviet Union, in terms of the eight-nation memorandum, to invite the International Commission to make visits-on-site visits. That is what he said. Mr. Lachs, who I believe is here in the delegation of Poland and who was then the representative of Poland, said the following, and since it is very important, I am going to quote from what he said. He referred first to what Mr. Zorin had said, and then he stated :

"That is what Mr. Zorin said : the Soviet Union then is prepared to invite inspection. Thus the suggestion made in the eight-Power memorandum has been accepted. What more could the Soviet Union have done ? The memorandum speaks of inspection. The Soviet Union says 'We shall invite'."

Now, I submit that that is a considerable movement away from the position that "We will not allow anyone to come to our territory", and' I suggest we should take serious note of it.

But that is not all. Mr. Kuznetsov, the First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union who was also with us at Geneva for some time, took up this point and elaborated it. He said that when the State concerned was considering what it should. do in a given case which had been brought to its notice and which it was discussing with the International Commission, and in a situation which the Commission felt called for a visit to the site, the State concerned-and here I will quote Mr. Kuznetsov's words"... would have to take into account the fact that if it did not invite the Commission,

227

then the Commission, as is stated in the memorandum, would inform the parties to the treaty of all the circumstances of the case". Then Mr. Kuznetsov went on to say :

"In other words, the nuclear Power concerned will be made aware that highly qualified scientists, members of the International Commission, would inform all States and world public opinion that the nuclear Power concerned on whose territory the event had occurred had refused to invite the Commission to assess the nature of the event".

He then went on to say :

"The State concerned would have to weigh up what the other States would think and the reaction of public opinion on the concrete case, whether the world at large would understand the refusal of the nuclear Power concerned to invite the Commission in that particular instance. In the light of these considerations, can one conclude that the nuclear Powers will always adopt a negative attitude on inviting the Commission to visit their territory? Of course this cannot be done".

"Of course this cannot be done", said Mr. Kuznetsov.

Therefore, I would suggest that fortunately also there was considerable movement from the other side, that is to say from the side of the Soviet Union. And when we left Geneva, though we were unable to report that a test ban agreement had been reached, I think we could say that the difference between the two sides was not great. In fact the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Michael 'Wright-who I think is also in this room-said at a meeting on 20 August of this year at Geneva that the gap is not wide.

I would like now to draw the attention of this important Committee-which we know is looking at the matter objectively and practically and wishes to reach results on it-to a most striking confirmation of the validity of the Eight-Nation Memorandum (ENDC/28), which is before-the members in the report of the Committee. I wish to draw its attention to a most striking confirmation of its effectiveness.

Some of the leading brains of the world met last month in Cambridge in one of the series of Pugwash conferences. Now these are not people whose views can be taken lightly. Scientists and men of affairs, and not only scientists but political scientists and the top-ranking physicists of the world were present. From all sides, including American, British, Soviet and other scientists from many countries, including my own, they said that they thought a test ban agreement could be signed immediately, on either of the two following bases : Either that the Eight Nation Memorandum should be put into effect, plus one obligatory on-site inspection per country per annum, and that could be signed for an indefinite period; or that the Eight-Nation Memorandum as it stands-that is to say without the so-called obligatory on-site inspection-should be put into effect for a period of two years, and it should be seen how it works and then it could be put into effect indefinitely if it worked well.

I submit that this not only shows that it is a workable Memorandum, but it also shows, if I might say so, that there are no difficulties in interpreting this Memorandum. And indeed, if I may say so, there are no such difficulties. The eight nations have deliberately refrained from interpreting this Memorandum. Not because it is at all difficult to interpret the Memorandumnot in the least-but simply because, unfortunately, the two sides have been looking at this Memorandum, in certain of their States differently from each other, and we have not wanted to enter into a controversy with them. But we have said that if they would let us give an agreed interpretation, and accept that interpretation, we would of course interpret it. However,' we do not want to enter into a controversy with them because it is not the purpose of the eight nations who sit at Geneva and who are now concerned about reaching a solution in this forum here to stimulate controversy. So we have not interpreted it.

But I would like to submit that from what I have told the Committee just now regarding what

happened in the recent conference at Cambridge, there is no difficulty in interpretation, that this is not a problem of interpretation. People know exactly what the Memorandum means. The point is whether they are really willing to put it into effect.

Now because we have not interpreted this memorandum, I will not do so on this occasion. But I should like to make one point absolutely clear, and I do this because it has been suggested that the Memorandum does not have in it the element of deterring a violation of a treaty on the cessation of tests. I submit that this is not the case. And if I may have a moment, I will show how that is so. Before I do so, I would like to say that Mr. Dean, the representative of the United States at the Geneva Conference, was good enough to explain that one of the two great basic differences between their position and the position of the other side regarding a test ban was that-and I am now quoting Mr. Dean :

"the major deterrent to a series of tests comes from the fact that a potential violator

228

does not know which one might be certified by the Commission as eligible for an on-site inspection." (ENDC/PV.71, p. 46)

That he said was the major deterrent, namely the element of surprise.

Now I should like to assure this Committee that the Eight-Nation Memorandum is full of surprises for any country which embarks upon the course of violation-it is full of surprisesand that this element of deterrence arising out of surprise is abundantly present in the Memorandum. And I will explain how. First, who would decide, in terms of the Eight-Nation Memorandum, when a particular event is suspicious and significant? Would the parties to the treaty decide? No, the international commission would decide that matter-none other but the international commission. Under the Memorandum, when an event takes place which is suspicious, it is not for a party to say : "No no, this event is not suspicious. It has taken place in my territory, but it is a perfectly harmless event. We had a big meeting and a

thousand people clapped their hands and that is all you heard. There is nothing wrong here at all".

It is not for the country to decide here what happened. It is for the international commission to decide which event is suspicious and significant. Then, having made this decision, what happens? Who decides whether further clarification is required of the nature of that event? Again, it is not the party concerned, in whose territory the event occurred. It is the international commission which decides that in that particular event further clarification is required; and it moreover decides on what points that clarification is required, and it calls for that clarification. Then, thirdly, it is the international commission, after it has received such clarification, which decides whether it wishes to consult with the country concerned on the nature of the event. I repeat, to consult with the country concerned on the nature of the event. Finally, it is for the international commission to suggest or in other ways make clear to the country concerned that in a particular case it feels that it cannot clarify the nature of the event without visiting the site. None of these determinations, this series of four determinations, is made by the country concerned or by the opposite party. All this is done by the international commission itself. So we would suggest that the element of deterrence is strongly built in to the Eight-Nation Memorandum

It is sometimes said that more than this is necessary. What more, I would ask? Is it ever going to be possible to lead forces against either the United States or the Soviet Union to enforce a treaty? Are we going to make war on a country which does not observe a treaty to the hilt? Surely that is not the case. Surely all that can happen is that if a treaty is broken, the parties to the treaty are free to act in any manner they please. And that also is written into the Eight-Nation Memorandum. Surely there can be no stronger enforcement of international law than what we have provided.

Now in these circumstances, why is there no agreement between the two sides? We have looked at the barometer of recent tests. We have seen that, unfortunately, there is an acceleration of the arms race. And this would seem to show that, unfortunately, there is not at this moment a disposition to agree. In other words, this is a political situation.

I say in all seriousness that when we consider in isolation the question of nuclear tests, we are, let us face the fact, focussing on this one question the whole weight of the cold war, we bring it to this narrow focus because here we are really asking the countries concerned to renounce the cold war, to renounce preparations for a war of destruction. That is the essence of the cold war : Preparations for a war of destruction. That is, what we are asking them to do. The way is there. As I have said, both sides have even accepted a particular method as a basis for negotiation. This way has been ratified, if I may use that expression, by eminent people drawn from all parts of the world. But we are not reaching agreement because unfortunately we have not been able to persuade our colleagues on both sides to renounce this race in the development of the means of destruction even though their own leaders have told us that no security can be brought now by the development of these weapons of destruction.

I would like in this connexion to speak of our own concern, that is to say, the concern of countries that are not nuclear powers. We are not blaming either of the nuclear sides in this matter, but we would-like to say that there is a universal element in this. This is not an issue therefore that can be left to the two sides, with great respect to them, although it is only they who can stop nuclear tests. But the considerations which are germane to the stopping of nuclear tests are not considerations which affect only the nuclear powers. We all have a right to see that these tests are stopped because we all have a right to protect this world from the massive destruction which would occur if there were an outbreak of war whether by design or by carelessness or by an outburst of anger or by accident.

In this connexion I should like to quote very briefly from the words of a distinguished

229

American humanist whom we have all heard of, Mr. Lewis Mumford. The words that he speaks are obviously addressed to both nuclear powers. This is what he says : "Under what cannon of sanity, then, can any government, or any generation, with its limited perspectives, its fallible judgement, its obvious proneness to self-deception, delusion, and error, make a decision for all future ages about the very existence of even a single country? Still more, how can any one nation treat as a purely private right its decision on a matter that will affect the life and health and continued existence of the rest of mankind?"

This is from a recent article by Mr. Mumford, entitled "The Morals of Extermination".

The nuclear countries must forgive us therefore for saying to them that they have no right to continue testing nuclear weapons because their own leaders have said that they cannot any longer get security this way and because by testing nuclear weapons they are assuring not only their own destruction but the destruction of the world itself. Therefore, with great respect to them we feel that they have no right to continue in this process which is leading us closer to annihilation. As to what they should do, it is in their hands now.

There is a memorandum of basis which has been widely supported from all parts of the world. There is no reason why that memorandum should not be made the basis today of serious negotiations. Too long has passed in merely looking at this memorandum from a distance. Too much has been made of differences of interpretation, which have not been found to exist when other people of goodwill and drawn from the same countries have looked at this memorandum.

We appeal and we hope that this whole Committee will join unanimously in this appeal to the nuclear Powers that they should stop standing on the sidelines, that they should come to agreement on the basis of this memorandum which has been given to them, and that they should do what the world expects them to do, for unless they do it, we will not survive much longer.

INDIA USA ALGERIA FRANCE SWITZERLAND RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWEDEN BRAZIL MEXICO ETHIOPIA NIGER NIGERIA BURMA POLAND ITALY

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Azim Husain's Statement on U.N. Budget Estimates

Speaking in Fifth Committee of the United Nations Shri Azim Husain, Member of Indian Delegation, made the following statement on 11th October 1962 on U.N. Budget Estimates for 1963 :

Mr. Chairman, to begin with, my Delegation would like to pay a warm tribute to the Acting Secretary General on the presentation of his first budget, and to the impartial and the efficient manner in which the work of the Organization has been carried out on a more intensive and extensive scale than ever before. During a very difficult period the Secretary General and the Secretariat staff have acted as true international civil servants. My Delegation would also like to express its appreciation of the manner of the preparation of the documentation in respect of the 1963 budget; it gives comparative figures in respect of earlier years, it is clearer and more intelligible than before, and the explanations now offered under various headings and sections give all information necessary for a proper and a vivid understanding of what has transpired during the current year, and what may be expected during the year to come. In his statement before this Committee on October 4th, the Secretary-General shed further light on the latest position in regard to the more important issues pertaining to the new budget. My Delegation would also like to express its admiration for the work done by the Advisory Committee, and for the most illuminating comments made by the Chairman, Mr. Aghnides, when he introduced the report of the Advisory Committee. The meticulous care, the sense of responsibility, and the sympathetic understanding with which the Advisory Committee has done its work is evidenced by the fact that the Secretary General does not intend to contest the cuts proposed by the Advisory Committee. This has simplified the task of this Committee in examining the budget estimates, but at the same time both the Secretary General and the Advisory Committee have raised certain basic issues of principle for the consideration, of the General Assembly, which need the most earnest and careful examination by this Committee.

It is gratifying to note from the Secretary General's Report that the cash position of the Organisation has improved due to the fact that the contributions received towards the Congo Ad Hoc Account and miscellaneous income

230

exceeded the total cash disbursements during 1961. Also, the contributions to the regular budget increased from 81.9% to 84.85% at the end of 1961. In addition, the bond issue has helped to overcome the current cash difficulties of the Organization. But, as observed by the Secretary General before this Committee on October 4th, the financial crisis in which the Organization finds itself continues, and it was difficult-if not impossible-for him to predict what the position will be even three months from now. The total contributions to the regular budget outstanding at the end of 1961 was \$ 13 million. The position of the Working Capital Fund is no better, which can no longer be regarded as a source of cash to fill the gap created by the late payment of contributions, and a substantial increase has been proposed. Over \$ 31 million or 30% of the total receivable amount in respect of the Special Account of the U.N.E.F. remained to be collected from over one-third of the Member States. Contributions to the Congo Ad Hoc Account amounting to \$ 10 million were in arrears from 81 Member States. In consequence, the Secretary General told us that on 3rd August 1962 unpaid obligations amounted to \$ 139.7 million, as against net cash resources of only \$ 33.3 million. Thus the gap between receipts and expenditures continues to increase.

In order to remedy this grave situation, it would seem appropriate for the General Assem-

bly to make a specific request to the Member States concerned to clear their arrears in respect of the regular contributions, as well as the Working Capital Fund, some of which have not been paid since 1957 despite repeated requests having been made for their payment. In respect of the floating of U.N. Bonds, though by 1st August 1962 over \$ 72 million had been pledged, less than \$ 28 million had been paid by 18 countries, with the result that the Secretary General had to resort to borrowing on a large scale from special funds. It needs to be emphasized that such borrowings could not remain indefinitely outstanding, in view of the dwindling resources of the Organization. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that Member States should pay their contributions to all the U.N. accounts regularly, so as to ensure the efficient working of the Organization in the interest of maintaining peace and security, and to assist the social and economic development of the world.

An important question in this regard pertains to the contributions to the Special Account of U.N.E.F. and the Congo Ad Hoc Account. This matter is not free from difficulties, because it is not a question of lack of diligence of king payments, nor is it a question of inability to pay, but a question of refusal to pay for other reasons. This is an involved and a difficult political-not legal--question which needs to be resolved by a laborious, long and difficult process of mutual accommodation and adjustment within the General Assembly between the two opposing views. We have three items on our Agenda, items 9, 10 and 11, concerning the cost and financing of U.N.E.F. and Congo operations, as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. My Delegation would, therefore, express its views on this guestion at the appropriate time.

I would like to add that so far as India is concerned, we have not only paid our contribution for 1961 to the regular budget, but our contribution for 1962 has also been paid, and there are no arrears in respect of any previous years. In respect of the \$ 140,000 held in the Suspense Account, the position has been explained in Document A/C50/920/Add.1. Likewise, India has met fully up to date its obligation in respect of the Working Capital Fund. Similarly, India has made its full and complete contribution to the Special Account of the U.N.E.F. and the U.N. Congo Ad Hoc Account for the entire respective periods up to 30th June 1962. Finally, the Government of India have decided to subscribe to the extent of \$ 2 million for purchase of U.N. Bonds. Funds have been voted by our Parliament, and necessary steps are being taken to purchase the Bonds.

The Secretary General has proposed a budget of over \$ 86.6 million, which means an increase amounting to about \$ 4.5 million or $5 \frac{1}{2}$ % as compared to 1962 appropriations. As we have been warned by the Secretary General, by the time this Session concludes possibly the estimates will be increased further, as a result of decisions taken by the Assembly. Last year the increase over the previous year's budget was 3%. It may be recalled that in the last five years the U.N. budget has already increased by 50%. The new increase is, therefore, a matter requiring serious attention. This increase is, occasioned by the greater number of programmes requiring serious attention. This increase is, occasioned by the greater number of programmes requested by Member States to be performed. and by the rising cost of services, materials and equipment. It need hardly be recalled what has been repeated here in recent years in this Committee by many delegations, that threequarters of this world lives in conditions of extreme poverty, and the bulk of the membership of the U.N. now consists of countries from

231

this underdeveloped part of the world, who find it difficult to meet the growing budgetary demands of the U.N. without the curtailment of some of their essential internal development activities. If we are, therefore, to curb this ever-increasing budget, and to maintain it at a level consistent with the capacity of the Member States to support it, it would be necessary to carefully scrutinize what procedural and other restrictions can be imposed upon ourselves to bring about this result. In its own interest the Organization would have to adopt a policy of austerity. The alternative is financial collapse, which would deal a shattering blow to the hopes of mankind for peace and progress.

The Advisory Committee in paragraphs

22-27 have expressed their concern about the rapid expansion in the number of conferences and meetings both at Headquarters and at Geneva. My Delegation shares this concern. Since this matter would be discussed in detail under item IV of our Agenda-Review of the pattern of conferences established in terms of General Assembly Resolution 1022 (XII)-my Delegation would offer its detailed comments at that time, and at this stage would only stress the importance of this item from the point of view of economy, and as one of the factors necessary to prevent a runaway budget. We agree with the view of the Advisory Committee that General Assembly Resolution 1202 (XII) is inadequate and out of date, and needs to be modified in accordance with new and realistic conditions now prevailing.

There is also the question of duplication of work by a number of committees, political and economic, with more or less overlapping functions, to which the Secretary General has drawn attention in his introduction to his Annual Report on the work of the Organization. He has illustrated this by an example in the field of Information from Non-Self Governing Territories. This is a specific area in which the corporation of Member States in the Main Committees concerned could help to avoid such overlapping of functions, and thereby save unnecessary expenditure on conference services.

As regards the principal reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee, since this Committee has already voted on some of those proposals, I shall not comment thereon. Other reductions proposed fall in Sections (3) and (4), especially as, under the heading "Staff costs and related activities", an increase of 5% was proposed over 1962 appropriations, mainly in the economic and social fields. The Point that needs special emphasis is mentioned in paragraph (123) of the Advisory Committee's Seventh Report, which recommends that when the level and functions of posts have yet to be clearly formulated or their duration uncertain, the needs are best met under the category of temporary assistance, rather than by the creation of more established posts. It is also hoped that reductions in the staff of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self Governing Territories, as envisaged in paragraph (29) of the Secretary General's Foreword, would be effected.

In connection with General Service salary scales at Geneva, my Delegation agrees with the views expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph (71) of their Seventh Report. It is of the utmost importance that the tendency towards unilateral action and disregard of objective judgments should be curbed. The action taken by W.H.O. led to I.L.O. taking similar action followed by the U.N. While the Secretary General is continuing his consultations with other interested organizations to find a satisfactory basis for subsequent adjustment of salaries, my Delegation would like to support the recommendations contained in the Salary Review Committee's Report of 1956 concerning the need for a strongly constituted independent body to make judgments when problems arise in the administration of the common system.

Since major increases have taken place as a result of new economic and social activities. these deserve special attention. As the Secretary General pointed out, the expansion of the Organization and its activities is inevitable and necessary, if it is to keep pace with a fast changing and progressing world, and meet the needs of its: vast new membership of recently independent developing countries. The growth of the Organization stems not so much from the operation of Parkinson's Law as from the new work programmes of varying urgency and importance proposed every year by Member States, such as the Decade of Development, Peaceful Uses of Outerspace, International Travel and Tourism, African Development Bank, and so on.

At the same time I must repeat that practically half the new membership is of economically underdeveloped countries who cannot augment the finances of the Organization to the extent of its expanding requirements. The expansion, his therefore, to be curbed. Of this, the Acting Secretary General is deeply conscious by adopting the phrase "controlled expansion" as his motto. We would like to congratulate the Acting Secretary General on the cautious manner in which be, since his assumption of office last years has proceeded with the necessary expansion of the Organization, and the generally modest further increase he has proposed. At the same time, it is necessary to follow the counsel of caution contained in paragraph (38) of the Seventh Report of the Advisory Committee, namely, that no staff expansion-controlled or otherwise-should take place, unless it is clear that it is beyond the capacity of existing staff to absorb new work loads resulting from new decisions of the various U.N. organs. The Advisory Committee is not at all certain that the absorption capacity has been completely exhausted, and that each programme added from now on automatically calls for additional staff. It may be possible to manage with the existing staff by requiring higher professional and technical training, and merging some work loads or sections. My Delegation agrees with the recommendation that a careful survey of existing resources be made, perhaps by the Controllers' Administrative Management Service, or any other independent expert group that the Secretary General may wish to appoint, before "controlled expansion" is resorted to. In this connection. I have no doubt that the Controllers' Administrative Management Service is already familiar with the Work-Study method of assessing work loads which has been successfully employed in the U.K., India, and perhaps other countries as well.

The second important point is the one mentioned on many occasions in the past and reiterated by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 8 and 9 of their Ninth Report (Document A/5243) drawing attention to the importance of drawing up of carefully thought out priorities especially by the Economic and Social Council, so as to ensure concentration of effort within limited resources. Only through the constant review of activities and staffing arrangements would it be possible to eliminate work which was of lesser importance, or whose continued justification was open to doubt, and to transfer staff to more vital areas. In this connection, my Delegation supports the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph (47) of their Seventh Report that the time has arrived for a systematic review and rationalisation of the host of Economic and Social Council decisions, as well as parallel

General Assembly decisions over a period of 15 years, so as to eliminate duplication and to sort out the more essential from the less essential, and to re-orientate all such activities to accompany the Development Decade. Perhaps this could be assisted by the establishment of a Special Committee on co-ordination and the adoption of Resolution 909 (XXXIV) calling for a thorough review and reassessment of existing work programmes mentioned by the Secretary General in his address to this Committee. The result of these two reviews should be placed before the next Session of the General Assembly for authorisation for "controlled expansion of staff", after full consideration of all its administrative and budgetary implications.

in respect of the additional expenditure of \$ 578,000 proposed by the Secretary General in document A/C5/919, the views of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 42 to 47 of their Seventh Report have been supplemented in paragraphs 6 and 11 of their Ninth Report (A/5243). The Indian Delegation agrees with the proposed reduction of \$ 96,000 and strongly supports the suggestion of the Advisory Committee about transmitting to the Economic and Social Council these Reports, bearing on their activities. A part of the financial difficulties of the Organization has arisen from the large and extensive decisions of the Economic and Social Council; it would, therefore, seem desirable that in the interest of effective operation and solvency of the Organization, suitable procedures should be adopted to avoid these difficulties in the future.

Another important item of expenditure is the public information activities which my Delegation regards as essential and important, and deserving of expansion in as many directions as possible. At the same time my Delegation is not unmindful of the fact that these activities can be expanded with the commensurate expenditure almost ad infinitum. Already within two years the budget from a little over \$ 5 million is proposed to be increased to a little over \$ 6 million, that is an increase of 20%. We would, therefore, agree with the recommendation of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph (29) of their Seventh Report, that the continuation of the policy of stabilisation is possible, and should be confirmed by the General Assembly. And, further, that a ceiling of \$ 6 million may be prescribed for 1963. The reduction in the budget estimates proposed by the Secretary General is \$ 198,840, which is about 3%, and is, therefore, not very large. As to how this reduction is to be effected and how the O.P.I. budget may be stabilised, my Delegation, while supporting the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 30, 31 and 32 of their Seventh

233

Report, would make further suggestions and observations at the time of the detailed discussion of the O.P.I. budget under Section (3).

It would be recalled that earlier this Committee considered an unusually large demand of \$2.7 million as supplementary appropriations. Unless appropriate steps are taken, we may be faced next year with a similar or larger demand for supplementary appropriations. In this connection, therefore, my Delegation drew attention to paragraphs 18-20 of the Advisory Committee's Seventh Report, and urged the importance of conforming to Financial Regulation 13.1 and Rule 154 of the Assembly's Rules of Procedure, otherwise the General Assembly would lose overall financial control vested in the General Assembly by the Charter. It is hoped that the letter transmitted by the Chairman to the President of the General Assembly would produce the desired result.

My Delegation also pointed out at the time that simultaneously with the implementation of Rule 154 by all the committees and the Assembly, the Secretariat should ensure the effective implementation of the complementary Rule 155, in accordance with which the Secretary General is required to keep all committees informed of the detailed estimated cost of all resolutions which have been recommended by the committees for approval by the General Assembly. It would be recalled that last year the Advisory Committee in paragraph 54 of Document A/4901, while discussing this matter, observed that Rule 155 appeared to have become a 'dead letter', and urged that attention should be given to its application. This was mentioned by my Delegation last year in this Committee, and I would like to. reiterate that.

While it may be difficult for the Secretariat to propose estimated costs of resolutions which do not give adequate guidance, the raising of this question, which have repeatedly come up for occasion would induce the committees concerned to pay greater attention to this matter than has been done hitherto.

Several delegations alluded to the question of the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat. The views of my Delegation on this question, which have repeatedly come up for consideration since the very inception of the U.N., are well known. We co-sponsored last year the Thirteen Power resolution on the subject, and there is very little that can be added to its basic principle that minority of Member States should not monopolise the Secretariat. The Acting Secretary General has already taken some steps towards the solution of this problem. This matter would come up for detailed discussion under item (7) of our Agenda, in respect of which the report of the Secretary General is awaited. My Delegation would carefully study this report and express our views thereon at the appropriate time.

There appears to be no particular difficulty in this Committee coming to a decision about the 1963 budget estimates., because the Secretary General, conscious of the need for stringent economy, has decided not to contest the reduction of \$1,946,050 recommended by the Advisory Committee, if that be the wish of this Committee. My Delegation would like to express its deep appreciation of the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness shown by the Secretary General, and wish him God speed in his efforts to maintain the Organization within the limitations in which we find ourselves today as an effective instrument of international cooperation.

SHRI B. N. CHAKRAVARTY'S STATEMENT IN REPLY TO PAKISTAN FOREIGN MINISTER

Replying to the criticism of India made by Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative made the following statement on October 15 1962 :

I very much regret the necessity of coming

here again to reply to some of the misstatements made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on Friday last. As I shall attempt to show, he has not answered any of my questions nor. has he attempted to disprove the accuracy of my statement. He has apparently found it impossible to do so and has therefore tried only to confuse the issue. The Foreign Minister asked me whether I can claim :

"that provisions and procedures set forth in the Indo-Pakistan Passport and Visa Agreement of 1953 have been paid the slightest respect?" (A/PV.1151, page 6)

He has quoted paragraph 17, sub-paragraphs 3 and 4 of that Agreement.

I confess that I am somewhat surprised at this question, and I find it difficult to believe that he does not remember the developments subsequent to that Agreement, Soon after the ratification of the Agreement, it became apparent that co-operation was not forthcoming from

234

Pakistani Missions in India for the repatriation of thousands of Pakistani nationals who continued illegally to cross over into India without any travel documents. All our efforts to induce the Pakistani Missions to follow the procedure as laid down in these sub-paragraphs of the 1953 Agreement were in vain.

In 1955 Pakistan amended its Pakistan (Control of Entry) Act of 1952. Under article 7 of this amended Pakistani Act, the Central Government was authorized to prosecute or remove Indian nationals from Pakistan and to :

"use all means that may in the circumstances be necessary to effect their removal".

This was in direct violation of the very procedure referred to by the Foreign Minister.

In January 1956 the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi was informed that since they were making a dead letter of the 1953 Agreement, the Government of India would be forced to assume powers to expel the large number of Pakistanis who had infiltrated into India. Even this produced no result.

It was this continued non-co-operation from Pakistan that compelled the Government of India in 1957 to amend the Foreigners Act of 1946 and to apply its provisions to nationals of Pakistan as much as to other foreigners for purposes of deportation, etc. Pakistan also immediately followed suit and amended the Pakistan Foreigners Act to cover the deportation of Indian nationals. Am I to understand that the Foreign Minister is not aware of this legislation of his own Government which put an end to the provisions of sub-paragraphs 3 and 4 of paragraph 17? May I also, in all humility remind him that these provisions were not followed by Pakistan when Indians were deported from East Pakistan.

The Foreign Minister has quoted from an Indian weekly called The New Age, which is run by an opposition party. Pakistan, which does not now believe in any political parties, may not know it, but those that are familiar with such a system will know that opposition parties sometimes try to make capital out of any situation which they consider to be the result of the Administration's inefficiency.

The Foreign Minister has, however, not been fair to The New Age by quoting out of context only some portions from that lengthy article. Fortunately, I have the journal here, and I crave your indulgence to read the first part of the same article which the Foreign Minister has thought fit to suppress

"The infiltration of Pakistani Muslims into Tripura is not a new feature. For the last fifteen years infiltration has been going on, often with the connivance of the local administration. Driven mostly by hunger for land and jobs, Pakistani Muslims entered Tripura, raised huts on Khas Government lands and bribed the corrupt officials in order to get permission to stay on permanently in Tripura.

But this infiltration by Pakistani Muslims could no longer be ignored because of the present deterioration"--they were writing this in July---of relations between India and Pakistan, particularly, on the issue of Kashmir, and also because of the frequent border incidents followed by heavy concentration of Pakistani forces in the regions bordering on Tripura. These developments were rightly viewed with alarm and anxiety by the people of this territory.

"And when, in this background, the Administration. revealed that the percentage of Muslim Population in Tripura had doubled during the last ten years (between 1951 and 1961) and the infiltration of Pakistani Muslims was still no less than a hundred a month, a spontaneous cry was raised to stop this infiltration and to drive out the Pakistani Muslims who had infiltrated during the last 15 years.

". Amarpur"-which has been refer-red to by the Foreign Minister--"where the Muslim population during the last 10 years increased by 242 per cent was selected as the 'worst nest' of Pakistanis. . ."

I think I have quoted enough to show what this weekly, which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan recognizes as a well-known Indian journal, has to say about Pakistani infiltration and what a distorted picture he has presented by quoting out of context from its article.

The Foreign Minister has seen an ominous significance in a simple, reorganization of our Eastern. Army Command which became necessary for facilitating military operations against recent aggressive Chinese incursions into India. Pakistan, which is still looked upon as a crusader against Communism and which is given substantial military aid on that consideration, has now chosen to flirt with China.

A Reuter's report of 13 October said that border negotiations between China and

235

Pakistan had begun in Peiping. No wonder Pakistan has of late been less enthusiastic about its membership of SEATO.

I now come to the Foreign Minister's comments on the statement which I made on 3 October. He has made much of an unfortunate typographical error in the provisional records which had been corrected immediately. What I said was : "statutorily debarred from holding the highest office in the State", not "the highest offices". He has also misunderstood me in thinking that non-Muslims are second-class citizens merely because they are so debarred. I did not say that they were second-class citizens only because they were deprived of the birthright of every citizen to hold the highest office. I have given other evidence as well, namely, that they are subjected to political and economic discrimination and are left with a sense of insecurity,

In his attempt to justify the discriminatory constitutional provisions in Pakistan, the Foreign Minister has quoted as an example that in the United Kingdom the Crown can only be worn by a Christian, and that of a particular denomination. This is indeed a queer example to cite. The Crown is not an elective office. Not every Christian, even of that particular denomination, can aspire to be King or Queen of England.

What discrimination can others complain of ? It is only an elective office to which a citizen can aspire; it is not to a hereditary monarchy.

Again, if he had to refer to the Constitution of the United States, he might have done well if he had paid a tribute to the American electorate, who are not swayed by religious considerations in electing their President.

I used the words, "Pakistan claims to be an Islamic State", advisedly because I have no reason to think that Pakistan is truly an Islamic State. The Foreign Minister has merely tried to sidetrack the main issue which I had raised, namely, that as many as 2.25 million non-Muslims had been driven out of East Pakistan during the period 1951 to 1961. This is an indisputable fact which he has not been able to challenge.

The Foreign Minister has again misquoted me when he said that I had alleged that not a single general election had been held in Pakistan ever since its establishment in 1947. He has omitted the very material qualifying phrase which I used, namely, "even on the comparatively limited franchise which was obtaining in the British days". The only election that has been held since 1947 was, the one held in the early part of this year, and that was an indirect election through an electoral college of 80,000 electors in a population of 90 million. Does he challenge my statement that this election to the National Assembly was not even on the comparatively limited franchise which was obtaining during the British days ? No, he cannot,

Coming now to the question of Kashmir, again the Foreign Minister has summarized my arguments but has evaded a straight answer. Does he challenge my statement that the British Government made it clear that the partition was of British India and that it did not apply to those States ruled by Indian princes? No. Does he challenge my statement that both India and Pakistan, as also the United Kingdom, were partners to the decision that accession should be decided only by the princes ruling the State! No. He has not been able to challenge my statement that the right to accede to either India or Pakistan was the right to be exercised by the princes; that the accession of a State had nothing to do with the principle on which British India was partitioned. He has not answered my question whether Pakistan would grant the right of self-determination to the people of the States whose rulers acceded to Pakistan. Does he question the legality of those accessions ? He has not answered my question why Pakistan, if it believes in the principle of self-determination, had to invade the State of Kashmir in the first place. These are indeed inconvenient questions-best to evade.

While he has evaded answers to my questions, I shall not evade an answer to his question whether I have the audacity, as he says, to maintain that it was for the feudal Maharaja alone to decide the destiny of the 4 million people of Kashmir. My answer is categorical and straight. Yes, that indeed was the decision and, what is more, a decision to which both Pakistan and India, as also the United Kingdom. were parties. That was the principle followed in the case of some 600 princely States which acceded either to India or to Pakistan. That the accession is not related to the principle of partition of British India is clear from the British Government's announcement of 3 June 1947. which said :

"His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that the decisions announced (about partition)... relate only to British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission's Memorandum of 12th May, 1946, remains unchanged."

236

The Cabinet Missions Memorandum reads as follows :

"His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of paramountcy. This means that the rights which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by the States to the paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering into a federal relationship with the successor government or governments in British India or, failing this, enter into particular political arrangements with it or them."

Provision for accession was made in the Government of India Act of 1935 as adapted under the Indian Independence Act of 1947 :

"An Indian State shall be deemed to have acceded to the dominion if the Governor-General has signified his acceptance of an Instrument of Accession executed by the Ruler thereof,"

The Foreign Minister has referred to Junagadh. The objection to the accession of Junagadh to Pakistan was because it was contrary to the principle of contiguity; because the State was not contiguous to Pakistan. There was also an expressed opposition from the population. In the case of Kashmir, not merely the Ruler, but also the principal political party in the State, 90 per cent of whose members were Muslims, also agreed to the accession.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has asked me whether a plebiscite now would be disastrous for India. Again, I would not evade the issue as he has done to my questions. My answer is that, of course, it would be disastrous for India, not because, as the Foreign Minister imagines, the plebiscite would go in favour of Pakistan, but because the rousing of communal passions would be disastrous for the minority communities both in India and in Pakistan. Pakistan may not care for the fate of its minorities; India does. Even though the accession of Kashmir was legally final, we accepted the Security Council resolutions of August 1948 and January 1949 for the sake of a peaceful settlement, but on the specific condition that Pakistan would first withdraw its troops from that part of Kashmir occupied by them.

It was also made clear that if that were not done, we would not be bound by the resolutions. We had then hoped that the plebiscite would be over in a few months' time. In 1948 and 1949, we were still passing through the horrors of partition, attended by mass migrations and communal riots. Conditions in India and Pakistan at that time were in any case unsettled. The situation was disturbed, and a plebiscite in Kashmir then involving the arousing of communal passions in those circumstances could not have led to a very much further worsening of the situation.

Today, all that is past history, a history of which both India and Pakistan should be ashamed. Fourteen years have elapsed since then, and as Pakistan deliberately did not comply with those resolutions, and since there have been developments in Kashmir itself, it is no longer possible to be bound by or to proceed on the basis of those resolutions. During these years we have, after a great deal of effort, succeeded in building up a stable democracy in India on a secular basis. With 50 million Muslims, and many millions of Christians and many other minorities, we are not prepared to have another mass migration and large-scale killings which would disturb the stability of India and endanger our very existence. It would spell the ruin of all that India has striven for and accomplished during the last fifteen years. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has quoted Ambassador Jarring, but he has forgotten what Mr. Jarring said in his report to the Security Council dated 29 April 1957. Mr. Jarring stated :

"The implementation of international agree-

ments of an ad hoc character which has not been achieved fairly speedily may become Progressively more difficult, because the situation with which it was to cope has tended to change."

That is precisely what has happened. It is too late in the day for Pakistan now to suggest that we get back to the situation which obtained in 1948 and 1949.

The Foreign Minister ended up with a quotation from the founder of Pakistan. These were indeed noble expressions of sentiments by a great leader, but the squeezing out of two and a quarter million non-Muslim citizens of East Pakistan during the period of 1951 to 1961, even after the initial mass migrations, bears eloquent testimony to the manner in which these promises and assurances have been honoured after his death by successive Pakistan Governments.

237

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO SWITZERLAND UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN CHINA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Speech in Political Committee

Speech delivered by Ambassador B. N. Chakravarty, Permanent Representative of India in the Special Political Committee of the United Nations on October, 22, 1962 :

Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to take this opportunity to welcome in our midst the distinguished delegates of Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago and Algeria. We are also looking forward to welcoming Uganda. We know they have valuable contributions to make to our deliberations here. This year, we have decided to combine the two items of race conflict in South Africa and the treatment of people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin in the Republic of South Africa under the single heading "The Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa." Discussions on these two subjects have been going on for a long time but it is regrettable that South Africa has paid no heed to the successive resolutions that have been passed by the General Assembly year after year. Far from taking any liberal attitude, the Government of South Africa has been taking a progressively more ruthless policy towards the non-white, population. The question of the treatment of the people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin has been under consideration since 1946. This question really dates back to eighties of the last century when the Government of South Africa began to enforce discriminatory measures against them in violation of the solemn assurance given as early as 1875 that the Indian settlers would be accorded "privileges no whit inferior to those of any other class of Her Majesty's subjects resident in the Colonies." The subject has been under discussion between the Governments of India and South Africa for a long time and, although after prolonged negotiations, the Cape Town Agreement was reached in 1927 and these were solemnly reaffirmed in 1932, the terms of these agreements were not implemented by the South African Government. The immediate cause for bringing up the question to the General Assembly in 1946 was the passing of the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act, otherwise called the Ghetto Act by the South African Parliament, in 1946.

South Africa took up the plea of domestic jurisdiction under Article 2 (7) of the Charter. It was pointed out that the South African Government had infringed not only the fundamental principles and purposes of the Charter in respect of all its non-white population but also violated the Cape Town Agreements of 1927 and 1932 in respect of its population of Indian origin. Field Marshal Smuts, while conceding that the question might cease to be one of domestic jurisdiction, if there had been a treaty regulating the rights of persons of Indian origin in South Africa, denied that the Cape Town Agreements were instruments giving rise to any such treaty obligations. We had to point out that the Cape Town Agreement was solemnly ratified by the legislatures of both South Africa and India and was undoubtedly a Treaty. After a good deal of discussion, the plea of domestic jurisdiction was rejected and a very mild resolution adopted. The General Assembly expressed the opinion "that the treatment of Indians in the Union should be in conformity with the international obligations under the agreements concluded between the two Governments and the relevant provisions of the Charter" and requested the two Governments "to report at the next session of the General Assembly the measures adopted to this effect (52nd plenary meeting, 8 December 1946)." South Africa completely ignored this resolution, and when the matter came up in the second session, South Africa again objected to the inclusion of the item on the strength of Article 2(7) of the Charter. This plea was again rejected and the First Committee adopted a resolution reaffirming the resolution of 8 December 1946 and requesting the two Governments to enter into discussions and to invite the Government of Pakistan to take part in such discussions. This resolution however failed to secure a twothirds majority. In the third session the General Assembly adopted a resolution inviting the Governments of India, Pakistan and South Africa to enter into discussion. The question did not come up in the fourth session as correspondence was going on between the three Governments at the time. No conference materialised and although similar resolutions were passed in the fifth and subsequent sessions, South Africa ignored these resolutions, as before.

The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of Apartheid was first raised in 1952 at the instance of India and 12 other Asian-African countries. Although this item, came up before the General Assembly only in the seventh session, reference had been made to the subject in various resolutions of the General Assembly even earlier. This resolution, 103 (1) of the General Assembly passed in its first session, declared that "it is in the higher interest of humanity to put an end to religious and so-called racial persecution" and called upon all Governments

"to conform to the letter and spirit of the Charter and to take the most prompt and energetic steps to that end". Again in the 5th session, although the subject matter was the treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa, the resolution stated in its preamble "Considering that the policy of racial segregation (apartheid) is necessarily based on doctrines of racial discrimination" and went on to say in paragraph 3 of its operative part "Calls upon the Governments concerned to refrain from taking any steps which would prejudice the success of their negotiations, in particular, the implementation or enforcement of the provision of the Group Areas Act, pending the conclusion of such negotiations". When the question of race conflict was first brought up in 1952, South Africa as usual took up the plea of domestic jurisdiction and urged that the General Assembly was not competent to consider the item in accordance with Article 2(7). This plea was rejected and ever since 1952, this item has been debated in the Assembly and various resolutions passed. All these have been completely ignored by- South Africa. Not only did the Government of South Africa ignore these resolutions, mild as they were, further stringent measures were adopted by the Government accentuating the race conflict.

I have given this brief historical survey mainly for the benefit of the new member States of the United Nations and those individual representatives in this Committee who may be new to the subject. The two items had remained separate for so many years because of historical reasons and because of the violation of the solemn treaty obligations undertaken by the Government of South Africa in regard to the ease of the people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin. Not only did that Government violate the provisions of the Charter, it also violated the specific obligations undertaken by her under a solemn international agreement. The position was further complicated by the fact that for a long time, the South African Government did not consider the people of Indian and Indo-Pakistan origin to be South African nationals although they had been there for a century. Prime, Minister Verwoerd, as late as 1st July 1959, referred to these people as "foreign Natives who are not our concern and our responsibility". The expression "Foreign Natives" is a contradiction in terms. If a person is a native of a country be cannot be foreign.

Conversely, a foreigner cannot be a, native of the country. To the racists of South Africa, however, native with a capital N has a special significance and has not the ordinary dictionary meaning of the word 'native but means member of non-European or uncivilized race. If persons of Indian origin, 95% of whom were born in South Africa and have been there for generations are: to be treated as aliens, why should not South Africans of European origin be treated as aliens. as well. As Bishop Reeves says in his book, South Africans of Indian origin are not only being deprived of their lands but also of their means of livelihood.

Be that as it may, it was, as I said before, on these historic and legal considerations that the two items had to be kept separate. My Delegation has however repeatedly pointed out during debates in this Committee that it was not India's desire that any special treatment should be accorded to the people of Indian origin in South Africa. The Government of India did not isolate this question from that of Apartheid as a whole and was always in favour of equal treatment, equal rights and privileges for all the inhabitants Of South Africa, whatever their Origin, race or religion. By agreeing to merge the item this year, the Government of India have given further proof, if indeed any proof were needed, to show that India does not ask for any relief or special treatment for persons of Indian origin which will not at the same time apply to Africans. India looks upon the, solution of the question of the treatment of Indians in South Africa as an integral part of the solution of the general problem of Apartheid. We took this step this year mainly because there is no point in having two debates on items which are only two facets of the same policy of Apartheid. One debate will not only save the time of the Committee but will also increase the effectiveness of the debate by marshalling all relevant facts.

I had the honour to speak in this Committee last year on this subject. I had then brought out in detail enough material to show how absurd is the claim of the distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa that Apartheid really means a policy of separate development for South Africa's nonwhite population. In doing so, I had restricted myself to referring mainly to the lawless laws that exist on the South African Statute Book. The existence of these laws could not be denied and the laws themselves throw an flood of light on the conditions in South To my knowledge, none of these laws have, during the course of the year, been repeated, nor has the implementation of-thew harsh laws been in any way relaxed. In fact, there has been some further legislation which is designed to inflict even- greater tyranny and suffering on the nonwhite population of South Africa. I refer to the General Law Amendment Act, which is popularly known as the Sabotage Act which became law on the 27th June this year. As the title indicates,

239

it is a series of amendments of laws that have been already on the Statute Books to maintain white supremacy in South Africa. Sabotage is defined in very broad terms and includes almost every conceivable action to which the Administration can choose to object. For example, the Administration may consider it as sabotage, any action that may be damaging or injurious to public health, to supplies of water, light, power, fuel, foodstuffs, to sanitation and medical facilities, to communications, transportation or to any property. There would normally be no pre-trial examination, trial should be without jury and the burden of proof of innocence is on the accused. The punishment on conviction is a minimum of five years' imprisonment and the maximum penalty is death, even for a juvenile. The International Commission of Jurists on June 21, 1962, issued a statement from Geneva condemning the Bill. Sir Leslie Monroe, who was Secretary General, had previously sent the following telegram to Prime Minister Verwoerd:

"The Bill, as reported in the international press prescribes penalties of extraordinary severity, including the maximum penalty of death for sabotage for political motives. May I respectfully urge upon Your Excellency that the extreme penalty for sabotage for political motives is unwarranted in democratic jurisprudence and that your Government pause before requesting the legislature to pass such a Draconian measure."

This appeal went unheeded. The Commission particularly criticised the extremely wide terms of the offence of sabotage, the excessive punishment which it provides (maximum penalty being death by hanging) and the placing of the onus of proof on the accused. In the view of the Commission, the Bill drastically reduces the right of free assembly, of freedom of speech, of the freedom of the press and freedom of movement. The definition of 'sabotage is so wide that almost anyone who takes any action against the status quo may, be accused of sabotage.

Chief Luthuli, President of the African National Congress, now under a ban, has said in a message to a London journal that "South Africa's New Sabotage Bill is designed to inflict tyranny and suffering. Provisions of the Bill go far beyond legitimate peace-time security measures in truly democratic countries!'. He adds "that the Act amounts to admission by the South African Government that the freedom struggle of the people has become effective; but it cannot and will not destroy the movement for liberation." A prominent leader of the banned African National Congress Mr. Nelson Mandela was arrested on August 5. Along with him was arrested Walter Sisulu. A warrant was also issued for the arrest of Patrick Duacan on August 15. He is son of the former Governor-General and editor of the Liberal fortnightly 'Contact'. Fortunately, Mr. Duncan had fled to Basutoland some time before.

The New York Times of October 14, 1962, reported the first house arrest order issued under this new Act. The Order was issued by the Minister of Justice against Mrs. Helen Joseph, a Johannesburg widow who was National Vice-President of the banned Congress of Democrats, an organisation working for multiracial rule in South Africa. The five-year arrest order confines Mrs. Joseph to her suburban home between 6.30 P.M. and 6.30 A.M. on weekdays and 2.30 P.M. on Saturdays and 6.30 A.M. on Mondays. She may not leave her home on holidays, may not leave Johannesburg, may not have visitors at home and must report regularly to the police station. It is this type of lawless law which is bound to drive opposition underground and subjects South Africa to A tyranny which is worse than that practised even in Nazi Germany.

The distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa has complained that this Committee considered the Bantustan policy to be merely a bluff. He claims that this policy has been well received by the Bantu of Transkei and that it is operating smoothly and successfully. The fact however is that Bantustan is nothing more than a native reserve. It has been so arranged as to make labour easily available to industries which are being located on the borders of these Bantustans. The whites will have cheap labour from these Bantustans, where no alternative employment is available and at the same time the labour will return across the border to Bantustan without disturbing the policy of Apartheid. Under the so-called self-government, the police and the security forces would still remain the responsibility of the whites. The Chiefs are nominated by Government and they have to work under the control and guidance of white administrators who can get rid of them any time they prove difficult. With the help of these docile Chiefs the worst kind of police state is being created. Let us not be fooled by this sort of self-government. As regards the future of these Bantustans, the position has been made quite clear-if any clarification was needed-by Prime Minister Verwoerd, who, speaking in the Senate on 1 May 1961, categorically stated that "when we talk about the native's rights of self-government in these areas we cannot mean that we intend by that to cut large slices out of South Africa and turn them into independent States". So much for self-government.

240

It is interesting to note in this connection what Bishop Ambrose Reeves has to say in his recent book "South Africa-Yesterday and Tomorrow"-

"Whatever its advocates may say the fact is that in practice apartheid has meant naked and deliberate discrimination against Africans, Indians and Coloureds alike. It is a myth to describe apartheid as "parallel development" for such development requires equal opportunities and facilities for all. These do not exist in South Africa. What does exist is deliberate division and carefully devised inequality. This is the policy that has pursued so relentlessly at such great moral, social, political and financial cost. Apartheid has dulled the sense of justice of the Whites and brutalised thousands. It has created one law, for the Whites and another for the Non-Whites. It has shown a cynical disregard for the worth and dignity of the individual, and an ever-increasing curtailment of the already restricted rights of the Non-Whites. In short, apartheid has taken the universal failings of racial prejudice and fear and exalted them into virtues, and has made colour differences the standard for judging the worth of a man".

The distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa has complained bitterly against the functioning of the United- Nations organisation and has said that "During past years, it has become a different organisation. The ideals of its founders have been ruthlessly pushed aside, The actions of too many of the member States are actuated by self-interest. Important provisions of the United Nations Charter are callously disregarded or otherwise used to serve the ends of groups of States. Principles are ignored. Instead, there has developed the application of what I last year described as the 'double standard'." It is indeed amazing that South Africa which has been consistently violating the provisions of the U. N. Charter and flouting the successive resolutions of the General Assembly should complain that "important provisions of the U. N. Charter are callously disregarded." It is indeed ironical that a country which has one law for the White and another for the Non-White should charge the United Nations of "double standard". Instead of condemning imaginary double standard of others, the distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa may more usefully try to correct his own double standard.

Mr. Chairman, I have however some sympathy for the distinguished Foreign Minister when he says that during the past few years the U. N. has become a different organisation, The United Nations has indeed changed since 1946 particularly so far as South Africa is concerned. There were then very few countries from Asia and Africa who were members of the United Nations. We know how difficult it was in those days even to put the two subjects we have been discussing today on the agenda. We know how during the first period up to 1957 many countries consistently abstained and some even voted against the resolutions calling upon South Africa to reconsider its Apartheid policies. Many justified the abstention on the grounds that the World Organisation was not competent to deal with the

internal affairs of a member State. This was exactly the position that was taken up by South Africa. My Delegation which was on the forefront of bringing the conditions in South Africa to the notice of this world body had a most uphill task to perform. It is not for nothing that Chief Luthuli said in his book "Let my people go". I quote: "The way in which India in U. N. O. has taken up the cudgels on behalf of the oppressed South African majority and dragged' the whole scandal of Apartheid into the open has heartened us immeasurably". It is perhaps for the same reason that the distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa has made India the 'principal target of his attack. While we deeply appreciate the compliment coming from such a great man as Chief Luthuli, no one is more conscious than we are, of our failure to get any tangible results. We can only plead that in trying to get the maximum of support of the United Nations, as it was then constituted, the resolutions on race conflict in South Africa had to be toned down and moderated as far as possible. The resolutions deplored the situation in South Africa and called upon that country to live up to the Charter which it had signed. There was a yearly request by India and Pakistan calling on South Africa to discuss the question of HI-treatment of its citizens of Indian origin. South Africa did not even reply to the communications received from India and Pakistan. It went on ignoring the harmless platitudinous resolutions that were repeatedly adopted year after year by the General Assembly. It is, therefore, understandable that the distinguished Foreign Minister should lament the passing away of those good old days. Friends started deserting South Africa and more and more countries gradually began to condemn the policy of apartheid. Ultimately, South. Africa was left with no support other than from Portugal. The situation changed even further during the last two years, after the entry of a large number of African States who, naturally, demanded some more meaningful action. The resolutions became progressively stronger but even these resolutions failed to produce the desired results. The 13th

241

session was a landmark in these developments when the United States for the first time voted for the resolution to express regret and concern that South Africa continued to flout the provisions of the U. N. Charter. It was not until the 15th session when, for the first time, none opposed the resolution except of course Portugal, and there was no abstention. The resolution called on all States "to consider taking such separate and collective action as is open to them constitutionally." As early as 1946, my Government had already taken the steps advocated in this resolution. We have no diplomatic ties with the Republic of South Africa. No ships of that country are allowed to come to Indian ports and there has been no trade between the two countries since 1946. In our opinion, there was nothing to prevent other member States from taking similar unilateral action against South Africa. Following the 15th session, several African countries broke off political or economic relations with South Africa. It is a matter of deep regret to my Delegation that other States did not find it possible to follow a similar course of action. The efforts made by a few Afro-Asian countries cost South Africa only a small portion of her trade which has been made up by increased trade with other nations carrying on trade with South Africa. If all the Afro-Asian nations were to boycott South African goods the total loss to South Africa would be no more than about 50 million dollars. South Africa would not be hurt unless the more important trading countries find it possible to go in for a trade boycott. About 7/10ths of the exports of South Africa go to ten countries and a number of them would suffer more than South Africa by a trade boycott as they have a favourable balance of trade. South Africa, therefore, knows that there is no reason to worry about any real move for economic sanctions in the United Nations. The distinguished Foreign Minister is right only to this extent that the advent of African States has made some difference in the tone of the resolutions that have been passed during the last two years.

The following report from the Cape Times of the 24th February 1962 may be of interest:

"Mr. Martin Louw, a Port Elizabeth advocate and son of the Minister of Foreign Affairs condemned certain provisions of the Immnorality Act in a letter to the East Province Herald. Mr. Martin Louw said, 'Despite caustic arguments to the contrary, Section 16 of the Act as amended is an entirely bad and ill-conceived piece of legislation. It is fundamentally bad because it sets out from an entirely unjustified and logically indefensible premise, viz., that the State is entitled to interfere in what is essentially a private relationship between adult individuals which per se causes no harm to anyone, except, possibly, the individuals concerned themselves. To that extent the relevant provisions of the Act constitute an unwarranted inroad on traditional liberty of the individual-a cornerstone of democracy in all nations with a Parliamentary form of government'."

On the 28th of February, Mr. Eric Louw, the father of Mr. Martin Louw, according to the Durban Times complained that had the letter been written by any other young man, it would not have been telegraphed to the Cape Times, nor would it have been published under double column headlines. "The double column headlines so prominently placed above the report are clearly with the intent of 'getting at' a political opponent through my son, which I can only describe as another example of the discreditable and unsavoury type of journalism which characterizes certain United Party-supporting newspapers and the manner in which the freedom of the press is being abused." We wonder if the distinguished Foreign Minister of South Africa ever paused to think that in this particular case his son might have been right and he might have been wrong.

The persistent ignoring of the Assembly resolutions by South Africa and the suppression of the non-white population there, has created a dangerous and explosive situation. So far. African movements have been remarkably peaceful and restrained, in the fare of continual provocation. The principle of non-violent resistance was first practised by Mahatma Gandhi in South Africa. The success of that movement in India had a considerable effect on the non-white leaders in South Africa. The campaign of 1952, jointly carried on by the African National Congress and the Indian Congress, was entirely based on nonviolent principles. The complete failure of these non-violent movements has now given rise to a demand for a more militant action. The nonviolent movement is being discredited and leadershin is passing on to the hands of people who feel that no change can be brought about in South Africa without violence. Time is fast running out and unless some peaceful solution is found, none may be available later. The struggle

in South Africa is slowly but inexorably moving towards a violent one and almost everyone is now reconciled to the idea that there, will be a final violent conflict between racism and African nationalism each trying to stamp out, the other. The Government seems to be determined to try to maintain itself by adopting more and more repressive measures. The opposition will

242

become better organised and as a reaction, would be more inclined to violence. The fact that a number of liberal white South Africans are leaving the country is a pointer to the shape of things to come. It may even lead to a major international conflict if the struggle by the non-whites in South Africa were to receive active support from outside. All these are dangers which cannot be ignored and there is now a serious threat to peace in this area. It is high time that some positive action is taken by South Africa to prevent this catastrophe.

The votings in the Assembly during the last few years, must have shown South Africa that she is being more and more isolated. The world unequivocally condemns the racial policy followed by the Government of South Africa and appeals to that Government to take urgent steps to put a stop to this evil. South Africa must not think that the rest of the world is out of step or that criticism is made against its Government out of some particular grudge. As I said last year; we speak more in sorrow than in anger. The time has come when South Africa must understand that the policy of Apartheid, which is a negation of human rights, must be changed, if not on humanitarian considerations at least in enlightened self-interest. A continuation of this misconceived policy is bound to endanger their very survival in South Africa. As the London Times put it, we seem to be witnessing a Greek tragedy and if the world is showing its interest it is because it is not South Africa alone but the whole world which is exposed to the dangers arising out of racial conflict and affront to human dignity. There is still time to call a halt.

In conclusion, I would like to reserve the right of my delegation to speak on the resolutions on the subject at the appropriate time.

INDIA BURUNDI RWANDA ALGERIA JAMAICA UGANDA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN USA SWITZERLAND UNITED KINGDOM GERMANY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PORTUGAL

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri J. N. Khosla's Statement on Southern Rhodesia

Following is the statement made by Shri J. N. Khosla, member of Indian delegation, on October 26, 1962 on the question of Southern Rhodesia in the Fourth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, after three weeks of statements and discussion on this subject, it is hardly necessary for me to argue at length that the system of government in Southern Rhodesia and those in charge of it, have utterly discredited themselves by their failure to make any real attempt to come to terms with Africans with a view to establishing a just, and equitable social, economic or political order, in the land. While colonialism has seen a rapid decline everywhere, the Settler Community in Southern Rhodesia has refused to relax its hold on the destiny of the 3 million Africans, who are denied political power, are excluded from holding any responsible positions in the civil or defence services, are generally condemned to master-servant relationship, and, to life in the slums. These unfortunate people have been subjected to indignity and repression by numerous discriminatory laws, and are deprived of their fundamental liberties by an elaborate network of restrictive legislation of which it would be enough to mention two : the notorious Vagrancy Act and The Law and Order Maintenance Act, the outrageous clauses of which caused the resignation of a Chief Justice of Southern Rhodesia.

The Advisory Committee appointed by the Southern Rhodesian Government on the Development of the Economic Resources of Southern Rhodesia, reported only a few months ago that :

"The problems of urbanisation are intensified in the case of the African because of social and legal limitations on his mobility as a wage-earner or businessman and the restriction on his capacity to add to his personal resources or accumulate property. His freedom of action is limited, whether he wishes to acquire skill utilize his knowledge in his productive work, either promote trading and other enterprises, own property in a specified area or have access to the normal channels of credit and capital. The inability to grasp the opportunities for an ample and more productive way of life is the basis of African discontent, as well as his distrust of the European with his higher standard of life and greater opportunities of advancement,"

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Salisbury and the Bishops of Gwelo, Bulawayo and Umtali, who cannot be described as Red revolutionaries,

243

dealing with Africans' living standards, have reported :-

"... wages are inadequate, housing conditions in many instances are unworthy of human beings, and terms of employment are such that husbands are separated for long periods from their wives..." (Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 642, p. 1736).

With white supremacy so well established it is not surprising that the wages of European employees are nearly 15 times those of the African employees. "It is difficult" reports the Advisory Committee (1962), "to ascribe the large differences in wage rates and earnings solely to either the superior organisational, supervisory and entrepreneurial ability of the European or his greater opportunities of contributing to output. We take the view that the capacity of the European to earn higher incomes is, in part, due to contrived advantages." (P. 16).

Even in the Agricultural sphere, the African

does not fare better. He has no voice in price control (P. 276 of the Report) and bulk of his grain sold through official channels is less profitable (P. 279). In development of Irrigation the capital cost to the Government has amounted to œ5,417,000 in European areas as against mere œ317,000 in African areas (P. 316). Thus irrigated acreage under Government schemes in the African Reserves and the Purchase Area is only 9 thousand compared to 38,061 in the European Area. (P. 315). There has even been discrimination in spending on dams and reservoirs.

The Report states

"Any advance in production technique by African, resulting in increased supplies of crops at present principally produced by Europeans, seems to threaten the livelihood of those already responsible for the main supply." (P. 187).

This committee knows well how little is being spent on the social and educational services for the African. Some progress has indeed been made, but unless the African has political power, he will not be able to protect himself against discrimination in economic and social spheres.

We have frequently heard the professions of the Southern Rhodesian authorities and the United Federal Party regarding Multi-racialismindeed a laudable aim, and any genuine effort to achieving it should have our full support. But a system cannot become Multi-racial merely by calling it so. Multi-racialism would imply a harmonious development of a nation containing many races, on the basis of common sharing of political powers and on equality of opportunity for all. There can be no true partnership amongst unequals. We cannot, of course, expect a miracle to happen. Indeed Rome was not built in a day, as Rev. Gondo reminded us the other day. Unfortunately, however, hardly anything is being done to move towards the goal and the professions of the authorities have remained mere emptyphrases. The Economist (London) of 24th February 1962 wrote :-

"Lord Malvern successfully fooled doubters in Britain that 'Partnership' means giving African a chance; Sir Roy Wellinsky is still trying to convince Tories that an 'African' Member of Parliament is representative provided his constituents are mostly white."

Thus multi-racialism in Southern Rhodesia has only meant "multi-racialism in which whiteman's superiority is assured". The white Settlers persist in entertaining misleading hopes of multiracialism of their own imagination and misinterpreting the U.N. resolutions as "anti-white racialism". Even a liberal amongst the settlers, Sir Edgar Whitehead, has given evidence that his aim is to destroy any effective political organization that the Africans may form. "The common fate of African Parties has been", wrote the Economist (London) on the 24th February 1962, "to be outlawed by the authorities as soon as they show signs of gaining mass support." The African National Congress was banned in 1959. In banning its successor-the National Democratic Party---on the 9th of December 1961, Sir Edgar declared, "The Party is abolished for the sins it has committed after it had vears of 'very fair trial'." The Times (London) on 12th December commented :-

"Perhaps Sir Edgar feels that the second banning will ensure, that the African nationals will go to polls (after a year) in a moderate and compliant way. But what assurance is there that he will not have to ban them yet again for new sins ?"

How right the "Times" was I Sir Edgar, a few weeks ago felt it necessary to muzzle the Zapu, the successor to the National Democratic Party, on the same old pretext of maintaining law and order that one is familiar with. Nkomo and several hundred other African leaders were put into prison, or their movements restricted. Their relatives are being harassed. Funds, vehicles and property of the party have been seized. As a matter of fact even before the ban against the Zapu was imposed, the party's activities were seriously restricted by existing legal and even extra-legal measures. Thus the

244

Economist (London) reported on the 24th February 1962

"For the most part these weekend political gatherings (of the Zapu) have passed off quietly, in spite of the provocative behaviour of some white reservists, whose deep-seated hostility to the Africans is depressing to watch. Their current tactics appear to be to interrupt or arrest the speakers on the slightest pretext that the law allows them."

In the face of such serious provocations and the acute frustration caused by the settlers' continued refusal to share power with the Africans, the temptation to resort to violence in order to get rid of the domination of a racial minority, for some, at least, must be irresistible. We would not commend use of violent means for achieving independence. But Whitehead's government has to blame itself for the increase in violence under his regime. What else does he expect when he drives the people into a blind alley and then deprives them of their leaders who alone can have some moderating influence on them?

According to the United Kingdom Government, Southern Rhodesia became a self-governing territory in 1923 and cannot therefore be deemed to fall within the scope of Chapter XI of the Charter. It therefore denies that the United Nations has competence to deal with the territory, or to ask for information thereon, under Article 73(e) of that Chapter. Indeed no such information has ever been furnished by the United Kingdom.

Such an argument is untenable, both from the constitutional as well as from political point of view. I need hardly recall the tragic story of the British domination of the territory for decades, culminating in its annexation on 23rd of September 1923, followed by grant of the so called "responsible government", 8 days later. This unprecedented, and, if I may say so, indecent haste was intended to vest the small European minority-comprising 2% of the total population of the territory with political power in internal affairs. Far-reaching powers, however, were reserved to the Secretary of State for colonies, primarily to safeguard the interests of the native inhabitants and also for purposes of general over-all control. He had general powers of disallowance of any Act of the Southern Rhodesian legislature within a year; the Rhodesian legislature could not legislate on a number of subjects, without the Act in each case being reserved by the Governor for the Royal assent,

which in practice, according to Bernard Braine, Joint Under-Secretary of State far Commonwealth Relations in Britain, meant that it had to secure the approval of the Government in London. Besides, amendments to certain Constitutional provisions were put beyond the reach of the colonial legislature.

With such vital limitations to its legislative powers, the Southern Rhodesians could by no stretch of imagination, be regarded as selfgoverning. The fact that the British government has never exercised its reserved powers, does not make these powers obsolete or inoperative. Mere non-usage does not create a Convention in Britain (vide Jennings Law and the Constitution). Besides, as we well know in actual practice, use of reserved power is not always necessary. A colony will seldom legislate, in such matters, without prior informal consultations and approval of the White-Hall. Sir Garfield Todd, a one-time Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, has confirmed this practice in his statement to the special committee on this territory.

Sir Edgar Whitehead himself had no illusions about the possible application of reserve powers when last year, on 7th April in Bulawayo, he took his electorate into confidence, saying :-

"With the speed with which Africa is moving it is extremely dangerous to leave the reserved powers for another two years. I want to see them removed this year. For the last twenty years, and even before the war, the British Government largely left us alone. We are not in the world's eye. But recently the Ministers of the United Kingdom have been entertaining members of the opposing group. 'Ibis became increasingly dangerous. Under two electoral rolls the proposed Parliament of this country will remain for all time in the control of people with upper roll qualifications."

The Federal Constitution of 1953, not only reaffirmed the colonial status of Southern Rhodesia, brut also reduced the Legislative powers of the colony.

The United Kingdom representative's contention in this Committee several months ago that "the autonomous status of Southern Rhodesia has been repeatedly recognised internationally", evidently implies participation of Southern Rhodesia in the GATT, ITU, W.H.O., etc., but only without the right to vote like several of the other non-self-governing territories and has no validity in this context.

That the United Kingdom did not submit information on the territory under Article 73(e) of Chapter XI does not make the territory

245

self-governing, inasmuch as Angola or Mozambique cannot be deemed to have graduated out of colonial status merely because of Portugal's stubborn refusal to transmit information on them. A unilateral action or declaration of an administering authority cannot by itself conclusively define the constitutional status of a non-selfgoverning territory.

The competence of the General Assembly of the United Nations in regard to Southern Rhodesia remains unquestionable. It accrues to it from the colony's constitutional status as such, and the resolutions of the General Assembly which it passed by virtue of the Charter, and which set out, among other things, "Factors which should be taken into account in deciding whether a territory is or is not a territory whose people have not ve, attained a full measure of self-government". [Resolution 742 (VIII)]. Whether one examines the Southern Rhodesian Constitution of 1923, or the Federal constitution of 1953 or even that of 1961, the territory in question is described as a "colony" and in fact essentially remains so, in character and competence. "A full measure of self-government" envisaged in Chapter Xi of the Charter has never been given to Southern Rhodesia, and even if it were it would be hollow unless it conformed to Resolution 1541 (XV), so well known to this Committee.

During the last 40 years not one Southern Rhodesian African has been considered to be civilized enough to find a seat in the legislatures or to occupy a position in the higher or even the middle rungs of the executive. To apply the term "responsible Government" or to say that "all executive power was transferred to elected members responsible to the legislative Assembly" is mere casuistry.

The Constitution of December 1961 does not materially alter the position of the African. It has utterly failed to do justice to his legitimate aspirations. The British Government's plea that it was based on a scheme accepted by African groups at the London Conference, is. at best, only, technically correct. It has never been denied that the National Democratic Party was I dissatisfied with the scheme from the very beginning. It is also admitted that Mr. Nkomo repudiated especially the part dealing with franchise soon after the Conference. We all know that the scheme was vigorously denounced by the Africans, 'immediately it was made known to them. In view of such strong countrywide opposition. we humbly suggest, it was a serious mistake' to' enact a Constitution based on this scheme. Acceptability by the people, the Moncton report had rightly recommended, was to be an essential condition for the Constitution. But this was completely ignored. In the referendum on the Constitution only 6,000 out of the 60,000 persons voting were Africans. In fact the African was never properly consulted. They were forbidden to organize meetings outside their reserves and not more than 12 persons could meet inside their reserves. The National Democratic Party had refused to participate.

It is not my intention to examine this Constitution in detail. But it would be essential to comment on some of its glaring shortcomings :

- 1. Its system of two-electoral rolls is morally wrong and politically unsound. It virtually condemns the African to a second class citizenship and strikes at the very root of multi-racial approach by deepening the gulf between the Settler community and the rest.
- The representation given to the Africans is too meagre to be acceptable to them. The Manchester Guardian weekly of September 27th emphasized :-"The foremost cause of this deadlock is the African dislike of the new constitution which gives them only 15 guaranteed seats in a Legislative Assembly of 65."
- 3. The franchise based on income and

literacy qualifications is undemocratic and inconsistent with human dignity. It would effectively keep out the majority community from power in the foreseeable future. Here again, the British Government, it is regretted, has chosen to ignore the Moncton Report's categorical advice that "a basic literacy' test is not compatible with our recommendations". (P. 42). Sir Edgar in one of his utterances expressed his belief that the Africans might achieve a majority on the rolls--not in the Legislature-in 12 to 15 years. This assumes progress both in education and in economic standards at a pace hardly warranted by facts and experience, especially while bulk of the population has no control over its own destiny. Speaking to his own party on 7th April, in Bulawayo, Sir Edgar boasted :-

"Under two electoral rolls the proposed Parliament of this Country will remain for all time in the control of people with upper roll qualification."

246

- So, Sir Roy Wellensky was not far wrong in expecting that the white community domination would last for 200 years.
- 4. The three safeguards provided by the Constitution-Declaration of Rights, a Council of State and a rigid Constitution-to protect the non-Europeans are illusory.

Apart from the fact that the Constitutional Council, as constituted, cannot inspire any confidence in the Africans, it has purely advisory functions, without any compulsive power. If it considers a measure passed by the Legislative Assembly discriminatory, it may so report to the Speaker. But the Legislative Assembly can reaffirm it by 2/3rd majority immediately, or by simple majority after a lapse of six months. Besides the Government can set aside the Council's objection by "certifying urgency".

In fact the Secretary of State, in piloting the bill in the British Parliament, himself admitted :

"The Constitutional Council has a useful function in the way of forming public opinion of a very limited character, but the real king-pin on which I pin my faith in the new proposals is the Declaration of Rights".

"But when one examines the Declaration of Rights" said Mr. Callaghan in the House of Commons, "it is so qualified in its terms and has such enormous exceptions to its operation that it is rather threadbare as a protection to those in danger of being discriminated against." Sir Frank Soskice the former British Attorney General condemned the Declaration of Rights in even stronger terms.

The Declaration of Rights, moreover, does not apply to the existing restrictive legislation. The Law and Order Maintenance Act, the Detention Order, or the Vagrancy Act, etc. are all outside its scope.

Rigidity of the Constitution as a safeguard for the African would also be found ineffective. The Settlers with 50 out of 65 seats can always muster two-thirds majority, as Sir Garfield Todd pointed out, as a petitioner. In the past, electoral qualifications have been raised to prevent Africans from getting elected. This could happen again.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that this Constitution, has been condemned by all except the Settlers and a few so called "moderate" Africans with vested interests. Speaking in the House of Commons, Mr. John Dugdale summed up : "This Constitution is not only bad, but it is positively a fraud".

I have listened with great interest the speech delivered yesterday by the distinguished, representative of the United Kingdom. As one who has devoted several years to the Study of the Constitutional law and development of the Commonwealth, I greatly appreciate the contribution made by this distinguished speaker. We all have admiration for the way the Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand developed into full fledged nations. We only wish that similar development could have also taken place in Southern Rhodesia. Unfortunately the beginning in this case has been made on totally different lines. It reminds one rather of the development of South Africa than that of the other Dominions. Permit me to quote once again from the House of Commons debate oil the Southern Rhodesia Constitution Bill. Mr. John Dugdale on the 22nd of June said :-

"In 1910 we made a great mistake. We gave to the white population of South Africa almost complete control over the black population, and that has proved to be a terrible mistake, as everybody on both sides of the House will agree. It seems now that it is proposed that we should do exactly the same thing to the population of Southern Rhodesia. The safeguards that are being brought in are no better in many ways than the safeguards brought in the case of Union. They will disappear, and I fear that they will disappear in a much shorter time than they did in South Africa. If this Bill becomes an Act, Southern Rhodesia, will go the way of the Union." (Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 642 p. 1737.)

And, this is the real danger. And it is evident that this is now being widely recognized in Britain.

Under these circumstances, we cannot but turn to the British Government with fervent appeal to abrogate the Constitution of 1961 and to immediately convene a Constitutional Conference so as to avert Southern Rhodesia from undergoing the tragedy of Algeria or Angola. We hope Britain will not shirk its responsibilities in this hour of crisis. That it has the power to intervene, there is not the least doubt. Southern Rhodesia remains a colony even under the Constitution of 1961 which describes it so. Unlike in the Dominions, the Governor of Rhodesia continues to be appointed by the Secretary of State in consultation with (but not on the advice of) the Prime Minister of the colony. As the famous, British Constitutional authority, Professor Beridale Keith points out, "the Balfour Declaration of 1926 does not apply to the Governors of States and Provinces who still act

247

as agent of the British Government in addition to his functions as constitutional head of state." (A.B. Keith, Constitutional Law of the British Dominion, 1933 p. 150). Similar view is expressed in a more recent work by O. Hood Phillips, "Constitutional Laws of Great Britain and the Commonwealth" (1957) p. 629.

The power of the British Parliament is absolute and without control as Chief Justice Cook put it.

Statute of Westminster II (1931) provided that an Act of the United Kingdom Parliament passed thereafter shall not extend to a Dominion without its express consent. But statute of Westminster does not apply to Southern Rhodesia.

We know that Honourable Mr. Butler, as also several other British Cabinet Ministers, have stated that the Constitution of 1961 cannot be changed, for that would be against tradition and practice, having been an outcome of negotiations. But we hope Britain will not adopt too rigid an attitude in this regard. Rigidity is against British tradition and character. After all the "negotiations" did not secure an agreement of the masses-the major party to be effected by any settlement in this colony. Besides, Britain cannot afford to remain a disinterested party in the present crisis which threatens the breakdown of law and order.

Under less serious circumstances Malta's Constitution of 1947 granting self-government to the colony was suspended on 30th April 1958 and revoked soon after. The British Guiana Constitution was also suspended in 1953. Similar action was taken in Grenada recently. More examples can easily be cited. Here it is not my purpose to examine the merits or demerits of the British action in each one of these instances. All I would like to emphasise is that the British Government can and has in the past annulled, in cases of emergency, constitutions granting internal self-government to several of the colonies.

And, in any case, Article 22 of the Order in Council granting the Constitution of 1961, reserves "full power and authority, to amend, add to or revoke this order at any time prior to the appointed day and any Order in Council made by virtue of this Section, may vary or revoke any previous Order so made."

On this basis alone, the British Government

should be able to act, immediately, before the Southern Rhodesian Government orders elections, which, many people fear, would seriously worsen the situation.

The distinguished United Kingdom representative's contention yesterday, that his country is not an Administering Authority in regard to Southern Rhodesia is untenable. The United Nations Charter imposes on the General Assembly certain duties towards colonial territories. We also know that these colonial territories are at different stages of development. Whatever their respective stages might be, they remain colonies till they achieve independence. That a colonial power has little to do with the day to day administration of a colony does not mean that the colonial power is no longer the Administering Authority vis-a-vis the United Nations. The distinguished British representative himself admitted that Southern Rhodesia was neither Sovereign nor independent. How can he then expect this Assembly to get away from its obligations under the Charter? If the United Kingdom has some special arrangement with this colony, that arrangement is of its own making and cannot absolve it from its international obligations as an Administering Authority, and this, in fact, is safeguarded even in the 1961 Constitution, by Article 32.

My delegation would like to once again strongly urge the United Kingdom Government to immediately annul the constitution of December 1961, and to convene a conference to draw up for the colony, a new constitution, which would adequately ensure the rights of the majority of people in line with the United Nations Charter and the Assembly's Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial territories and peoples. We urge further that the British Government secure restoration of all rights of the non-European population, the removal of all restraints and restrictions, in law and in practice, on free exercise of political rights, release of all political prisoners and grant of general amnesty.

We know that the problem is difficult and full of complexities. Sir Roy Wellensky's Boston Tea Party speech and his threat to use force are indicative of the possible risks. If, therefore, we are asking the British to reverse their policy pursued over the years, in Southern Rhodesia and to do this notwithstanding their big financial interest and their racial and cultural ties with the Settlers, it is primarily because this colony is at dangerous cross-roads. A wrong turn would mean ruin--a racial war, chaos, and irreparable damage to British prestige and long term interests. Britain has to its credit a commendable record of decolonisation in recent years. Let that record be not spoiled by hesitancy and inaction in Southern Rhodesia. The situation is fast deteriorating.

248

Moncton Report (P. 76) had aptly warned "To say that events are moving fast in Africa is a truism. They are moving like an avalanche, and it appears only too likely that those who merely cling to their familiar positions will be swept away."

Before I end my statement, I should like to pay my delegation's tribute to the petitioners who have undertaken an arduous, and in some ways a thankless job, in order to give us an insight into the Rhodesian affairs. We hope, that, before long they will be able to put their shoulders together to build their country on basis of equality, liberty and fraternity and to make it a worthy member of the comity of nations.

May I also take this opportunity to pay my humble tribute to the respected and amiable personality who left this Committee, rather suddenly, the other day. While I found myself often at variance with Sir Hugh Foot, I could not but have real admiration for his character and ability, his breadth of outlook and sincerity of purpose, his human approach to problems and above all for his courage of convictions. We wish him success in his future assignments.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman and the distinguished members of this Committee for giving me a patient hearing.

INDIA USA OMAN LATVIA ITALY UNITED KINGDOM ANGOLA PORTUGAL AUSTRALIA CANADA NEW ZEALAND SOUTH AFRICA ALGERIA MALTA GRENADA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

ITALIAN REPUBLIC

Extension of Trade Arrangement

The trade arrangement between India and Italy, which expired on June 30, 1961, has been extended for two years from that date. Letters to this effect were exchanged in New Delhi on October 16, 1962 between H. E. Mr. Enrico Carrara, Charge d'Affaires, Embassy of Italy, and Shri D. S. Joshi, Special Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

The arrangement provides for a freer flow of goods between the two countries. The main items of export from India to Italy are industrial raw materials; food items like coffee, tea, spices, meat preparations and dried fruits; cotton fabrics; jute, coir and leather footwear.

The principal items of imports into India from Italy are agricultural and other types of machinery; scientific, engineering and optical instruments; synthetic fibres and dye-stuffs.

INDIA ITALY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA **Date** : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

MEXICO

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Mexican President

Speaking at a Banquet held in honour of His Excellency the President of Mexico and Madame Lopez Mateos at Rashtrapati Bhavan, October 7, the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said :

Mr. President, Madame Mateos, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I convey to you. Mr. President, and the members Of your party a very cordial welcome on behalf of the people and Government of India? We hope You will spend a few days in sight-seeing, enjoying your stay and knowing a little about our country.

I am happy to note that today marks the 25th wedding anniversary of the president. We are very happy that you both are spending the silver jubilee of your wedding in New Delhi at the Rashtrapati Bhavan. We wish you many happy years of married life and hope that you may

249

spend the golden jubilee of your wedding here again.

I know, Mr. President, you have a very exalted conception of marriage. You were good enough to leave with me yesterday a copy of your Constitution. I turned over its pages and in Chapter Four on Mexican citizens, article 34 reads- :

"Men and women of Mexican status have to fulfil the following requirements they must reach the age of 18 if married, 21 if unmarried."

That shows that you believe that marriage makes for maturity of mind, spirit of accommodation, and give and take which are so essential for the smooth working of democratic institutions.

We are both engaged, our two countries, in a process of national reconstruction. History does not permit us to mould our futures as we please. We have to reckon with conditions which are not chosen by us but which we encounter. They are given to us. They are transmitted to us from our past. Your great ancestor, the Mayan and the Aztecs, had flourishing civilisations. Then, you had a period of 300 years when you were ruled by Spain. Now you are trying to integrate the descendants of the Mayan, the Aztecs and the Spanish settlers into a single and homogeneous Mexican community. We are engaged in a similar task though on a different scale.

Your Constitution affirms your faith in freedom of speech and press, in adult suffrage, subject to the condition I mentioned, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom to criticize the Government as much as you want. These freedoms are there embodied in your Constitution. Freedom of worship is the most important thing of all. During the Spanish rule the clergy were a part of the governmental bureaucracy. The Spanish King was the head of the Mexican Church and your country suffered so much of bitterness and-bloodshed on account of the confusion of the functions of the State and the Church. You have today dissociated the two and your Church and State are separate.

More or less the same idea is embodied in our Constitution also. Economically we are adopting more or less the same policy. We believe in a mixed economy as you do. We call them private and public sectors. We are trying to use them for increasing our agricultural productivity and industrial productivity. You are using science and technology for developing agriculture and industry and you have succeeded in this task because your industry and agriculture have shown remarkable progress.

Now I come to the international scene where we are working together. We are facing up history, living in a very crucial and decisive period of human history. We have all the resources, the scientific knowledge, the technical skill and the awareness of the needs of the people. Yet we live in a world of fear where more than half the population suffer from hunger, cold, disease and illiteracy. It is possible for us to remove these things from the face of this earth but something stands in between. We have not had the political wisdom or the ultimate commonsense or faith in the moral imperatives which are essential for us to bring the two things together. We have come to a stage where we have either to abolish war or it may terminate our existence. Negatively, you must remove all. Positively, we must build up a world polity. You have done your best and your country has made great suggestions at the Disarmament Conference that there should be banning of all the nuclear tests at any rate from the 1st of January 1963. On the positive side, you want colonialism to end, racial oppression to be terminated. You want underdeveloped countries to be aided. If you want to establish a peaceful world, it is necessary that these frustrations and disabilities from which people suffer should be removed. You are working for these ultimate goals. More than these things a new world depends on what one might call an international mindedness. There also I see symptoms in your country. In the premises of your Ministry of Education building you have four statues symbolising (1) the ancient Mayanistic civilisation, an Indian Chief, (2) a Spanish Catholic Saint. (3) Plato and (4) the Buddha. That shows that we are the inheritors of all he world, of all the spiritual culture which this world is able to give to us. That idea of trying to five together, absorbing valuable elements of all great cultures is symbolised by what is found in that particular place-your Ministry of Education.

Your political objectives, your economic goals, and your international are akin to those which we adopt in this country. That is why we are so much attracted to your country and to your leadership in that country, and we are anxious to develop cultural, commercial and economic relations with your country.

We wish you success in all your attempts to raise the living standards of your people and to improve the international climate.

I should not forget my dear friend, Madam Mateos who is here who has been taking a significant part in the social progress of her country.

250

I understand, like all true women, she loves children. She loves art. She is the President of the National Institute for the protection of children and she is providing free breakfast to thousands of undernourished, under-privileged children in the schools of Mexico.

Her interest in art is well-known. She patronises musical concerts, ballets, art exhibitions etc. So the work which she is doing is as vital, so far as I am concerned, not merely in taming President Mateos but, also in trying to lift the condition of her people. Here is a Title child who calls itself a bird. She is interested in the same things--art, sports, music etc. We are very happy that you are with us.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I ask you to drink to the health of President Mateos, Madame Mateos and Miss Mateos T'

MEXICO INDIA USA SPAIN PERU **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

MEXICO

Reply by the Mexican President

In reply to the speech by the President at the banquet at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 7. 1962, the President of the Republic of Mexico Dr. Adolfo Lopez Mateos, said :

I have listened to the words of His Excellency, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India, with genuine pleasure and attention. In them are blended, in a natural way, the spontaneous cordiality of the Indian people and spiritual serenity that their most profound philosophers have taught us.

Emotion and meditation are qualities that ate usually considered contradictory in India, nevertheless, they are complementary vitrues; reason serves as a guide to sentiment and the heart gives warmth to the soul. Therefore, I am deeply grateful to His Excellency Dr. Radhakrishnan for the remarks he has made with reference to my country and to myself. I see in them a clear example of lucid cordiality and I shall always remember them both for their genuine spontaneity as well as for their intelligent circumspection. The peoples and the Governments of India and Mexico are the heirs of two great historical movements : the Mexican Revolution which began in 1910, and the struggle for Indian Independence, guided by the Congress Party, under the spiritual inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi.

Both movements represent, each one with its own characteristics, two of the boldest and most generous feats of our country : the transformation of the social and economic situation of our peoples, without sacrificing the rights of the individual and without denying our cultural tradition.

The defence of this heritage and the continuation of the reform movement started by our predecessors are at the present time imperiled by severe problems of international scope. After the second world war, the traditional boundaries between national and international policies have vanished almost completely. There was a moment when the world seemed. divided into two blocks. Fortunately, this conception has had to be abandoned; the existence of countries with independent international policy, as well as other factors of a similar nature, have shown that present day reality is more complex and variegated.

In the case of Mexico, the expression "independent international policy" does neither mean "neutralism" nor the will or aspiration of constituting a third block or being associated with it. Loyal members as we are of the United Nations and of the Organisation of American States (the oldest regional system in the world, among those existing at the present time) our policy upholds with sound firmness, both within these organizations as well as in our bilateral relations, a clear and precise international doctrine. One of these principles is the legal equality of all States, and consequently, that of the full respect for the rights of all nations, particularly the weaker ones; another is the principle of non-intervention, a shield against any alien interference in the internal affairs of a country, and lastly, the right of all peoples to create their own destiny-the principle of self-determination-is one of the basis of our foreign policy

Faithful to these principles, we have contributed, positively, without excesses or extremism, to the evolutionary process that has freed many nations in Asia and Africa. Today, this process is approaching to its end. A new era is opening. It is not the question of conquering political independence, but of assuring the survival of the new nations and the hastening of their economic, social and cultural progress.

The present world crisis is due, fundamentally, to the situation of the nations which constitute (to use a popular, though most inaccurate denomination) the group of countries "in the process of development" and the group of "under-

251

developed" countries. Both groups represent about two thirds of the world's population. Moreover, in Many cases, it is the question of nations that are heirs to high civilizations, owners of a spiritual tradition, alive and creative. Technical progress and economic advancement are not, and cannot be, the only indices for measuring the complex organism which we call a civilized society. India and Mexico also coincide in this: to avail oneself of modem science and technical progress does not necessarily imply the giving up of our past or the betrayal of our spiritual heritage.""

We recognize, on the other hand, that the highest spiritual values bear fruit only in a society of justice, in which men enjoy a humane standard of living and suffer not from hunger, ignorance, unhealthiness, and lack of freedom. Now. these evils afflict as yet the greater part of mankind. As long as this situation does not disappear, international peace will be menaced both by the natural despair of peoples and because this state of things breeds endless quarrels and rivalries. In the past few years many internal conflicts have become scarcely disguised small international wards. Each one of these conflicts could have been the origin of a new universal war. It is obvious, therefore, that the preservation of peace is a matter closely bound to the peaceful and independent development of the nations of Latin America, Asia and Africa.

General disarmament, the banishment of nuclear arms and experiments, the peaceful settlement of the differences dividing the great powers and other questions relative to international security and peace, have deserved our constant attention. Once and again we have made constructive proposals, with the will of collaboration to the solution of these problems. We think, nevertheless, that the progress that could be achieved in any of these fields, would be sterile if it is forgotten that one of the permanent causes of violence is the condition of extreme poverty in which more than half of mankind lives. Therefore, we state that the economic and social development of our peoples is one of the essential conditions for international peace.

It is almost unnecessary to explain that we conceive economic progress in intimate connection with social justice. Without economic development there cannot be real social justice and without social justice there will be no peace among the nations of the earth.))

Disarmament, the economic development peoples, and foreign aid. are matters closely bound with each other. We believe that international cooperation must be free of any political pressure. Its Purpose, however, is complementary. It concerns each nation, through its daily efforts and its every day sacrifice, to create national wealth and to distribute if in a fair manner. Foreign aid is necessary and beneficial, but never should it substitute the nation's own work. This is a national task; in order to carry it out successfully, the nation must be the owner of its resources and use them in accordance with the provisions afforded by science and the interests of the majority. That is why we think that the principle of self-determination must expand, as it already does, to the economic sphere; not that this would mean, in the least, the disregard of the freely accepted obligations which, because of it, are clear proof of sovereignty.

We consider, on the other hand, that one of the most efficient methods to promote economic development is to insure and strengthen the international market, stabilizing the prices of raw materials. One of the permanent causes of under-development is the unbalanced condition that exists between the prices of raw materials and those of manufactured goods. The solution to this problem would place on more equitable basis, the subject of international cooperation between the developed countries and other nations.

Last year, we had the honour of having amongst us His Excellency Jawaharlal Nehru. During his visit,, the Prime Minister of India was able to verify the affection that we Mexicans feel for his people and of the admiring regard in which we hold him. Our people sees in his person the clear-sighted idealist who has a deep sense of reality, the statesman who conciliates a healthy nationalism with a universal vision of man When he extended me the invitation to visit his great country, I accepted with great pleasure. I feel that the friendship between Mexico and India will not only be beneficial for both countries : I state that this friendship, founded on common principles and ideals, shall also be beneficial for all other nations. Our friendship serves the democratic peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa. Consequently, it serves the cause of peace.

In concluding, I wish to render public tribute to the President of India, His Excellency Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. He also has, visited our country on two occasions. He knows that in Mexico he has many friends who appraise his worth and readers who admire him. His work as a philosopher is a bridge between Eastern and Western thought; his work as an educator has been inspired in a humanist and universal insight of culture and on accepting the high political office which he now holds, he, embodies

252

an ancient philosophical ideal : the ultimate and of philosophy. is public action. His activity as a thinker, teacher and statesman can be resumed in one word: Concord.

Ladies and Gentlemen : I propose a toast for the personal happiness of His Excellency Dr. Radhakrishnan and for the progress, peace and grandeur of the generous Indian people."

MEXICO INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

MEXICO

Joint Communique

Following is the text of a Joint Communique issued by His Excellency the President of Mexico and His Excellency the Prime Minister of India on Wednesday, the 10th October, 1962 :

In response to the inivitation extended to His Excellency President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India during his visit to Mexico in November, 1961, the President of Mexico, accompanied by Senora Eva Samano de Lopez Matoes, Miss Ave Lopez Mateos Samano and Their Excellencies the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of Industry and Commerce, Doctor Manuel Tello and Doctor Raul Salinas Lozano, paid a visit to India from the 6th to 10th of October, 1962.

The President, and the Prime Minister took advantage of this visit to review the current international situation and to exchange views on questions of mutual interest to their two countries.

The visits of the Prime Minister of India to Mexico in November, 1961. and of the President of Mexico to India in October, 1962, indicate the growing friendship between Mexico and India. The friendship is based upon their common desire to work for the maintenance of world peace and to co-operate in various programmes for the promotion of the well-being and prosperity of the peoples in their two countries and in various areas of the world.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the preservation of world peace is the, most important task before, mankind if the human race and its civilization are to survive. They believe in the abolition of war as an instrument of national policy and in the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. They are resolved, therefore, to continue to work for the early realization of agreements to achieve general and complete disarmament under international control and a total ban on all nuclear tests.

The President and the Prime Minister also agreed that although the era of colonialism is fast coming to an end, it is necessary in the interests of world peace that the existing gulf between the developing avid the developed countries of the world should be bridged as early as possible. The developing countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa contain almost two thirds of the entire population of the world and have been the cradle of great civilizations. Unfortunately, their social and economic development has been retarded by circumstances beyond their control with the result that the standards of living of their people are much lower than those of the peoples of the developed countries. This disparity causes frustration and tensions which may, if not removed early, pose a threat to world peace.

It is necessary, therefore, that the developing countries make every possible effort within the limits of their resources for the social and economic progress of their people. It is equally necessary that the developed countries assist in this programme by giving technical and economic assistance. The terms of such assistance to be really effective must be consistent with the sovereignty and independence of the recipient countries, and free from any conditions which may defeat the very purpose of the programme, viz., to give economic and social content to freedom and independence.

Economic aid by itself, however, is not sufficient. It is necessary that the developing countries should be able to get reasonable prices for the commodities they produce and have the opportunities for selling their semi-processed, processed and manufactured goods to the developed countries. This requires a purposeful review of the present methods and systems of international trade. The President and the Prime Minister hope that early action will be taken to solve the current problems in this field.

The President and the Prime Minister also agreed to promote the, cultural and economic relations between the two countries. As regards cultural relations, preliminary talks have already been initiated to study the most appropriate methods for an exchange of knowledge on the culture, science and id of Mexico and India, in their ancient as well as contemporary manifestations. As regards the strengthening of economic relations, it has been decided to send a Trade Delegation to India in the near future in

253

order to study and recommend the commodities and goods which may be exchanged; an Indian Trade Delegation will also visit Mexico with the same purpose. The possibilities of exporting from India locomotives and engineering goods not manufactured in Mexico, has been tentatively considered. On the other hand, Mexico would be in a position to export to India steel plates, lead and zinc concentrates and sulphur.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their conviction that maintenance of world peace and promotion of development programmes require that relations between States should be based on the principles of sovereign equality, cooperation for mutual benefit, respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of each other.

The President and the Prime Minister were happy to have had this opportunity of exchanging views on current international questions and questions of mutual interest in an informal and friendly atmosphere. They look forward to greater Indo-Mexican cooperation in the pursuit of their common objectives in the United Nations and in other forums. The President and the Prime Minister agreed to keep in touch with each other to secure this common objective.

MEXICO INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

MEXICO

Talks for Expansion of Trade

The Mexican Minister for Commerce & Industry, Dr. Raul Salinah Lozano, had a meeting in New Delhi October 6, with Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of International Trade and senior officials of the Union Ministries of Commerce & Industry and Finance. Dr. Lozano was accompanied by Dr. Ricardo Zevada, Director of National Bank of Trade, Mr. Ricardo Garcia Saenz, President of National Association of Importers and Exporters, Mr. Enrique Rojas, General Manager of Mexican Maritime Transportation Company and Mr. Heriberdo Vidales, President of National Confederation of Chambers of Commerce. The Indian officials present at the meeting included Shri B. N. Adarkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce & Industry and Shri K. S. Sundararajan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

The two delegations discussed common problems of trade between the two countries and expressed their desire to increase the field of mutual commercial and economic cooperation.

The Mexican delegation showed interest in buying railway equipment including locomotives, structurals, engineering products, pharmaceuticals and other manufactures from India. On the Indian side, the possibilities of buying cotton, hides and leather, some categories of steel plates, non-ferrous metals including zinc concentrates from Mexico were indicated.

It was decided to exchange Aide Memoirs indicating the possibilities of expansion of trade and techno-economic collaboration between the two countries.

It was also agreed that a Mexican delegation consisting of railway experts and other industrial and business interests would visit India soon. India would also send a trade and industrial delegation to Mexico to study the possibilities of increased economic and trade cooperation. The two delegations agreed that after these studies were made it would be possible to take concrete steps to expand trade and other aspects of mutual

MEXICO USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA RUSSIA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Broadcast to Nation on Chinese Aggression

The following is the text of the broadcast by the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru from the Delhi Station of AIR on October 22, 1962 :

"Comrades, friends and fellow-countrymen, I am speaking to you on the radio after a long interval. I feel, however, that I must speak to you about the grave situation that has arisen our frontiers because of continuing and unabashed aggression by the Chinese forces. A situation has arisen which cans upon all of us to meet it effectively. We are men and women of peace in this country, conditioned to the ways of peace. We are unused to the necessities of war. Because

254

of this, we endeavoured to follow a policy of peace even when aggression took place on our territory in Ladakh five years ago. We explored avenues for an honourable settlement by peaceful methods. That was our policy all over the world, and we tried to apply it even in our own country. We know the horrors of war in this age today, and we have done our utmost to prevent war from engulfing the world.

But all our efforts have been in vain in so far as our own frontier is concerned, where a powerful and unscrupulous opponent, not caring for peace or peaceful methods, has continuously threatened us and even carried these threats into action. The time has, therefore, come for us to realise fully this menace that threatens the freedom of our people and the independence of our country. I say so even though I realise that no power can ultimately imperil the freedom we have won at so much sacrifice and cost to our people after long ages of foreign domination. But, to conserve that freedom and integrity of our territory we must gird up our loins and face this greatest menace that has come to us since we became independent. I have no doubt in my mind that we shall succeed. Everything else is secondary to the freedom of our people and of our Motherland and if necessary everything else has to be sacrificed in this great crisis.

I do not propose to give you the long history of continuous aggression by the Chinese during the last five years and how they have tried to justify it by speeches, arguments and the repeated assertion of untruths and a campaign of calumny and vituperation against our country.

Perhaps, there are not many instances in history where one country, that is India, has gone out of her way to be friendly and cooperative with the Chinese Government and people and to plead their cause in the Councils of the world, and then for the Chinese Government to return evil for good and even go to the extent of committing aggression and invade our sacred land. No selfrespecting country, and certainly not India with her love of freedom, can submit to this, whatever the consequences may be.

There have been five years of continuous aggression on the Ladakh frontier. Our other frontier at NEFA remained largely free from this aggression. Just when we were discussing ways and means of reducing tension, and there was even some chance of the representatives of the two countries meeting to consider this matter, a new and fresh aggression took place on the NEFA border. This began on the 8th of September last. This was a curious way of lessening tension. It is typical of the way the Chinese Government have treated us.

Our border with China in the NEFA region is well known and well established from ages past. It is sometimes called the McMahon Line. But the Line which separates India from Tibet was the high ridges which divide the watersheds. This has been acknowledged as the border by history, tradition and treaties long before it was called the McMahon Line. The Chinese have in many ways acknowledged it as the border, even though they have called the McMahon line illegal. The Chinese laid claim, in their maps, to a large part of the NEFA which has been under our administration for a long time. The present Chinese regime was established about 12 years ago. Before that, the Tibetans did not challenge it. Even the maps that the Chinese produced were acknowledged by them repeatedly to be old and out-of-date maps which had little relevance today. Yet, on this peaceful border where no trouble or fighting had occurred for a long time, they committed aggression and this also in very large numbers and after vast preparations for a major attack.

I am grieved at the setbacks to our troops that have occurred on this frontier and the reverses we have had. They were overwhelmed by vast numbers and by big artillery, mountain guns and heavy mortars which the Chinese forces have brought with them. I should like to pay a tribute to our officers and men who faced these overwhelming numbers with courage. There may be some more reverses in that area. But one thing is certain-that the final result of this conflict will be in our favour. It cannot be otherwise when a nation like India fights for her freedom and the integrity of the country. We have to meet a powerful and unscrupulous opponent. We have, therefore, to build up our strength and power to face this situation adequately and with confidence. The conflict may continue for long. We must prepare ourselves for it mentally and otherwise. We must have faith in ourselves, and I am certain that that faith and our preparations will triumph. No other result is conceivable. Let there be this faith and fixed determination to free our country from the aggressor.

What then, are we to do about it ? We must steel our wills and direct the nation's energy and resources to this one end. We must change our procedures from slow-moving methods of peace time to those that produce results quickly. We must build up our military strength by all means at our disposal.

But, military strength is not by itself enough. It has to be supported fully by the industry of

255

the nation, and by increasing our production in every way that is necessary for us. I would appeal to all our workers not to indulge in strikes or in any other way which comes in the way of increasing Production. That production has to be not only in the factory, but in the field. No antinational or antisocial activities can be tolerated when the nation is in peril.

We shall have to carry a heavy burden, all of us, whatever our occasions may be. The price of freedom will have to be paid in full measure, and no price is too great for the freedom of our people and of our Motherland.

I earnestly trust and I believe that all Par-ties and groups in the country will unite in this great enterprise and put aside their controversies and arguments which have no place today, and present a solid united front before all those who seek to endanger our freedom and integrity.

The burden on us is going to be great. We must add greatly to our savings by the purchase of bonds to help to finance production and meet the increasing cost of national defence. We must prevent any rise in prices, and we must realise that those who seek to profit at a time of national difficulty are anti-national and injure the nation.

We are in the middle of our Third Five Year Plan. There can be no question of our giving up this Plan or reducing any important element of it. We may adapt it the new requirements here and there. But, essentially, the major projects of the Plan must be pursued and implemented, because it is in that way that we shall strengthen our country not only in the present crisis, but in the years to come.

There are many other things that our people can do, and I hope to indicate some of them at a later stage. But the principal thing is for us to devote ourselves to forge the national will to freedom and to work hard to that end. There is no time-limit to this. We shall carry struggle as long as we do not Win, because we cannot submit to the aggression or to the domination of others.

We must avoid any panic because that is bad at any time, and there is no reason for it. We have behind us the strength of a united nation. Let us rejoice because of this and apply it to the major task of today, that is preserving our complete freedom and integrity and the removal of all those who commit aggression on India's sacred territory. Let us face this crisis not lightheartedly, but with seriousness and with a stout heart and with firm faith in the rightness of our struggle and confidence in its outcome. Do not believe in rumours. Do not listen to those who have faint hearts. This is a time of trial and testing for all of us, and we have to steel ourselves to the task. Perhaps, we were growing too soft and taking things for granted. But freedom can never be taken for granted. It requires always awareness, strength and austerity.

I invite all of you, to whatever religion or Party or group you may belong, to be comrades in this great struggle that has been forced upon us. I have full faith in our people and in the cause and in the future of our country. Perhaps, that future requires some such testing and stiffening for us.

We have followed a policy of non-alignment and sought friendship of all nations. I believe in that policy fully and we shall continue to follow it. We are not going to give up our basic principles because of the present difficulty. Even this difficulty will be more effectively met by our continuing that policy.

I wish you well, and whatever may befall us in the future, I want you to hold your heads high and have faith and full confidence, in the great future that we envisage for our country.

CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA **Date** : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President of Cyprus

Speaking at a Banquet held in honour of His Beatitude Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, President of India said in New Delhi on October 31, 1962:

Your Beatitude, your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I should like to express to you, Sir. and the members of your party a very cordial welcome on behalf of the Government and the people of this country and on my own behalf. We followed with very great interest and sympathy your struggle for the independence of Cyprus. You by your wisdom, skill and unwavering faith, transformed a focus of dangerous unrest into a quiet centre of peace. Our congratulation to you on that great achievement. Your Constitution is replete with checks and balances. You have been elected by the Greek orthodox Church as the Head of the Church, by

256

the Greek people, as the Head of the State And you also happen to be the national leader of the people, of Cyprus. I think your Constitution, under your guidance and leadership, will work smoothly and contribute to the prosperity of the people of Cyprus, of all communities. That is our earnest hope and desire.

People wonder how an Archbishop elected by the members of the orthodox Church could also be the Head of the State. You today paid your homage at the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi. He was essentially a man of religion. He thought all life was of one piece. There was no distinction between the sacred and the secular. He worshipped God as truth and he realised that the only way to attain truth was through the practise of love. He identified himself with the interests of the people and turned to politics. He turned to politics out of a religious urge. He wanted to establish the freedom of the people of this country. So there is nothing inconsistent between religion and politics. Rightly understood the two things make' for one end. As I said this afternoon, you know the truth and it will make vou free. The acceptance of truth, the pursuit of truth will express itself in the practise of love and the establishment of brotherhood. No great achievement is ever done without toil and sacrifice. We lived in a world of make-believe, of half-truths. We did not heed the warnings that were given to us but we have been suddenly shaken out of our slumber and we are now awake to the realities of the world.

China is a country with which we had the most friendly relations for may centuries. Even in this generation, we had the most friendly relations with China of Sun Yat-Sen, the China of Chiang Kai-Shek and the China of Mao Tse-tung. We were among the very first to recognise the People's Republic of China. We did so on December 30, 1949. Ever since then we have been persistently agitating for the admission of China into all the international assemblies-the U.N., the UNESCO, the WHO, FAO, etc. It is only yesterday, in spite of our conflict with China we voted for the admission of China into the United Nations Assembly. We did this because we want. the United Nations to be a fully representative organisation, universal in its range and we wanted every country to be included in it, to be exposed, to the winds of public opinion to understand what the currents of the world are. For that-purpose we did it.

Again in 1954 at the Conference on Indo-China in Geneva we worked with the Chinese in the most cordial spirit. In 1955 we again at the Bandung Conference worked together in a cooperative way. We wanted to establish some peaceful relationship between the two great countries of Asia-China and India. In 1954, it was that we entered into an agreement where we enunciated the famous five-principles-the principles of respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty for each other; a pact of nonaggression, non-intervention in other people's affairs, mutual respect and benefit and peaceful cooperation and co-existence. These were the five principles. All these five principles were flagrantly violated by the unilateral action of China. A nation pledged to peaceful discussion of all out-standing problems to the ways of peace which did it utmost to bring about peace to every part of the world-that nation has been betrayed. There is no doubt, however, it has stirred our people to a supreme effort to, resist this challenge to recover lost territory and reestablish our freedom and territorial sovereignty even in those regions which have now been lost.

We are very pleased that you were good enough to express your great sympathy and support for us in this matter. So far as the political principles are concerned your up-bringing, your ways of thinking, your political faith-all these things are akin to ours. The statements which you made at the recent Belgrade Conference on international affairs are more or less the views which we ourselves adopt. It is our hope that you will continue to lead your great country-greatness does not depend on mere numbers-lead that country to greater prosperity and strength.

May I now, Ladies and Gentlemen, request you to drink to the health of His Beatitude the Archbishop Makarios, President of the Republic of Cyprus.

CYPRUS USA INDIA CHINA SWITZERLAND INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

Reply by Cyprus President

Replying to the Toast by the President Dr. Radhakrishnan, His Beatitude the President of the Republic of Cyprus Archbishop Makarios said :

Mr. President, I wish to thank Your Excellency most warmly for your kind words and the cordial, reception, which you and the Indian people have accorded me. I also wish to thank you because by your kind invitation you made it possible for me to visit your historic country which has offered so much to humanity.

257

From most ancient times India has created a great civilization and opened avenues for the cultural advancement of humanity This is the most common characteristic between our two countries. Although India is a vast country and Cyprus a small island, nevertheless the inhabitants of both have their descent from most ancient peoples and had in the past created glorious civilizations. These civilizations were founded on certain principles and values, which still exist and are respected in our two countries. Respect for freedom, for democracy and for justice have composed from the very ancient times the rule of our social life and form the essential basis of our public spirit. These principles still constitute the foundation of the national life of our two peoples.

In the past both our peoples have suffered grave misfortunes. Their fate has been common in their resistance against stronger countries and in their continuous struggle for freedom. Not so long ago, both India and Cyprus have overthrown the colonial regime and they are now devoting themselves to new efforts for their progress and prosperity. I am very happy that on the international field as well, our two countries, nonaligned towards any political or military blocks and inspired by the ideals of peace and justice, are closely cooperating in a common effort to contribute constructively to the solution of the various international problems. The faith in common ideals and common aims from the basis of the friendship and cooperation that exists between our two countries. My visit to your country is a clear manifestation of our ardent desire for an even closer friendship and cooperation.

I regret that my visit takes place at a time when an unjustified and unprovoked aggression against your country has been committed. I wish to reassure you that the people of Cyprus wholeheartedly support your struggle in the defence of the integrity and freedom of India. I am confident that the struggle of the people of India against the aggressors will be successful. The liberal and peace-loving peoples of the world, condemn the aggression and wholeheartedly offer you their moral support.

Mr. President, I convey to you the greetings of the people of Cyprus. In your person I greet not only a great political leader of a great country, but also a wise man, a philosopher and a, great humanitarian. I consider myself happy for the opportunity of our personal acquaintance. Thanking you once again for the warm reception and the gracious hospitality, I raise the glass to your personal health and happiness and to the prosperity and peace of your country.

CYPRUS USA INDIA **Date** : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Rumanian President

Speaking at the Banquet held in honour of Ms Excellency the President of the Council of State of the Rumanian Peoples' Republic at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 17, 1962 the President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said:

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Foreign Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : May I express to you all on behalf of the Government and the people including myself a most cordial welcome.

Our countries he far apart. We speak different languages, follow different customs, adopt different traditions. Yet, there are certain co ideals which bind both our countries---the promotion of the well-being of our people and prevention of war. These are two great objectives which we have together.

You, Sir, were elected the Leader of your Party in 1945 and have been guiding the affairs of your country all these years. The ravages of war were healed. The passions roused were quietened, the unity of the people from Maldavia, Transylvania and Muntonia, Christians, Jews and Muslims, has been established and you tried your best and succeeded to a large extent in raising the economic standards of your people. Your agriculture has shown remarkable progress, your industrial production has been tremendous. More than all, by your educational scheme, you have abolished illiteracy. I was very pleased to know from you that you have a compulsory eight-year period for all-your children and you even go and distribute text-books freely to them. These are some of the ideals which we are attempting to pursue, though within the frame-258

work of democratic institutions. Our goals are the same but our methods are different. Yet, the objectives bind us. All these great ideals, great hopes we have, will be blasted by a few unscrupulous individuals who wish to assert their claims, real or imaginary. by the use of military force.

War is the common enemy of all mankind and we should try to work together to see to it that war is abolished in this world. We agree on certain fundamental principles so far as international affairs are concerned-non-intervention in other peoples' affairs, territorial integrity, equality, mutual respect and aid to one another. These fundamental principles bind us both together. So both in the domestic and in the international fields we work with similar objectives.

We have been able to establish close cultural and commercial relations with you. You are the first people to develop an oil industry in Europe and we have obtained aid from you, assistance from you, in the building of the Gauhati refinery. You have been of considerable help. Your technicians are working today in jwalamukhi, Trombay, Adampur and Gandhinagar. Our students art there being trained by you and we have some of your students also. We have had exchanges of cultural delegations. Artists of your country have come to us and our people have also gone to your country. In these different ways we have been able to establish close cultural and trade relations with you and the latest agreement which we have had we are exporting iron ore to you against the import of petroleum products, drilling equipment and other plants.

This close collaboration, which we have established, between our two countries, I have no doubt, will be further strengthened by your visit, Mr. President, and the members, of your party. You were responsible for establishing these friendly relations between our two countries and under your guidance and leadership I have no doubt that these relations will further improve.

"May I now ask you all, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the health of the President of Rumanian Republic, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister."

USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Reply by Rumanian President

Replying to the toast proposed by the President of India at the banquet held in his honour, the Rumanian President said:

Esteemed President, esteemed Mr. Prime Minister, Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen and friends: Allow me first and foremost to thank wholeheartedly His Excellency the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, for all the kind words and for the appreciation addressed to our country and to our Rumanian people. At the same time, allow me to extend my heartiest gratitude to your Excellency for the invitation extended to us to pay a visit to the Republic of India.

It is for us a great pleasure as representatives of socialist Rumania and the Rumanian people to visit socialist this great and beautiful country and we would realise better the efforts, the pre-occupations of the Indian people and of the country's leaders, and also in order to achieve still closer friendship and relations between our two countries and peoples.

Wherever we went on the soil of India, we were surrounded with attention and friendly love. We have seen interesting things and very instructive things, and I consider that there are possibilities of developing our relations in the future.

We have seen several enterprises which are quite modem. We have visited the Institute of Scientific Research, the Institute of Nuclear Research, we talked with the local experts. Everywhere, we met with goodwill and with the desire of being given explanations. We also met a spirit of true friendship.

The Rumanian people, like the Indian people, are pre-occupied with raising their country's economy and to set up favourable conditions for the continuous raising of material and cultural levels of their peoples. The Rumanian people like the Indian people, are interested in the maintenance and consolidation of peace. It is to these purpose that the forces of the Rumanian and the Indian peoples are devoted in the various international meetings. The representatives of our two peoples in many important problems have common positions and extend their assistance.

Indeed, peace is the dearest thing which represents the ardent desire of all the peoples of the world. It is worth-while working untiringly,

259

shoulder to shoulder and to bring our contribution to the settling of outstanding problems, in order to attain a stop in arms drive which endangers the peace of the world and to achieve general and complete disarmament and to set up such a climate favourable to good understanding and co-operation among peoples, no matter their social system. This is the principle by which socialist Rumania is being guided, like the other socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union. We are endeavouring to bring our contribution together with the other peoples and States for release in international tension. Like, little brooks United in rivers, and like rivers united in bigger rivers, it is in this way to work together and join our forces in order to ensure lasting peace in the world.

I would like to raise the glass and toast for the prosperity of the Indian people, for the prosperity of India and also to the health of President Radhakrishnan, Prime Minister Nehru and for the friendship and cooperation between our two peoples, and for peace throughout the world.

Volume No

1995

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Rumanian President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of Indian President

The Rumanian President, Mr. Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, made the following speech at the banquet given by him in honour of the President of India in New Delhi on October 19, 1962:

Esteemed Mr. President, Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen & Friends: This will be the eighth day of our stay on- the soil of your great and beautiful country. On our arrival in India the local leaders invited us to live here exactly as we were at home. I want to assure you that we have felt here particularly well and our stay here was extremely pleasant. We have been surrounded here all the time with the greatest attention and care and the Indian authorities have taken all the steps so that we should feel here as well as possible. Our meetings with the population everywhere we passed, through will remain unforgettable. Wherever we went, we were received with joy and with friendly love. We have had fruitful talks with the Indian leaders.

I think that Your Excellencies will agree With me if I say that our visit and the results of our visit have been particularly fruitful. We have had talks and exchanges of information with Your Excellencies, and the results of these talks will be written down in several documents that will be made known to the public. For all this, allow me, Your Excellency, to thank you wholeheartedly, and by thanking you to thank the entire Indian people for the friendly reception that was given to us as well as for fruitful results that we have obtained.

During our exchange of opinions and information we embraced a wide circle of problems, first and foremost regarding relations between Rumania and India. Together we have found that the relations between our countries are good and that there are favourable, conditions for further developing the relations between us.

During our talks, as I had mentioned before, we both had the feeling that we were both of us knocking at open doors, that is to say, I mean that every problem that we treated was agreed. Similarly, we found with pleasure that we were agreed on the most important international problems of our times. Our two peoples and countries are pre-occupied with the peaceful settlement of problems that are now pre-occupying mankind, and in order to maintain and consolidate peace throughout the world our two countries are working for co-operation and understanding among all countries.

The idea of peaceful coexistence lies at the basis of the policies of our two governments. Allow me to drink for the prosperity of India, for the happiness and welfare of the Indian people, for the sincere and unshakable friendship between Rumania and India, for Your Excellencies' Health, for Mr. President, Dr. Radhakrishnan's health, and that of Prime Minister, Nehru.

I wish them wholeheartedly long life. of health and strength in their work as well as success in their activities. Long live everybody. May the Rumanian-Indiand friendship live and flourish for ever.

260

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Reply by President Radhakrishnan

Replying to the President of Rumania, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said:

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Foreign Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: We were very pleased to hear the kind and generous words which you Mr. President, just said about your short visit to this country. It is a matter of regret for us that your visit has been so brief. And, of course, you are considering a longer visit sooner.

You referred to the troubles your country passed through and the achievements of the Rumanian people who are tough, tireless, earnest and dedicated. Under your magnificent leadership they have been able to bring about radical changes with regard to their social and economic conditions. You were good enough to send me some books on Rumanian art to make us believe that you do not merely pursue wealth and power but you feel that there must be integration of these things with art and beauty. Mere wealth and power-they are the kind of a cultural vacuum which will not be of much use. You yourself come from Moldavia. Naturally, you think that the Moldavian dialect is the sweetest of all the dialects of Rumania and say that Moldavian people hear, pause, think and take action after due deliberation. These are the qualities which you have manifested in your leadership. You spoke, Mr. President, about the need for peace. If the world settles down in peace, the whole of humanity will be profited. If you look at the statistics you will find that 15 million people are in military service and 150 billion dollars are spent in the production of arms, an amount which exceeds the national income of almost all the underdeveloped countries numbering 1,300 millions. The aid which they get is 5 billion dollars. If these resources are diverted to peaceful purposes, this world will be a happier place and all the nations of the world will benefit from it.

You are working for the goal. So are we.

We believe in co-existence, mutual co-operation. You referred to Indo-Rumanian friendship. Friendship as between individuals, between nations, is the true wealth and if we are able to develop true friendship with Rumania, it will be a source of great advantage to both our countries and to the world at large and I hope and I wish to reciprocate your sentiments that we might grow together seeking co-operation in domestic and international peace.

May I ask you now to drink to the health of our distinguished guests and Indo-Rumanian friendship.

USA MOLDAVIA

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Joint Communique

The following is the text of the Joint Communique issued by His Excellency the President of the State Council of the Rumanian People's Republic and the Prime Minister of India:

On the invitation of the Government of India, Ms Excellency Mr. I Gheorghe Gheorghieu-Dej, President of the Council of State of the Rumanian People's Republic, together with His Excellency Mr. Ion Gheorghe Maurer, President of the Council of Ministers, accompanied by His Excellency Mr. Cornelieu Manescu, Minister for External Affairs and Members of the Grand National Assembly, Rumanian Government officials and technical experts, paid a visit to India from 12th to 20th October 1962. The delegation also included Mr. Valentine Steriopol, Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade and Mr. Horatiu Iancu, Ambassador of the Rumanian People's Republic to the Republic of India. They visited Bombay, Bangalore and Agra and spent three days in Delhi. Apart from seeing some of the industrial and social development projects, the President of the Council of State of the Rumanian People's Republic and his colleagues took the opportunity of this visit to have a friendly and informal exchange of views with the Prime Minister of India on the international situation and on questions of mutual interest to the two countries.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the maintenance of world peace is the most urgent task before mankind today. They are of the view that war, as a means of settling international differences, must be abolished and all concerned should continue to work for the early realization of agreements to achieve general and complete disarmament under international control 261

and a total ban on all nuclear tests in all environments.

There are a number of difficult intenational problems which require solution but war does not solve any problem. The President and Prime Minister, therefore, express their determination to increase their efforts aimed at the settlement through negotiations of all international issues, with a view to contribute to international detente and to ensure lasting world peace. They call upon all concerned to continue to exercise patience and tolerance and redouble their efforts to solve those problems by peaceful discussions.

Abolition of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and of racial discrimination are essential to eliminate tensions and conflict and to promote a climate of mutual understanding and co-operation among all countries of the world based on the sovereign equality of each State, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and co-operation for mutual benefit. The President and Prime Minister consider that, in the exercise of their sovereign rights, all peoples are free to work out their destinies on the basis of their own convictions and aspirations.

They consider it necessary that the existing gulf between the developing and the developed countries of the world should be bridged as early as possible in the interests of a peaceful and progressive human society. The developing countries should, therefore, make every possible effort for the social and economic progress of their people. And, in this task, the developed countries should assist by giving maximum possible technical and economic assistance.

Economic aid by itself, however, is not sufficient. It is necessary that the developing countries should be able to et reasonable prices for the commodities they produce and have the opportunities for selling their semi-processed, processed and manufactured goods to the developed countries. ibis requires a careful and comprehensive examination of the current and Prospective Problems and trends in international trade so as to eliminate measures and methods which interfere with the free flow of international trade. The President and the Prime Minister welcome, therefore, the proposal for an International Trade Conference to be organised by the United Nations.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their satisfaction with the development of the cultural and economic relations between their countries. The programme of cultural exchanges between India and Rumania for 1963, which will be finalised soon, will further promote the development of mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries.

The Prime Minister expressed his gratitude to the Government of the People's Republic of Rumania for the valuable assistance they are giving for the setting up of the Oil Refinery at Nunmati and in the field of exploration for oil.

The President and the Prime Minister note with satisfaction that the trade relations and relations of economic and technical cooperation between the Rumanian People's Republic and the Republic of India are growing continuously and that there are prospects for their expansion and development. During the course of the visit, there was an exchange of views between the officials of the two countries regarding long-term technical and economic cooperation between India and Rumania. Following the discussion, there was an exchange of letters on this subject between His Excellency Mr. Cornelieu Manescu, Minister for External Affairs of the Rumanian People's Republic and Shri K. C. Reddy, Minister of Commerce and Industry to the Government of India.

The President of the State Council of the Rumanian People's Republic invited the Prime Minister of India to visit Rumania and the Prime Minister gladly accepted the invitation.

The visit of President Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, following as it did the visit of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, the then Vice-President of India to Rumania in 1956, and of Mr. Chivu Stoica, the Prime Minister of Rumania, to India in 1958, symbolises the steady growth of friendship and cooperation between Rumania and India. The President and the Prime Minister are confident that the close and friendly relations between India and Rumania will continue to develop to the mutual advantage of the two countries and lead to further cooperation in the common task of promoting world ace.

INDIA USA PERU RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Exchange of Letters regarding Technical and Economic Collaboration

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on October 19, 1962 between Shri K. C. Reddy, Minister of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. Corneliu Manescu, Rumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, regarding technical and economic collaboration between India and Rumania.

262

The letters provide, among other things, for necessary technical assistance to India in the

field of oil industry, ore and mineral mining and chemical and petro-chemical industries.

The two Governments have arranged for discussions for the working out of the proposals arising out of this arrangement and also to arrange for further meetings and discussions at appropriate level. There will be periodical review of the progress of the implementation of the projects agreed upon between the two Governments the Governments concerned will make proposals as to the manner in which collaboration could be made increasingly useful.

On the Rumanian side, Mr. Valentin Steriopol, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, and Mr. Horatiu lancu, Ambassador in India, were also present. For India, Shri M. P. Mathur, Indian Ambassador to Rumania, and Shri C. S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, were among those present.

INDIA USA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreement for Exchange of Goods Signed

An agreement for exchange of goods between India and U.S.S.R. during 1963 within the framework of the existing Indo-Soviet Trade and Payments Agreement was concluded in Moscow on October 4, 1962. A Trade Delegation led by Shri S. Vohra, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, negotiated prospects of developing trade between the two countries.

It is expected that the quantum of trade between the two countries during 1963 will be much larger than the volume of trade so far. In 1961, trade both ways was of the order of Rs. 560 million and in 1962, it is likely to be Rs. 800 million. In 1963, the total trade is likely to be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 1,000 million.

Among the items to be mainly imported during 1963, will be raw materials like raw asbestos, wood pulp, chemicals, newsprint,, refractories metal items like lead, zinc, alloy and special steel, chemicals, fertilizers, machinery and equipment, capital goods, oil and oil products including mineral lubricating oil, energetic and electric equipment etc.

Important items of export from India, apart from traditional goods, will be woollen and textile fabrics, leather footwear, leather cloth, safety razor blades, rolled steel products and other consumer articles like tanning materials, linoleum, coir products, handicrafts etc.

263

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date :** Oct 01, 1962

November

	Vo	olume	e No
1995			
-			
Content			
Foreign Affairs R Vol. VIII			1
CYPRUS Cyprus Preside	NOVEMBER CONTENTS ent's Speech at Banquet	No.11 PAGES	

Dr. Radhakrishnan's Speech at Banquet 266 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY					
President's Welcome Speech at Banquet 267					
1 1					
Vice-President Welcomes German President to Parliament 270					
German President's Address to Members of Parliament 272					
Thanks-giving Speech of the Speaker of Lok Sabha 275					
MEXICO					
Exchange of Letters for Development of Trade 276					
PAKISTAN					
Procedure for Transfer of Post Office Savings Bank Accounts 276					
Indo-Pakistan Trade Pact: Joint Communique 277					
Prime Minister's Statement on Proposed Indo-Pakistan Talks 277					
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA					
Prime Minister Condemns China for Betrayal of Panch Sheel:					
Statement in Lok Sabha 278					
Condemnation of Chinese Aggression : Home Minister's Speech 286					
Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha 290					
Debate on Chinese Aggression : Home Minister's Reply					
299					
Nation Dedicated to Repel Aggression Prime Minister's Speech					
in Lok Sabha 307					
(Continued overleaf)					

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(ii)

PAGES

No Compulsory Military Training at present : Prime Ministers				
Speech in Lok Sabha	317			
Prime Minister's Broadcast	318			
Prime Minister's Statement on Border Situation	n 319			
Prime Minister on Border Situation	319			
Prime Minister's Statement on Reported Chinese 'Announcement				
regarding Cease-fire	320			

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Air Services between India and Soviet Union: Diplomatic Letters Exchange 320 Shipping Services between India and USSR: New Agreement Signed 321

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Text of Notes Exchanged between U.S.	Assistant Secretary of
State and Indian Ambassador	321
P.L. 480 Agreement Signed	322

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

CYPRUS

Cyprus President's Speech at Banquet

Proposing the toast at a Banquet on November 3, 1962, His Beatitude, Archbishop Makarios, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, said :

Mr. President, your country is great not only in size but also in history, tradition and civilisation. When I received your kind invitation to visit your country I wanted to see and learn as much as possible about India. It is not, however, possible for any visitor who has spent a few days in your country to say that he has seen India. And I cannot say that. But I can certainly say that I have felt India and its people. I have felt the sincerity and kindness of the people, their devotion to their country and their great heritage. And above all I felt the spirit of freedom so alive in the hearts of the Indian people.

I am grateful to you, Mr. President, for making it possible for me to be among this noble people. It gives me great pride to think that this noble people are associated with my own country with sincere friendship and common ideals. Wherever I have been I found myself in a friendly atmosphere. Yourself, Mr. President, your Government and your people have treated me with great kindness. I cannot find the right words to express to you my deep appreciation and gratitude for the warm reception and gracious hospitality.

During my few days in your country I have also witnessed the great efforts for development and the progress achieved. It is very unfortunate that this process of development may have to slow down, because of the aggression of China on your country. But whatever the importance of development the cause of freedom comes first. Freedom is above all and the people of India have once more proved how much conscious of this maxim of life they all are.

The determination of the people of India to fight for their country's honour and freedom has gained the admiration of all the freedom-loving world. Evidence of this is that one country after another expressed their sympathy for your cause of safeguarding your country's integrity and their support for your heroic resistance against the aggressors.

Your cause is a just and right one. If the aggressors held the view that the right was on their side they should have sought to resolve the matter at the table of negotiations, instead of resorting to aggression. India, in keeping with her peaceful traditions, has always shown remarkable restraint in spite of the repeated provocations, and it is in the same spirit that Prime Minister Mr. Nehru put forward his extremely reasonable proposals for a cease-fire followed by negotiations. India's proposal to open negotiations provided that the Chinese forces withdraw to the positions they held prior to September 8 is in full conformity with the universally accepted standards of international conduct and has already received the support of a great number of peace-loving countries, including my country. It is to be regretted that the Peking authorities failed to accept this offer for peace. In such a case, of course, India has no choice but to continue her struggle. Pace is the greatest pursuit of humanity, but peace in freedom. Peace without freedom has no value.

Mr. President, I wish to express once more my country's full support and sympathy to your struggle, which is a struggle of all peoples dedicated to peace in freedom I feel certain that you will come out of this struggle successful and that peace, which is your, life's symbol, will return again to India so that you may devote all your efforts and resources to the progress of your country and the prosperity of your people. Thanking you again for Your cordial reception and kind hospitality I wish to you and to your people every happiness.

265

CYPRUS USA INDIA CHINA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

CYPRUS

Dr. Radhakrishnan's Speech at Banquet

The President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, replying to the toast proposed by His Beatitude, Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus at the Banquet said :

Your Beatitude, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen : I thank you most heartily for your generous words about our country, specially about our present conflict with China. You know what freedom means. Your country has, for the first time, achieved freedom two years ago. You brought it about with a political adjustment of the differences of the Turks, the Greeks and the British. You are today the leader of your country and I was pleased to hear that when even husband and wife have differences they turn to you as father-confessor which shows the general goodwill that there is for your personality in your country.

You referred to our conflict with China. We have had aggression, military encroachments four years ago. Now and then they were being revived. But the latest was after the 8th of September 1962, this year. All that we are asking for is to have a cease-fire and peace talks and vacation of the fruits of armed aggression after the 8th of September on our borders, western, middle and eastern sectors. We are, not asking for the complete vacation of all aggression before we start talks. We are asking for what they have by military force acquired after the 8th of September, this year. If they do that, we are prepared, our Prime Minister has said a number of times, for peace talks to commence. If they do not accept that it only means that they employ strenght, they respect strength and wish to achieve their aims by military force and there is no alternative as you said left to us but to resist this attack, resist this challenge whatever may be the cost or the consequences for us. Freedom is something which is most precious. We cannot barter it away. It does not matter what losses we suffer but we should stand UP for the precious gift of freedom which we acquired at so much cost and so much sacrifice. It should be understood by all friends and foes alike that our proposition is a very reasonable one. We are only asking for the vacation of the aggression after the 8th of September, the most recent military encroachments. These are the things in all the sectors, western, middle and eastern. If that is there, tomorrow there will be cease-fire and there will be peace talks but if that is not there, we will continue the, resistance of ours will continue and will go for a long time until the problem is settled in a just and a reasonable way. We want peace with honour, with justice, with freedom; that is what we ask for. You referred to our determination. I see in all sides people of all ranks, of all lavers of society, of all persuasion, political and religious, united as one man. That shock has brought 'the country together and I find that sometimes this exuberance, this enthusiasm takes a wrong expression. It is for our leadership to mobilise the emotions, the enthusiasm, discipline the fervour which our boys and girls are showing and make them understand. It is a serious undertaking on which we are engaged and it is not the time for futile demonstrations or angry words. We must be determined, disciplined until we are able to achieve the right goal by peaceful means if possible, by any means if necessary. That is the alternative which is before us and we shall not falter in this task. We shall not be untrue to our predecessors and to our descendants by bartering away the freedom of our country selling away a part of its territory to satisfy our present convenience or anything like that. That is the spirit in which we have undertaken this

task. I am glad therefore to be encouraged by you and by your words, saying that our cause is just and we will win. I have no doubt about it. Our people have no doubt about it and let it only be understood that we are not warmongers, we are not for expansionism, we are not chauvinistic, we are not getting into other people's territories. We are only anxious to. preserve our own territory and expel the intruder from it. That is our point and it is good to know that the free nations, of the world have appreciated our point of view. AU the peaceloving nations of the world who don't believe in the law of military might, who believe in peace through justice, through freedom, they are supporting our cause. Your words, Sir, have been a great encouragement to us and I have no doubt you will do your utmost, your best to support our cause wherever your field of opportunity may open itself. It is a pleasure for us to have had you with us. We are only sorry that you have been with us for only three or four days. You have seen something of our development and all that will have to be slowed on account of our present troubles but yet we shall go on. That is our hope. That is our resolve. That is our determination.

266

Sir, may I express to you our gratitude for your kind words and wish you well in the future, wish well to your people. May I ask you to drink to the health of His Beatitude, Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus and the wellbeing of the people of Cyprus.

CYPRUS USA CHINA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

President's Welcome Speech at Banquet

Speaking at the dinner held on November 26, 1962 at Rashtrapati Bhavan in honour of H. E. Dr. H. C. Heinrich Luebke, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, said :

Mr. President, Madam Luebke, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I extend to you, Sir, our most hearty welcome. I do so on behalf of the Government and the people of this country and of myself. We are very happy that you are able to accept the invitation which we gave you sometime ago. I must say that we are happy that we have with us today Mr. Duncan Sandys and Mrs. Sandys and Governor Harriman. It is an unexpected pleasure and we appreciate it all the more.

We have been following with great interest and sympathy the rebirth of liberal democratic Germany after the second World War and the wonderful way in which you repaired the damages and the devastation caused by the war and built up your economic strength. In my three or four visits to your country in the last ten years, I have been noticing how steadily you are making progress in every side, economic, scientific, technical and cultural. Our two countries have had very close and intimate relations for a long time past. For many decades our students used to go to your universities to study Indology and Science. I remember that one of our eminent scientist, Mr. Bose worked with Professor Einstein and was responsible for a formula, which is called Bose-Einstein formula. We used to have students there but today we have 2200 students in Germany, half of them students in universities, the other half, trainees in factories and institutes of technology.

You have given us considerable assistance in the development of our industries. You are visiting Rourkela very soon where a steel factory is set up with your collaboration. You will soon be in Madras too where there is an Institute of Technology which represents largely your endeavour. You will be laying the foundation-stone of the Administrative Wing of that Institute when you visit Madras next. In science and technology, you have been eminent. But to enrich human life requires other things also, and in those other values of culture, music, metaphysics, literature, you have been renowned.

In the world of Western music, almost all the great composers come from your country, namely, Bach, Beethoven Brahms, Wagner, Hayden, Handel, Schuman, Schubert, etc. You have been responsible for giving such innocent joy to people in all parts of the world.

In metaphysics, your thinkers made fundamental contributions which are memorable. It is their interest in metaphysics that attracted your thinkers to the study of Indian thought. You thought that there was something akin here. Duessen, the pupil of Schopenhauer, in his book on 'The Elements of Metaphysics', said: 'Three great thinkers are hailed in this world, Plato of Greece, Shankara of India, and Kant of Germany'. That is his estimate. We always differ in our impressions about who the great thinkers are, but that was what Duessen said. On-the last occasion, when he was in this country in 1911, about to leave Bombay harbour, he addressed the audience and said : 'You Indians have a great heritage. Cling to it.'

You know how Max Muller was the first one to edit the Rig Veda, and in his autobiography he said : 'If there are Christian Platonists, I think that there can also be Christian Vedantists. I claim to be one.'

Kant was the man who propounded the idea of perpetual peace. Goethe was one of your outstanding geniuses, a man who conceived the idea of world literature. That was why he took a great deal of interest in the German translation of Shakuntala. And when he wrote that poem,

267

he wrote those famous lines. I cannot tell them in German. He said : 'If you want a single name which embraces both earth and heaven, the blossoms of spring and the fruits of autumn, the vicissitudes of life, the innocence and joy of the morning of life and the sadness due to neglect and forgetfulness, I mention the name of Shakuntala.

The sadness of Shakuntala is only sadness, it is

not tragedy. It ended in the great recognition of her husband and the birth of a great son Bharata, who is the nourisher and sustainer of the world. It is sonic such phase of sadness through which we are passing today. It is sadness and sorrow, but it is not tragedy. It is something which will nourish us, enrich us, comfort us, chasten us and make us better. When we undergo this discipline of sorrow, of suffering, these pangs of pain so to say, I have no doubt that we will get out of it much better.

We won independence in a very peaceful way, with the result that the British are our good friends today. After achieving independence, we tried to battle with the problems of hunger, disease, poverty and frustration of millions, and it was our endeavour to develop a modern civilised democratic State. As we were attempting to do this thing, this blow came to us. A country whom we befriended and trusted for nearly 12 years, with whom we co-operated in the most friendly way, betrayed our trust and confidence and used force to change her frontiers to her advantage. That is what she attempted to do. We shall not allow this to happen again. We wish to demonstrate to the world that aggression does not pay. The course ahead of us may be full of hazards, may cost us a lot in suffering and sacrifice. However high the price might be, we are prepared to pay it.

Mr. President, I want to say this has resulted in two great advantages. Our nation found itself reborn. The petty differences which we had, linguistic, religious, provincial, regional, all these differences have been subordinated to one supreme loyalty of preserving the freedom and the territorial integrity of our country. There were impulses binding this nation together making it into one. They were obscure but today they have come out creatively alive. They are now within our conscious memory, they are not lost in the obscurities of our unconscious life. We are aware everyone of us, wherever he may be, to whatever caste, community, religion or political persuasion he may belong, he feels today it is not his personal comfort but the wellbeing of the nation, the integrity of the nation, fidelity to the ideals for which this nation has stood. These are the things which bind us together today. This rebirth of the nation has to come through the shock therapy which China has administered to

us today. That has made us alive to our fundamental oneness, to our fundamental unity, to our loyalty to this great land, not because it is a piece of geography, not because it is simply a historical tradition but because it has stood for centuries for certain great ideals which make for the healing of nations and solidarity of mankind. This rebirth of our nation is something which we owe to this attack by the Chinese.

Next I want to say about the way in which the world has responded to it. every race, every nation, aligned or non-aligned, in Africa or Asia or Europe or America, doesn't matter where it is, felt attracted to this thing. They felt, here is · commitment to right and opposition to wrong, • fundamental human quality which supersedes political divisions which are merely passing phases, which bring the whole of humanity together in our allegiance to the supreme values of life,-that virtuousness exalts the nation. It is that principle that has brought the world together to our succour. And I feel if the world is to be saved, it can be saved only by the assertion of these great human qualities, these creative principles of life. These are the things which make this world into a real community of nations. We stand today poised so to say between untold creative possibilities on the one side and destructive self-annihilation on the other. If we are still living in juxtaposition, it is due to balance of terror and not to the tranquillity of a true moral order.

What is essential is that this precarious peace based on fear of each other must be transformed into a peace where we are united by certain common ideals and common purposes. For the assertion of the fundamental human qualities which cannot be superseded by the passing insanities of modem times,-it is that we require and it is that quality that has come out today when India has become a victim of unprovoked aggression. It gives me hope. It has left to the rebirth of our nation and also a prelude to a world community based not on political arrangements or economic alliances but an allegiance to certain common principles and ideals which mankind holds dear. Your country and mine, Mr. President, are bound together by these democratic principles today. We believe in individual freedom, in human dignity, in social justice, in the welfare of all peoples of the world. We want to see the whole world flourish and prosper. We

do not want anyone to suffer and if any one suffers, our heart goes out to him. So it is a community of ideals that bind you and us together. I have no doubt the way in which you have responded to our present need and I am told that in the consortium your aid is the second

268

largest and you have given us 10,000 sets of warm clothing for our jawans in the front. It is the expression of a fundamental human quality, of sympathy and compassion for suffering people. It is that which made you do this. We are grateful to you for what you had done. Our relationship has not been merely political or economic. It has been cultural and spiritual and it is on those grounds that we wish to build a new community in this world. I wish to say to you how very grateful we are to you, how very happy we are that you are with us and how certain we feel that your visit will strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two countries.

Ladies and Gentlemen : May I ask you to drink to the health of President and Madam Luebke.

GERMANY USA INDIA GREECE TURKEY CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

German President's Banquet Speech

Replying to the toast proposed by the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, at the Banquet, H. E. Dr. Heinrich Luebke, President of the Federal German Republic said : May I thank you most sincerely for the very friendly words of esteem which you, Mr. President, have found for my country and myself. The cordial reception accorded to me by you, Mr. President, by the Prime Minister, and the members of the Indian Government, and also by the population of your capital city, has moved me deeply. Here, on this occasion I wish to thank you once againalso on behalf of my wife and those accompanying me for receiving us as guests in your country.

As you know, German professors have for centuries past been intensely interested in Indian culture. The work of those scholars has exerted a strong pro-Indian influence on wide sections of our people. Today, in the Federal Republic of Germany we endeavour to foster and intensify to the best of our ability the intellectual and spiritual relations that have developed between our two nations. We also hope to enable Indians and Germans to meet as friends in the human sphere, apart from co-operating in topical political and economic matters. In our present age, when thanks to our modem means of transport geographic distances between the nations appear to have shrunk together, it has become easier to learn to understand, through frequent visits and sympathetic endeavours, the character of a foreign people with its peculiar and manifold features.

The Indian nation with its multifarious character conditioned by its historical development has created a modem State. Together with my compatriots, I have been following this process with a lively and sympathetic interest during the last fifteen years. The increasing national integration, the transferring of loyalty from the group to the all embracing community of the entire nation is process of far-reaching significance. Through it you have proved here in India that the most varied religious communities, the most heterogeneous linguistic groups and races can in the closely interwoven society of today cooperate efficiently and to the benefit of all without abandoning their individual character.

The revolutionary activity of the great Mahatma Gandhi, your own wise statesmanship, Mr. President, and the successful political work of Prime Minister Nehru have played an outstanding part in achieving this.

A similar process of integration is at present going on in Europe. The beginning union of the nations of Europe is based only partly on economic or other practical considerations. Economic integration simply represents the visible element of a movement of great historical significance.

The European nations who through innumerable wars were bitterly hostile with one another up to the recent past, have begun to become aware of their common culture and history and, renouncing some national sovereignty rights, have entered upon the thorny path towards union. I am most deeply convinced, ladies and gentlemen, that the fulfilment of this historical task will also intensify the cooperation of Europe with the nations of other continents.

It is the Federal Republic's earnest desire that such a development may come about within the framework of the European Economic Community. It hopes that the growing economic strength of a unified Europe will bring in its wake an intensification of cultural and political relations with the other countries of the world.

IDENTICAL IDEALS

In spite of all differences in our historical development and our present situation the ideals of our two nations are identical in many respects.

Both India and the Federal Republic of Germany have given themselves a constitution whose binding principles are those of parliamentary democracy and the federative structure of

269

the community. We are endeavouring to realize in our States the greatest possible measure of social justice and to enable all citizens to enjoy the fruit of economic and cultural progress. To you as well as to us the State is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to establish the conditions that allow every individual to live a life in freedom and self-respect.

Both the German and the Indian people adhere unconditionally to the principles of the United Nations and both are imbued with a strong desire for peace. We Germans know war with all, its horrors and we hate it accordingly. But we know also that the peace is jeopardized by the threats of totalitarian forces. And we therefore follow with deep concern and indignation the development of the heavy conflict that has been forced upon India by a neighbour with whom she wanted to live in peace.

CHINESE 'BRUTAL' AGGRESSION

I can assure, you, Mr. President that the German people and its Government are most rigorously condemning this brutal aggression and are on the side of the Indian people in their defence against the assault. It is our view that all countries committed to the principles of democracy should render one another mutual assistance in the event that their freedom is threatened. We, too, are oppressed by grave worries and afflictions. Germany has been forcibly divided and is suffering badly from it. Millions of my compatriots are forced to live under a regime denying them freedom and human dignity. The restoration of German unity which was promised to us by the victorious Powers of World War II is sought by us in an exclusively peaceful way and in this we hope to be morally supported by the Indian people.

There were times in our history when the principle "cuius regio cuius religio" used to be applied; it means that the subjects of a sovereign State had to adopt that sovereign's religous denomination, but if they did not wish to do so they were allowed to move to another region where their own religious denomination prevailed. Even in those past times this regulation was considered to be cruel. But today, the Germans living in the enslaved part of our country would be only too happy if such a concession were made to them. Instead they are faced with the necessity either to risk their lives while fleeing across barbed wire, mine fields and walls, or to live a wretched life in a community which has developed into one single concentration camp.

Mr. President, with me, the entire German people admires the great and constructive work that India has accomplished since achieving its independence. My journey through your country will afford me the opportunity to become acquainted with some samples of this work and of the Indian people's efficiency.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will also in the future continue to assist India in the realization of her great projects. In doing so, the German people are inspired by the desire in close cooperation to bridge the gap between the material wealth of highly industrialized States and the deficiencies prevailing in many non-mechanized countries.

Permit me, Mr. President, to conclude my words with a personal remark. After your visits to the Federal Republic of Germany you are no longer a stranger to us Germans and you have many admirers and friends in my country. Your election to the office of Indian Head of State last spring was therefore greatly welcomed in Germany, not only in the Press, but also in wide sections of the population. Professor Dr. Theodor Heuss, my venerable. predecessor in office, has also asked me to convey to you his best greetings and wishes. I myself am happy that vie can further intensify our personal relations by our stay in your beautiful country.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Vice-President Welcomes German President to Parliament

The Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Hussain and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, welcoming His Excellency Dr. Heinrich Luebke, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, on behalf of the two Houses of Parliament on November 28, 1962, said :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Members of Parliament, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the great honour today of extending a hearty welcome to the President of the German Federal Republic on behalf of both Houses of the Indian Parliament and on behalf of the Indian people which the Parliament represents. Engaged in one of the most extensive projects of democratic parliamentary government, we are happy to welcome in you a parliamentarian of ripe experience. For your parliamentary work began more than three decades ago as a member of the Prussian Parliamentary Assembly. Then after the Second World War as a member of

270

the North Rhine-Westphalian Parliament and finally as member of the Federal German Parliament.

We know you had to suffer arrest and imprisonment for holding fast to your democratic opinions. There are many in the House who had to pay that price. We know no price is too high for acquiring and retaining freedom.

Then as a people, the vast majority of whose population gets its living from agriculture organised, by and large, in comparatively very small, holdings we welcome you as one who as the Minister of Agriculture first in the Government of North-Rhine-Westphalia and later in the Federal Government made most remark-able contributions to the rehabilitation of the rural economy of your country. We are aware of your great concern as shown in your Agricultural Law of 1955 to ensure the fullest participation of 'agriculturists in the continuing development of the German national economy' and to provide by a sound agrarian policy in particular trade, taxation, credit and price policy, conditions for evening out the disadvantages vis-a-vis the other branches of the economy', for increasing productivity, and for ensuring, to say it in the words of your Law, that 'the social position of persons employed in agriculture is assimilated to that of comparable group of persons in the professions'.

We admire your work for the German Farmers Federation, the Deutsche Bauernschaft, and the land settlement Organisation, the Bauernland, which you founded. We have followed with interest your 'Green Reports' and your 'Green Plants'.

An image of India was till lately fairly widely accepted in the world. Our own spokesmanintellectuals. writers, poets, charlatans-had not done a little to confirm it. The image of a dreamy, drowsy, other worldly 'spiritual' people with some sort of a contempt for the material-I wonder if this image was ever true. But I am sure it is thoroughly untrue of modem India.

it is true we have a metaphysical urge, we long to see beyond our noses, if possible go beyond the horizon and above the skies into the speculative beyond. There is a possibility of truth in that description. But anyone who cares to see will find that modern India is as far as any one from this one-sided emphasis.

One knows that lineal growth is not the characteristic of organic development. We realise with vividness that we have to be ready for the material Just as much as for the ideal, for inner experience as well as outward activity; we know with unmistakable certainty that we have to learn to stand with our legs on firm ground if we would converse with the stars on high. We feel the thrill on a national scale of being engaged in the tremendous task of achieving material prosperity under moral direction, of combining technique and ethics in a democratic society, of seeking to bring Siegfield and Buddha together in good and graceful social order. It is this mental attitude which engenders peculiar affinities between our people and Mr. President, yours. For your people have also been known as "Volk der Dichter and Dernker", a people of poets and thinkers. It is by no means an unjustified characterisation. But your contributions in the field of physical science or technology are no less great.

It is, therefore, not without reason that we seek to learn from you and find an uncommon understanding for us in your country. The Schlegal Brothers, Wilhelm von Hemboldt, Max Muller, Schopenhauer and Duessen, to name only a few have contributed in no small measure to make Indian thought almost an integral part of German thinking.

Those of us who go to your country to study know this process has brought the two people spiritually close to each other. There are at the moment thousands of our young men in your Universities, pursuing higher studies in the humanities and the social sciences as well as in natural sciences and technology. A large number are working in your industrial establishments. If one goes round the Institutes of higher learning in this country one comes across amongst senior teachers the students of Spranger, Jasper and Heidegger, Max Weber and Werner Sombart, as well as Haber, Hahn and Planck. You can see how this brings our two countries close to each other in a way-few other things could.

I need hardly assure you, Mr. President, how grateful we feel to you and your country for the cooperation we have been receiving in our programmes of economic development.

We are deeply appreciative also of your outspoken sympathy with us in the testing times through which we are passing. It is known to you, Mr. President, as it is to the whole world that we did not leave anything undone to live in peace with our neighbour China. That neighbour has chosen to threaten our liberties by a wanton massive invasion of our country. As you might have noticed during your brief stay in our country this astrocious action has galvanised the Indian people into the firm and unshakable resolve, come what may, to protect their liberty and preserve the integrity of their land. We realise the difficulties of that resolve. But our peace-loving people-these metaphysical dreamers as some would say-know to value freedom.

271

Freedom is not just a word, an abstract idea to them. It is the condition of their moral existence and national, like individual life, is a moral adventure to them. They do not regard any price too high for their freedom. Survival without freedom is not worth looking at. Indeed, these are terms on which survival is a sin. May God help us.

I now request you, Mr. President, to address this gathering.

GERMANY USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

German President's Address to Members of Parliament

Addressing the members of Parliament, November 28, 1962 His Excellency Dr. Heinrich Luebke, President of the Federal German Republic said :

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen. I regard it as a special honour to have been invited to speak before both Houses of the Indian Parliament.

I stand here before the Parliament of the largest democratic State in the world, the people of whom have, in free elections, placed the task of deciding on their fate with confidence in your hands. The task which your people has entrusted you with is a highly honourable one, and I congratulate myself on being able to appear before you on behalf of my nation.

German public opinion has followed the development of modern India with cordial sympathy. It views events in your country with all the more understanding since the development of your system of government has much in common with our own.

Similar to the Federal Republic of Germany, India is also a union of states which have their own State parliaments, as well as a Central Parliament consisting of two Chambers. Hence we are aware of the importance of your daily work.

We know and understand your troubles and necessities, and we share with you the high ideals by which you are guided in your efforts. It gives me very great pleasure to convey to you the greetings and sincere good wishes of the German people. For generations past we have felt ourselves linked in friendship with the people of India, since the great cultural heritage of India has in many ways exerted a fertilizing influence on German intellectual life. My joy at visiting your country is greatly overshadowed by the sorrowful events which are taking place on the northern frontiers of India. It is with regret, indignation and alarm that the Government and the people of the Federal Republic of Germany witness how your country is at present forced to defend itself against insidious aggression.

You may be assured that the entire German nation sympathizes with your cause. Our wishes for your success are all the more heartfelt because this is also a struggle for the preservation of that free democratic system, of which both our peoples believe that it is the one most in accordance with the dignity of free men.

In this connection I recall the great Mahatma Gandhi, who was the spiritual creator of the new India and who is also spoken of in Germany with admiration and respect. The history of India is rich in outstanding personalities. But the ideals which inspired the Indian nation in its struggle for independence found their clearest expression in the shining figure of Gandhi : the ideals of justice, freedom and the dignity of man. To establish and to preserve these, no risk was too great for him.

Prime Minister Nehru referred to this attitude of mind in a conversation with Tibor Mende and said :

"Even Mr. Gandhi, who was a great pacifist, always said that it is better to fight than to be afraid. It is better to indulge in violence than to run away. He meant that you must not surrender to evil, to basic evil, and that you must preferably fight in a peaceful way. If you cannot do that, well, then fight in the military way. But don't surrender to evil".

Our Basic Law is founded upon the same fundamental principles of international law as are embodied in the important Article 51 of your Constitution. In our case the relevant provision says that the general rules of international law are binding, not only on the Government, but directly on each individual citizen.

Warned by bitter experience in the past, we have further laid down in the Basic Law that

acts tending and undertaken with the intent to disturb the peaceful relation between nations are unconstitutional and shall be made a punishable offence.

In the same spirit as the provisions of your Indian Constitution, the Federal Government has declared its readiness to accede to any international disarmament agreement which may in

272

future be concluded between the great Powers, and to fulfil the conditions of such an agreement. Over and above this, the inalienable human rights are declared in our Basic Law to be enforceable law, binding upon the legislature. the executive and the judiciary,

We live in a restless and dangerous age in which all of us, as never before, are faced with the decision of whether to use the creations of the inventory spirit for the benefit or for the destruction of mankind.

For this reason it is needful for us repeatedly to recall the essential directing principles which we have established for the ruling of our States. We all know that people exist who abuse the principles which are sacred to you and to us. These directing principles are not there in order that nationalist and ideological ambitions and the brutal will to power are given a better opportunity to develop behind a facade of fine-sounding ethical postulates. We have adopted them because we know from history that without them mankind falls a prey to chaos. But if our organizations are in accordance with these principles, we shall be able to live and work together in that indivisible harmony which is the co-ordinating Divine Law of the universe as of the microorganism.

We Germans know where disregard of these principles leads to. We know war, and we hate it, because of the fearful misery which it brings to mankind.

That is why the words spoken by your honoured President Dr. Radhakrishnan in the address he broadcast on the 15th anniversary of India's independence were just after our own hearts. He said : "Today, let us re-dedicate ourselves to the task of evolving a cohesive purposeful pattern of society on the principles of unity, freedom, justice and cooperation".

Although they have basically so much in common, India and Germany regard many of the world problems of our time from a different point of view, and are not always of the same opinion as regards the best way of solving them. India has chosen a policy of "non-alignment" of freedom from alliances.

We Germans are not in a position to defend our freedom alone, and therefore are forced, in the interests of the common security of our threatened vital rights and values, to join with other nations who are in the same position,

In addition to this we are endeavouring, by means of an economic community, to combine with our west European neighbours to form a political union. in this way we want to lay the foundation stone for a new Europe, in which there will be no place for the national egotism of the past and its disastrous effects upon the peace of the world. One of the prerequisites for this new European order has been the happy reconciliation between Germany and France. This example shows how nations who for centuries have been enemies of each other can become close friends through peaceful understanding in the spirit of those basic principles for a new order in the world which both you and we maintain.

I said just now that we hoped to achieve this integration of Europe by way of the European Common Market. In view of certain fears which have been expressed in India in regard of the intended extension of this Common Market through the accession of the United Kingdom and other countries, I should like to say the following to you : We know how hard you are struggling to develop your country, in which efforts we participate. Please do not think that we are so short-sighted as to destroy with one hand what we are helping to build up with the other.

The countries of the Common Market are not in a position any more than any other country to throttle their trade with Commonwealth countries, or countries of the French Communaute : or any other countries, since in this way they would be weakening their own economics.

We know very well that just as you cannot thrive if Europe is poor, Europe, on the other hand, cannot thrive if you are poor. The economic and social progress which offers undreamtof possibilities to the world, is not only dependent upon peace and a just international order, but also upon close and trustful economic cooperation between the nations.

Such interdependence does not mean living unrelatedly side-by-side, but living in readiness to help one another.

It is with admiration that the German people follow your efforts to build up a modem State based on the principle of social justice and they congratulate you upon the successes which you have already achieved along this path.

We have all the more understanding for the work you have achieved, since after the terrible war into which we were driven by mad demagogues, we had to struggle upwards again out of a gigantic heap of ruins, amid hunger, homelessness and poverty. Every fourth person in the Federal Republic was an expellee without any possessions from the part of Germany occupied by Communists. Our people laboured hard and untiringly, all workers have cooperated trustfully together.

273

The success of our efforts was dependent upon the efficiency of our workers and entrepreneurs, supported by the assistance which our American friends gave us so generously to start our new life in freedom.

Now that our country has been rebuilt, we are endeavouring within the limits of our resources to promote those countries who still require the assistance of others in their industrial development. We wish to help them to increase productivity and thereby to raise the income of the individual.

Just as the social obligation of the individual towards the society of our people has become a fundamental principle of our public life, our people as a whole also feels itself to be under a social obligation towards the larger community of nations.

In order to avoid giving the impression that these observations are only of theoretical value, may I point out that today the Federal Republic of Germany holds a leading position among the nations providing development aid. In 1960, the assistance of the Federal Republic alone was more than three times as much as that of the entire Communist bloc.

I only mention this because I believe it is necessary to reach a realistic assessment of the contribution by the free nations on the one hand and that of the Communist countries on the other.

I should now like to say a few words about the problem which is nearest to the hearts of us Germans. The still unsolved problems of the forceful separation of a part of the German people from the whole of the nation-a problem that poisons the whole international atmosphere fills us with anxiety and grief, since up to now a just and peaceful settlement has been prevented. in this respect may I assure you that the German people has the will to reach a reconciliation also with Russia and her allies. You can see that our policy in this connection is not determined by revanchism. and militarism.

Seventeen million of my countrymen have been forcefully separated from us and are forced to live under an undemocratic, totalitarian regime which their hearts reject and will always reject. They do not have the possibility to voice their accusation publicly before the whole world. Therefore, on their behalf I ask for your understanding.

Would it not be contrary to all the laws of nature if the happy part of a nation were not to speak up for the oppressed and enslaved part ? Would you, my Indian friends, act differently if a quarter of your people were separated from you and had to live in slavery? If the occupied part of the country were surrounded with barbed wire and mine fields and a concrete wall built across your capital with sharpshooter behind that wall so that relatives could no longer meet relatives and friends could no longer meet friends ? Would you react differently than we do ? It is not possible to achieve a lasting stabilization of international relations if a nation remains forcefully divided. But we will be patient and will not attempt to solve this conflict by force. We will never lose our faith in the fact that eternal right will prevail over transient power. We request all nations of the world and also you in India to support LIS in this important matter.

The problem of the division of Germany into two parts is very closely connected with the problem of the status of the free part of our old capital Berlin, which the communist sphere of power intends to annex by gradually cutting it off from the free world. These problems have led to an international tension whose further development we are all following with anxiety. Hence, here and there impatient and fearful voices have been raised in a plea for as speedy a solution to these problems as possible, even if such a solution would be contrary to the unalienable human rights and the existing agreements.

No one would need to fear for world peace if all the free nations of the world were to stand up determinedly with the entire moral weight of their conceptions of human dignity, right and freedom, in favour of all nations who, against their will, have to live in bondage. In this respect we place our particular hopes in India, the land of Gandhi, and in those who administer his great legacy; in India, the leading country of the "non-aligned world"; in India which today is itself suffering under the pressure of force.

We feel encouraged in this hope by the understanding words spoken to us by your highly esteemed President Radhakrishnan a year ago in Frankfurt when he received the German literary peace prize. In his speech on the spiritual bases of understanding among nations and of peace, he said about the division of Germany, and I quote :

"The body politic may not be there, but the body historic, the, body cultural lives on, no matter how absent-minded and divided against itself and unaware of its own existence. The path to the goal may be long and arduous; it may be full of toil and suffering, but it will be reached eventually." Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention. I thank you for giving me the

274

opportunity to say a few words about matters which concern us all. Let me say in conclusion that I am confident that despite all burdens that are at present weighing on you and on us, the day will eventually arrive when we shall be relieved of our anxieties, when rightful conditions will be restored at your frontiers, and when the entire-German nation can once again enjoy its unity in freedom.

The new, more beautiful world to which we aspire and for which we are working, grows slowly. It is often very difficult for us to preserve our faith in it. But all growth in nature needs time whenever the roots must sink deeply on account of the sterility of the soil and the storms which pass over it. I believe that one of these roots should be the friendship between India and Germany. To drive it down deeper into fertile earth and to strengthen it, that is the purpose of my visit to India.

GERMANY INDIA USA FRANCE RUSSIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Thanks-giving Speech of the Speaker of Lok Sabha

Thanking the German President for addressing the Parliament, the Speaker of Lok Sabha said :

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellency and friends : We are deeply grateful to the President for agreeing to come over and give us this inspiring address. Mr. President has referred to many aspects of our problems as well as of his own country. As he has himself said, the miseries of war are manifold and a war does not solve any problems. Indians have been conscious of that all through and that was why we have been struggling for peace in the world.

Our contribution is well known to the world. We have been busy in our economic development and we are grateful to you, Sir, as well as to your people for giving us economic aid in many spheres. Besides the public sector undertakings there are about 300 projects in the private sector in which the Germans have collaborated with private citizens of ours and those projects are being progressed here for the economic development of the country.

You have brought to us the good wishes of your countrymen. In return we request you to take our greetings to your countrymen as well as our sincere feelings of deep gratitude for what you and your country have done for us.

We wanted to live in peace with all our neighbours. We have tried our best, but, as it is said, it requires at least two to make an agreement but even. one may start a quarrel. This aggression has been thrust upon us. This is not of our choice. We have been taken by surprise, as you know. We have the democratic system here and it is generally believed that democracy is ordinarily two years behind the dictatorship in such things. But we are sure that we will be able to make up that deficiency with the aid of our friends. So many friends have come to our aid.

Your presence here has inspired us. You must have watched with your own eyes how determined we are to fight out this aggression and get every inch of our land vacated whatever the cost and whatever the sacrifice. As probably you might have known, these Members of Parliament took a pledge a few days ago that they would not rest and would see that every part of this holy land of theirs is vacated as soon as possible. Now your presence here has given us great encouragement. Besides that economic aid that you have been giving us and which, we are sure, we will be receiving even in future, the whole-hearted and unqualified support that you have given to us at this moment has reinforced and strengthened our resolve to fight out this aggression.

You have referred to many problems of your country. We appreciate them. We recognise them. You also have many difficulties to solve. But we give you this assurance that the Germans have our full sympathies. You have yourself said that you want to settle it not by force but by peaceful means. Of course, you can assure your countrymen that we are with them in these ambitions and aspirations of theirs.

You said, Sir, that your visit has been overshadowed by this aggression that has befallen us. But we assure you that we think that your presence here and your visit to our country was well-timed because you have given us encouragement and hope to fight out the aggressor with a determined action. And that we hope to do.

In the end, again, I thank you on behalf of the Members of Parliament as also on behalf of my countrymen for coming over at this moment and sparing so much time for this gathering and for giving us this message which we will remember for a very long time.

275

GERMANY USA INDIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

MEXICO

Exchange of Letters for Development of Trade

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi, November 1, 1962 between Shri R. Prasad, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. Octavio Paz, Ambassador for Mexico in India, providing for further development of trade between the two countries.

During the recent visit to this country of a Mexican delegation led by the Minister for Commerce and Industry of that country, Dr. Raul Salinah Lozano, discussions were held with an Indian team led by Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister of International Trade, regarding expansion of trade and economic relations. It was agreed then that there was considerable scope for increasing the trade between the two countries especially in commodities not traditionally exchanged.

According to the letters exchanged today, Mexico will shortly send an industrial and trade delegation to India to explore the possibilities of purchasing railway equipment, engineering goods including transmission towers and other electrical equipment, pharmaceuticals and chemicals. Later an Indian delegation will visit Mexico to study the possibilities of purchasing cotton, zinc concentrates, other non-ferrous metals, fertilizers, hides and skins and steel plates.

Trade between the two countries had up to 1959 been of the order of Rs. 8 lakhs per annum. By 1961-62, the total trade had increased to Rs. 120 lakhs mainly because of large imports of lead, zinc fluorspar and sulphur. The chief item of exports from India is shellac. Manganese ore is a recent addition in Indian exports to Mexico.

MEXICO INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Procedure for Transfer of Post Office Savings Bank Accounts

In accordance with the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of January, 1958, claims for transfer between India and Pakistan of Court Deposits in the shape of P.O.S.B. Accounts and Postal Certificates are being channelled through the Custodians of Deposits, Ministries of Rehabilitation of the two countries. The last date for registration of such claims was 31-7-58.

The physical transfer of the Pass Books and Postal Certificates which constitute Court Deposits of evacuees is being secured by the Organizations of the Custodians of Deposits. On securing the Pass Books and the Certificates the Custodian of Deposits re-endorse them in favour of the owners and exchange the documents, (viz. Post Office Savings Bank Pass Books/Postal Certificates) between themselves for being made over to the owners in the other country. To complete their transfer postally also a procedure (circulated to all Postal Circles) has been evolved by mutual agreement between the Directors General, P & T, India and Pakistan.

The arrangements made apply to P. O. Savings Bank Accounts and Certificates of pre-independence origin alone and have no application whatever to the Savings Bank accounts and certificates opened/registered after Independence i.e., on or after August 15, 1947.

276

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pakistan Trade Pact : Joint Communique

The following Joint Communique was issued

in New Delhi, November 13, 1962 at the end of the trade talks between India and Pakistan :

"The Pakistan Trade Delegation led by Mr. K. S. Islam, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Cormmerce, Government of Pakistan, and the Indian, Trade Delegation led by Mr. D. K, Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, held discussions at New Delhi from the 9th November to 13th November, 1962. The implementation of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement (1960-63) with particular reference to the Special Arrangements incorporated in the Protocols thereto 'was reviewed. This was the 5th and last review meeting relating to the present Trade Agreement which expires on the 20th Match, 1963. The discussions were held throughout in a cordial atmosphere,

"The agreed minutes of discussions were signed today by the leaders of the two Delegations,"

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Proposed Indo-Pakistan Talks

Speaking on a call-attention notice regarding "the reported news about the proposed talk between India and Pakistan to resolve the Kashmir dispute peacefully," the Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on November 30, 1962: As the House is aware, we have recently had visits from Mr., Duncan Sandys, Minister of Commonwealth Relations in the United Kingdom, and Mr. Averell. Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State in the United States. We had long discussions with them about the Chinese invasion of India and our need for various kinds of equipment to meet this attack on our country. I am glad to say that these discussions were fruitful and we hope to get much of the equipment required from the United States and the United Kingdom as well as some other friendly countries, I am grateful to these countries for the help they are giving us in this crisis that we have to face.

In the course of my talks with Mr. Duncan Sandys and Mr. Harriman the question of our relations with Pakistan was raised. I told them that it had always been our policy to have friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan because this seemed to us essential not only because of geography, but because of our joint history, culture, language and the many that. had arisen between us during the long years. We had always aimed at that and we are sure that this is the only proper relationship that should subsist between two neighbouring countries and peoples which have had such close bonds in the past. The question of Kashmir was referred to and we explained to them our position in regard to it and pointed out that anything that involved an upset of the present arrangement would be very harmful to the people of Kashmir as well as to the future relations of India and Pakistan. We were, however, always ready to discuss this, as other matters, with representatives of the Pakistan Government at any level desired. In fact, we had suggested meetings at various levels in the course of the last few months, but no positive response had come from them.

Mr. Sandys and Mr. Harriman appreciated our position, but still suggested that a friendly discussion about these matters between India and Pakistan might be helpful. I was agreeable to this, as indeed we have been ourselves suggesting some such-meeting for sometime past. I explained to them again, however, our basic principles and how it was not possible for us to bypass or ignore them.

Mr. Sandys thereafter went to Pakistan and came back yesterday after consultation with President Ayub Khan suggesting that a joint statement should be issued on behalf of both the Governments stating that a renewed effort should be made. to resolve the outstanding differences so as to enable India and Pakistan to live side by side in peace and friendship, further stating that discussions should be. started at an early date initially at the ministerial level and later at an appropriate, stage directly between the Heads of Governments. We suggested some variations in the draft joint statement. These were largely agreed to Ultimately, the following joint statement was issued on behalf of the Governments of India and Pakistan

JOINT STATEMENT

"The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of, India have agreed that a renewed effort should be made to resolve the outstanding differences between their two countries on

277

Kashmir and other related matters, so as to enable India and Pakistan to live side by side in peace and friendship.

"In consequence, they have decided to start discussions at an early date with the object of reaching an honourable and equitable settlement.

"These will be conducted initially at the ministerial level. At the appropriate stage direct talks will be held between Mr. Nehru and President Ayub."

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister Condemns China for Betrayal of Panch Sheel: Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister moved the following Resolutions in Lok Sabha on November 8,

1962-:

- 1. "This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."
- 2. This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill-and friendship by India towards the Peopie's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and noninterference, and peaceful co-existence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces. "This House places on record its hi appreciation of the valiant struggle men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.
 - "This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.
 - "This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.
 - "With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to

drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and bard the struggle may be."

Moving the Resolutions, the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we meet in Parliament today earlier than was intended, because of a grave crisis that has arisen. This House, and everybody in India, and the greater part of the world know that the People's Republic of China has invaded India with massive forces, and there have been some bloody battles resulting in considerable casualties on both sides.

INDIA VICTIM OF AGGRESSION

For five years, we have been the victims of Chinese aggression across our frontiers in the north. That aggression was, to begin with, rather furtive. Occasionally there were some incidents and conflicts. These conflicts might well be termed frontier incidents. Today, we have seen a regular and massive invasion of our territory by very large forces.

China, which claimed and still claims to be anti-imperialist, is pursuing a course today for which comparisons can only be sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those past days, the European, Powers in the full flood of imperialist aggression and with strength and weapons given to them by the Industrial Revolu-

FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD

278

tion took possession of large parts of Asia and Africa by force. That imperialism has abated now, and many of the colonies of European countries have been freed and are independent countries. But, curiously the very champions of anti-imperialism, that is, the People's Government of China, are now following the course of aggression and imperialist expansion.

It is sad to think that we in India, who have pleaded for peace all over the world, and who have sought the friendship of China and treated them with courtesy and consideration and pleaded their cause in the councils of the world should now ourselves be victims of new imperialism and expansionism by a country which says that it is against all imperialism. This strange twist of history has brought us face to face with something that we have not experienced in this way for over a hundred years or more. We had taken it almost for granted that despite sonic lapses in recent years, as in the Suez affairs--we had taken it for granted-that this type of aggression was almost a thing of the past. Even the Chinese aggression on our borders during the last five years, has as it was, and 'indicative of an expansionist tendency, though it troubled us greatly, hardly led us to the conclusion that China would indulge in a massive invasion of India. Now, we have seen and experienced this very invasion and it has shocked us, as it has shocked a large number of countries.

History has taken a new turn in Asia and perhaps the world, and we have to bear the brunt of it, to fight with all our might this menace to our freedom and integrity. Not only are we threatened by it, but all the standards of international behaviour have been upset and so all the world is affected by it, apart from the immediate consequences. No self-respecting country which loves its freedom and its integrity can possibly submit to this challenge. Certainly, India, this dear land of ours, will never submit to it whatever the consequences, whatever they may be. We accept the challenge in all its consequences.

It may be that this challenge is also an opportunity for us. Indeed, the people of India in their millions have demonstrated that they accept this challenge and have shown a unity and an enthusiasm such as has been very seldom in evidence. A crisis has come and we have stood up to face it and meet that crisis.

I have moved a Resolution seeking the approval of this House to the state of emergency that has been declared by the President. That was inevitable when foreign legions invaded India and our Constitution wisely provided for such a course to be followed by us in any serious crisis, I have no doubt that this House will approve of this declaration by the President and subsequently I hope also of the Defence of India Ordinance and the other steps that are, being taken to face this crisis.

I should like this House for a moment to look

at this matter in some perspective, We stand, I do believe, at a turning point not only in the history of India and of Asia and possibly even of the world, because what happens in this conflict will affect it obviously. It will affect Asia, of which two of the biggest countries are China and India. But it will affect the world also and, therefore, this conflict has very widereaching consequences. We should try to look at it from this point of view. For the moment, we are shocked at this cruel and crude invasion of another country. The world has also witnessed the response of the people of the country invaded, that is, our country, and the world will vet witness the way the people of India act when their freedom is threatened and their dear liberty is imperilled.

So, we are shocked and in a state of high excitement. That is inevitable, and not surprising, but we have to remember that this turning point in history is not going to end soon. We may have to face this for a long period, for a number of years, I do not know how long, and we must train ourselves and the nation to be prepared to face it, however long the crisis may last. It is in that mood, in that mentality, that I seek this House to give a lead to the country.

Chinese aggression on our frontiers is five years old and during these years this House has discussed this matter repeatedly. On the last occasion this discussion took place on the 12th August, 1962. Many White Papers have been issued, giving the long drawn out correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China. Only today I have placed another bunch of these papers contained in White Paper No. 7. On the 22nd August, 1962 we sent a note to China. A reply was sent to this on the 13th September last. But before the reply was sent or received by us, even on the 8th September, China's forces crossed the international boundary in the north-west comer of NEFA across the Thagla ridge and began to threaten the Indian post at Dhola. We had a number of posts near the northern frontier of NEFA adequate enough to meet any minor or normal incursion. We hoped that we would be able to meet this new aggression and immediately we took steps to strengthen our forces in that area.

McMAHON LINE

Five days after this new aggression, on the 13th September the Chinese Government sent us

279

a threatening reply, asking for discussions on the boundary question. We have previously demonstrated by a mass of evidence that our boundary is what has been called the McMahon Line, but the boundary was not laid down even by Mr. McMahon, whoever is responsible for it. It was a recognition of the long-standing frontier on the high ridge of the Himalayas which divided the two countries at the watershed. To sonic extent, though indirectly, the Chinese accepted this. Certainly they accepted the continuation of this line in Burma. But, apart from the constitutional or legal aspects, it is undoubted and cannot be challenged that no Chinese has ever been in that part on this side of the line. excepting, as the House knows, in a little border village called Longju.

Even the McMahon Line which the Chinese have called illegal was laid down 48 years ago, in 1914, and that was a confirmation of what was believed then. Legal or not, it has been a part of India for a long number of years and certainly let us say for 50 years or so, apart from its previous history which is also in our favour. Here then is a boundary which for nearly 50 years has been shown to be our northern frontier. I am limiting what I say to 50 years for the sake of argument; really it was even before that Even if the Chinese did not accept it-and I would like to say that the objection they raised in 1913 to this treaty was not based on their objection to the McMahon Line; it was based on their objection to another part of the treaty which divided Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, the McMahon Line did not come in that; however, it is a fact that they objected to the whole treaty because of that other objection-even if the Chinese did not accept it then, this has been in existence now in our maps, in our practice, in our. Constitution, in our Organisation, administration etc.. for nearly 50 years. Even the non-acceptance of. can it entitle them to undertake an aimed invasion to upset it? Even the Chinese know and say that independent India has been in possession of this territory right up to the Himalayan watershed.

It is rather difficult for me to say what they say. Because, if any person takes the trouble to read through this vast correspondence, he will notice that their alleged frontier is a very mobile one ; it changes. It is wherever they have laid the frontier and in this matter too they have, stated many contradictory things. They have laid stress sometimes on the fact that we have occupied this area of NEFA or a large part of it, since we became independent. That is a curious statement since, as I have said all along, it was fully recognised in 1913-14. Apart from that, when we became independent, we did one thing. We naturally wanted these tribal people in the frontier areas to share our independence. The British largely left them to their own resources and interfered only when there was some trouble. But there is no doubt that the British considered their frontier to be the McMahon Line. They did not have a full-fledged administrative apparatus there. On gaining independence, we were naturally anxious to develop these areas as we were trying to develop other areas of India. We tried, therefore, not only to introduce our administration there but schools hospitals, roads, etc. It is this which the Chinese say represents our occupying that. Any person who sees these papers and the history behind them would easily say that we have occupied it in every sense, legally, constitutionally, administratively, practically for a large number of years.

Now, the point is that whatever the legal and constitutional aspect of their claim might be we think there is no force whatever---does that justify a sudden invasion of this kind? The House will remember that we have discussed this matter many times previously; we discussed it largely in relation to their aggression in Ladakh because nothing had happened here except with the sole exception of the little frontier village Longiu. Repeatedly, in the course of talks-sometimes they are reflected in these papers too-we were given to understand something not absolutely, not clearly,-as has now been discovered, always their phrases had a double meaning attached to them which could be interpreted any way, to assure us of something and later to deny that they had not assured us. I remember the long talk I had with the Chinese Prime Minister, specially, about the McMahon Line. I forget the exact date; it was Ave years ago or six years ago; I do not remember exactly. That was when

he came to India. We had a long talk and immediately after the talk, I put down in a note I prepared the contents of our talk so that I might not I forget it. That note is here in our office. Much later I sent an extract of my. note of that talk to the Chinese Government and they denied the truth of it. I was very much surprised and hurt because I was quite certain. When we were talking it was not once I asked; I asked the same question two or three times and definitely the answer Was given, to me. He gave me to understand that although the Chinese Government considered the McMahon Line an illegal line and a British imperialist line; nevertheless because of the large number of facts, because of their desire to be friendly' with us, they would be prepared to do this. That was the clearest impression that I got. He denied it later on. So, it becomes a little difficult to say what they stood by at a particular time.

Anyhow, my point is that whether they acknowledge the McMahon Line or not undoubt-

280

edly it has been, till a few weeks ago, completely in our possession; the area on this side was completely in our possession; for generations past it has been in our possession; if you like it I can put a later date, 1913-14 and I may say that it was a recording of what had been happening previously. How does it justify the Chinese Government to carry on an invasion of it, by any law, international standards of behaviour or for any other reason?

PECULIAR CHINESE APPROACH

The House may have noticed a very peculiar approach that the Chinese Government has made to what has happened recently in NEFA. They go on saying that India attacked them and their frontier guards as they are called are merely defending themselves. I must confess that it is a complete perversion of facts and the attempt to make falsehood appear to be the truth, and the truth to be the falsehood has amazed me because nothing can be more utterly baseless than what they have been saying. Here is a single fact. We have been up to the McMahon Line all these years; we have not gone one inch beyond nor have we covered another's territory. They have come. Let us for the moment assume their case that there is some doubt about where the McMahon Line is. But the point is that they have invaded an area which has not been in their possession ever, ever in the history of the last 10,000 years. After all the present Chinese Government came into existence 12 years ago or thereabout. Any claim that they may directly make to this territory can only be made either in these 12 years or possibly previously through Tibet. So, it becomes a question of what they can claim through Tibet or through their domination over Tibet. It is true that for a long time past there were some frontier questions between Tibet and India, even in British times. But all these questions were about little pockets or little frontier areas, small areas. Nobody has ever put forward, no Tibetan Government has ever put forward previously these large claims to what tantamounts to two-thirds of NEFA, apart from the Vast area in Ladakh.

So, we arrive at one firm conclusion which is not capable of argument or- denial; that is, the Chinese have come to this territory with a massive force, territory which for a long time at least has been included in India, and administered in a vague way and a little fully administered by India. If they had any claim they could have discussed it and talked about it and adopted various means of peaceful settlement, appointed arbitrators or gone to the Hague Court or whatever it was.

Here, I may say, it has been unfortunate, as has been, in so many other cases, that the present Government of China is not represented in the United Nations Hon. Members are surprised when we have supported the Chinese representation-representation of the People's Government of China-in the United Nations. We have supported it in spite of this present invasion, because we have to look at it this way: it is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is a question, which will facilitate Chinese aggression, it will facilitate its misbehaviour in the future. It will make disarmament impossible in the world. You might disarm the whole world and leave China, a great powerful country, fully armed to the teeth. it is inconceivable. Therefore. in spite of our great resentment at what they have done, the great irritation and anger, still, I am

glad to say that we kept some perspective about things and supported that even now. The difficulty is one cannot call them up before any tribunal or world court or anywhere. They are just wholly an irresponsible country believing' I believe, in war as the only way of settling anything, having no love of peace, and stating almost that, and 'with great power at their disposal. That is the dangerous state of affairs not only for India but for the rest of the world. I am not going into the question, as some people do, of communism or anti-communism. I do not believe that that is a major issue in this matter or any other. Communism may help; but the major issue is, an expansionist, imperiousminded country deliberately invading into a country-(Interruption).

An Hon. Member: With a slave army.

Prime Minister I do not know what the Hon. Member has said I am not entering into that argument. I am laying stress on this fact, because as some countries do, they explain everything in terms of communism and anti-communism. I think the result is that they are unable to see many of the basic facts of the question. Communism may help or communism may hinder. Communism may give them a certain strength or weakness, whatever it may be. But today we are facing a naked aggression, just the type of aggression which we saw in the 18th and 19th centuries; there was then no communism anywhere.

An Hon. Member : This is the 20th century.

Prime Minister: So, we have to face this new type of imperialism on our borders. Asia is facing this new type, and the whole world is concerned with that. For the moment, we are most concerned with it. and we have to face it and bear the burden ourselves, although some of our friendly countries are certainly helping us and we are grateful to them for that help.

281

To say that we are committing all this aggression on Chinese territory is a kind of double talk which is very difficult for a man of my simple mind to understand. "We commit aggression on ourselves; we commit aggression on the soil of our own country and they defend it by coming over the mountains into our territory." It is really extraordinary to what length people can go to justify their misdeeds.

It is true that when we heard on the 8th September of their coming over the Thagla pass into our territory in some forces, we had quite adequate forces in our posts. We had no doubt some forces, to meet any incursion, but it large forces come over, an ordinary military post can hardly resist them. We took immediate steps to send further forces to reinforce our posts. We sent them immediately as we had to, in the circumstances; yet, there was one unfortunate factor which normally should be remembered. That was, if we send our forces, who are tough, young and strong, nevertheless, we send them from the plains of India suddenly to 14,000 ft. high. For any person, however strong he may be, it requires time to be acclimatised to these heights- But they went there. When they went there, then began a process; we sent some further forces and thought that they would be adequate to meet the Chinese menace in so far as it was feasible. The Chinese also started increasing their forces there. Now for them, it was a relatively easy matter, because they have vast forces in Tibet. I do not know how much they have. They used to have 11 divisions, and I am told they now have 13 or 14 divisions in Tibet. Just imagine the very vast armies they are having in Tibet alone.

First of all, the Chinese armies were fully acclimatised, living for long on the high plateau of Tibet. It was just not in the line with the ridge but only a little below the ridge.

Secondly, the whole of Tibet has been covered in the last few years by roads, and the roads, there, in that extremely severe climate, mean simply levelling the ground, removing boulders, etc., because you do not require cement or anything at that height. The ground itself is so very hard. So, this is covered by roads, and they can travel perhaps at quick notice from one part to another in Tibet.

So, they could bring large forces to the other side of the Thagla ridge. They would not be immediately visible to us, because, on the other side,--and that is what we believe happened that although some forces were being added on by the Chinese crossing the Thagla ridge they could not be seen. They were adding large number of forces on the other side nearby and in the last few days of this battle that occurred there on the 20th, they poured in masses of the people. I do not know how much: six, seven and eight times the number of troops that we had. They have thus logistic advantage not only of bringing troops but supplying everything that could be brought immediately on the other side of the Thagla Ridge and send them. We had a certain disadvantage. I am merely mentioning the facts-the logistic disadvantage of the people having been suddenly sent to these heights. Everything that they require has to be sent by air, and our Air Force has done a very fine piece of work there, in taking everything by air in spite, sometimes, of enemy fire and the difficulties that always occur in these high mountains. So, this went on.

May I add that there has been a great deal of attack about our unpreparedness. I think most of it is based on ignorance. (Interruption) .

Some of them is true: first of all, it is perfectly true that we were not prepared to face two or three divisions of the Chinese army descending upon the forces there.

I was talking about unpreparedness. It is perfectly true, as I said, that we were unprepared to meet a massive invasion of two or three divisions. But the other things that are said about roads, about blankets, are very largely incorrect. (Interruptions).

I do not wish to go into details, I merely wanted to indicate that the criticisms that are made, partly justified, are largely not justified. About arms, it is not a thing which one normally talks about in Parliament openly. I have been glad to explain what we have done, what we have not done and the difficulties that we have to face.

The hon. House will remember that till independence, our defence department was entirely under the war office, and the war office not only laid down the policy, but insisted that everything as far as possible should be acquired through Whitehall. During the last great war, because of the difficulties of acquiring war material from abroad, from the United Kingdom, some of our ordnance factories grew up, but still they were rather elementary. The first problem we had to tackle, therefore, was to get out of this Whitehall atmosphere and the practice of our acquiring everything from there, determining our own policy and all that I think we have done rather well to build up in these years this industry.

MANUFACTURE OF ARMS

There is always a choice and there has been a choice in this and other matters for us to buy

282

arms from abroad or to make them ourselves. Obviously it is infinitely better to make them ourselves, because that strengthens the country industrially and otherwise and secondly, you cannot altogether rely on outside supplies; any moment they may fail you and economically it is bad to get them from outside. So our practice has been to try to build up our arms: the industry and the like in the country and we have done fairly well. We might have done better; I do not know. All kinds of difficulties arise, because development of one industry depends on the whole industrial back round of the country. We have laid stress on that. I would not go into that.

A great deal was said about arms, automatic rifles and the rest. For the last three or four years, we have been trying to make then and various difficulties arose about patents, this, that and the other and sometimes about our own difficulties in finding enough foreign exchange. This has been a continuing difficulty, as to how much we should spend in the shape of foreign exchange. Ultimately, we got over these difficulties and we started their manufacture-I forget the date, but some time this year and we are now making them.

The only alternative was previously for us to get a large number of these weapons from abroad. We hesitated; we wanted to make them ourselves. Undoubtedly, we could have got them, but remember this. If we have tried to get all these weapons from abroad in what might be called relatively peace time, we will have to spend enormous sums of money. Our whole planning, etc., will have gone, because when you talk 'of weapons in terms of war, you talk in terms of thousands of crores. It is not a question of few crores but thousands of crores. and it would have smashed our economy. It is a different matter when we have to face this tremendous crisis, which both our people feel as such and the world sees; we can get better terms to get the things and our people are prepared to spend much more.

I am merely pointing out some things-they may not be adequate explanation, but I want you to appreciate that every attempt has been made and continually being made to build up an industry-an aircraft industry, an arms industry, etc., an up-to-date one. Obviously we cannot be up-to-date in the sense of competing let us say, with America or the Soviet Union or England. It is just not possible for us to advance our basic industries and science so much. But we have made good advance scientifically. One of the most important features is that the defence science department that we have built up a high-class affair, employing about 2,000 scientists.

Anyhow, if there were mistakes committed or delays committed, it is not for me to go into that now. It is not a good thing for us to apportion blame and say that such and such officer or such and such Minister, etc., is to blame. We are all to blame in a sense. (Interruptions).

It is a fact that ever since 1st October, when I returned from abroad, every day I have been connected-previously I was connected through the Defence Ministry, but from the 1st October, I have been there every day. We, the Chiefs of staff and others sat together and discussed the matters. And, naturally, it is for the experts, the Chiefs of staff and their advisers to determine the tactics, the strategy etc., of fighting, and not for me; I do not know enough about it. I can only put questions to them, make suggestions to them, leaving the final carrying out of it to their hands.

We took several steps. On the very next day,

on 2nd October, we called back the Chief of the General Staff, General Kaul, who was on leave then. I want to mention his name specially because, quite extraordinarily, unjust things have been said about him. We sent for him and we changed the method of command, separating Naga I-Fills etc., from NEFA. We went there practically within 24 hours. Some people say he had not had any experience of fighting. That is not correct. He had the experience of fighting in Burma. He was our Military Attache in Washington when the trouble occurred in Kashmir, but he begged us to scud him there. We sent him there and he was there. I doubt, knowing a good many of our officers and others-many of them are good-in sheer courage and initiative and hard work, if we can find anybody to beat him. Anyhow, it is very unfair for our officers who are bearing, heavy burden, whether it be Kaul or anybody else, to be criticised in this way, criticised foreign correspondents sending news abroad, massages abroad. That is a highly improper, highly irresponsible thing to be done when they are bearing such heavy burden.

Then, General Kaul, as soon as, he went over there-he went there suddenly from here on the 4th walked daily, walked 16 to 20 miles from post to post over highly precipitous mountain area. fee fell ill and he came here to report after 4 or 5 days.

I would like to point out to the House a fact, which is no doubt known, that this invasion by the Chinese did not merely take place in NEFA on the 20th October. On that very day it was a coordinated attack all along the line from Ladakh to NEFA. Therefore, to say that because we had attacked them-we are perfectly

283

justified in pushing them and attacking themin NEFA, to make that an excuse and say that we had attacked them in NEFA and therefore they are attacking us on that day all along the line of Ladakh is a thing which is manifestly a false statement, a made-up thing.

Now, a few days after the 20th October-I think it was 24th-a message was sent to the heads of Governments or heads of States in cases where it may be so, almost all of them, pointing out the background of Chinese invasion and stating our firm resolve to resist it-a copy of it I have placed on the Table of the House. We have received many replies, not from all yet but from many of them, extending their sympathy and support at the present crisis.

Just soon after, four or five days after this massive attack, the Chinese Prime Minister came out with, what is called, a "three-point proposal" on which a cease-fire might be arrived. This was very vague. It was not quite clear what he meant. But what appeared to us and what appeared later on to us with further elucidation was that it meant our not only acknowledging or partly acknowledging their right to be where they were on our territory, but our force retiring still further, some 20 kilometres or so; that is to say, athough the Chinese armies would retire a little on our territory we would retire further and they would have an opportunity to build up their strength on our territory to attack us further later. It is an impossible thing for' us to agree to. There has been some confusion about this in the countries, not only here but in other countries too, but as we have explained it most people have understood it-I am talking about other countries.

We, in reply or independently or, rather, proposed that they should retire to the line prior to the 8th September, that is, behind the McMahon Line there and they should also retire the advance they had made since the 8th September in Ladakh. Some of our friends have said that this was a weak proposal, we should have asked them to go out completely. Well, it is for the House to judge our weakness and strength, and the proposals must have some realities, because we have not only to abide by it but we have to convince all our friends elsewhere that we are making something, a proposal which is reasonable and which can be given effect to. The proposal was that they should retire to that line as it stood on 8th September both in NEFA and Ladakh. Then we were prepared to meet their representatives to consider what further steps should be taken to lessen tension etc. Once that was agreed to, then would come as a third step our meeting together to consider the merits of the question

We have made that proposal and we stand by it, I think it is a reasonable proposal and certainly not in any sense a dishonourable or a weak one.

Then, meanwhile, many of our friends abroad, well-intentioned countries, made various efforts to bring about cease-fire, stoppage of fighting and a consideration of the matter on the merits.

Their efforts, or rather their desire, to help in stopping this fighting is very laudable, and we welcome their desire. But, not knowing all the detailed facts, sometimes they made some proposals which, had no great relevance to the situation.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT NASSER

I shall refer only to one of them, and that was the reference made by President Nasser of the UAR. I must pay my tribute to President Nasser in this matter because he did not make a vague proposal in the air. People advise us to be good and peaceful as if we are inclined to war. In fact, if we are anything, as the House well knows, we do not possess the war-like mentality and that is why for the purpose of war there is weakness. We may have developed it, but that is a different matter I am talking of the past. So, people talking to us to be good boys and make it up has no particular meaning, unless they come to grips with the particular issues involved. Now, President Nasser took the trouble to understand the facts and, thereafter, issued a presidential decree or communique issued by the President-in-Council of the UAR in which he made certain proposals. These proposals were not exactly on the lines we had suggested but were largely in conformity with our proposals. They laid special stress on troops withdrawing to their lines where they stood prior to the 8th of September. That was a major thing. That fitted in with our proposal. China has rejected this proposal made by President Nasser.

Now, this crisis is none of our making or seeking. It is China which has sought to enforce its so-called territorial claims. by military might. Indeed, she has advanced beyond the line of her territorial claims. As I said, their frontier is a mobile one; anything they could grab becomes their frontier. In this task, in defending our frontiers and our motherland, we have sought help from all friendly countries. I wish to express my gratitude for the prompt response to our appeal for sympathy and support which have been given to us by various countries. This help that is given is unconditional and without any strings. It does not, therefore, affect directly our policy of nonalignment which we value. Those countries

284

which have helped us have themselves recognised this and made it clear that they do not expect us to leave that policy. Help has been given to us swiftly by the United States, by the United Kingdom and by some other friendly countries. We are in touch with many others. We have also made approaches to other friendly countries like the Soviet Union and France for supplies and equipment.

No SURRENDER To AGGRESSION

We have often declared that we do not covet any territory of anyone else; we are, quite satisfied with our own territory such as it is. But there is another aspect of that. We do not submit to anyone else coveting our territory and although the aggressor in this instance has gained some initial successes-I do not know what they have in mind, whether they want to use it as a bargaining counter or they have some other evil designs-as I have said, we cannot submit to it, whatever the consequences.

There is one other aspect which I should like to mention, which is not indirectly connected with this matter but directly connected, and that is our development plans and the Five Year Plan. Some people have said : "Let us give up these Plans so that we may concentrate on the war effort". What is the war effort? People think of the soldiers in the front, which is perfectly right. They are bearing the brunt of the heat and danger. But in this matter, in the kind of struggle that we are involved in, every peasant in the field is a soldier, every worker in a factory is a soldier. Our work, our war effort essentially, apart from the actual fighting done, is in ever greater production in the field and factory. We must remember that. It is an

effort which depends greatly on our development. Today we are much more in a position to make that kind of effort in field and factory than, let us say, ten or twelve years ago; there is no doubt about that. We are not still adequately developed. I hope this very crisis will make us develop more rapidly. But this has always to be remembered that an army today, a modern army, fights with modem weapons which it has to manufacture itself in that country. It is based on the development of industry, and that industry must have an agricultural base if it is to succeed. Therefor, we have to develop all round, apart from agriculture and industry, which are the basic things in our Five Year Plan. Then there is power, which is essential from the point of view of war effort, from the point of view of industry, from the point of view of even agriculture. So that, to talk of scrapping the Five Year Plan is not to understand the real springs of our strength. We have to carry the Five Year Plan and go beyond it in many respects. It may be, in some matters which are considered non-essential, we may tone down or leave them but in the major things of the Five Year Plan we have to make the fullest effort. Among the major things agriculture is highly important. How can a country fight when it is lacking in food. But I do not think we will be. We have to grow more and more, which is a difficult thing. We have laid down the targets for our agricultural produce in our Five Year Plan, but in the last year or two, this year especially, we have fallen behind because of floods and all kinds of things.

Now, although we have fallen behind, I take it that we have to aim at higher targets than we have laid down even in the Third Plan, and I am sure we shall get that. I am not talking vaguely. I think we can get that. We cannot get it so easily if we laid down certain targets in the office here in the Food Ministry. We must go down to the peasant, to the agriculturist, and transform his present enthusiasm, his present energy into greater production. Nothing is more cheering and heartening than the reaction amongst the people, amongst the peasants who have given their little mite. Let them transfer them into greater production. I am sure they can, if we approach them rightly. So also with industry; so also with many other things like education etc. We must look upon all of them

as part of the war effort that we have to make. In this process-I hope we shall not only build up our nation more swiftly but will make it stronger, make it more social-minded and lay the base of the socialist structure that we aim at.

This peril we have to face is a grave menace. This challenge may be converted into opportunity for us to grow and to change the dark cloud that envelops our frontiers into the bright sun not only of freedom but of welfare in this country.

In effect we have to look at this matter as an effort of the whole nation. We may saysome people say-we want an armed people. That is true in a sense. But what we really want is the whole people mobilised for this effort doing their separate jobs whether it is in the field, the factory or the battlefield thus combining together and strengthening the nation and bringing success to us. We have to be armed, therefore, not only by weapons of warfare but by weapons of agriculture, industry and all those as well.

We do not minimise our task. Let no man minimise it or have any illusions about it. It is not a thing which we can deal with by momentary enthusiasm, enthusiasm of the moment or

285

lasting a month or two. It is a long effort that we require-a difficult effort-and we shall have to go out to do our utmost. It is not merely enough to pay something to the Defence Fund or to do something else. That is good in its own way. It is very welcome how people are paying them by straining every nerve to the utmost. We have to keep up our strength and our determination to the end. And that end may not be near. Therefore we have to prepare in every way to strengthen the nation not only for today and tomorrow but for the day after also to meet this menace. If we do that, I have no doubt that we shall be able to show the determination and fortitude that is required of our people. We have had a glimpse of it in their present enthusiasm which has been a most moving sight. To see our people come, not only the young but the old-old men and old women-and the young little children and their enthusiasm has been a sight to gladden any

heart.

Now before I end I should like to say a word about our soldiers and airmen who are working under extraordinary difficult circumstances. I want to send on your behalf our greetings and assurance of our full assistance. To those who have fallen in defence of the country we pay our homage. They will not be forgotten by us or by those who follow us. I am confident that all sides of this House will stand united in this great venture and will demonstrate to the world that free India which has stood for peace and will always stand for peace and friendship with other countries can never tolerate aggression and invasion. If we have worked for peace as we have done and we shall continue to do so, we can also work for war effectively if we are attacked as we have been.

Sir, I commend these Resolutions to the House.

CHINA USA INDIA FRANCE BURMA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU RUSSIA TOTO **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Condemnation of Chinese Aggression: Home Minister's Speech

Moving the Resolutions for the approval of the Proclamation of Emergency and for the affirmation of resolve "to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India", the Union Home Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made the following speech in Rajya Sabha on November 8, 1962 :

"With your permission, Sir, I rise to move the two Resolutions on the agenda together. I shall read them out The special session of this House of Parliament is in itself an indication of the fact that a grave emergency has arisen in the country. The Hon'ble Members are, I am sure, aware of the developments which have taken a turn for the worse since September 8, 1962. The development has been so sudden that it has no doubt taken the whole country by surprise. It must not have been so in the case of China which has been preparing all these days for launching a massive attack on India. The Peking and the Chinese newspapers are carrying on ceaseless scurrilous propaganda against India and blaming us for the intrusions into the Chinese territory, now especially, on the eastern front. I do not want to go into the past history, but what the Chinese have been telling the world is far from the truth and the facts are altogether otherwise. I shall, therefore, like to recount quickly what has happened during the last few years.

We have had a good deal of experience on the western front as to what the technique of the Chinese was to advance into our territory. They have built roads and established check-posts one after another, on the western front, gradually advancing into the Indian territory. When the Chinese started doing the same thing on the eastern front, the intentions of the Chinese were quite clear. The Chinese forces came down the Thagla ridge which is our frontier and entered into the valley and put up their posts across the river Namkachu. It was clear that they wanted to intrude into the Indian territory in this sector at-so. It was impossible to wait any longer and the Government of India formulated a clearcut policy to drive back the aggressors. Their tactics became apparent and our troops made every effort to drive them out. There was a clash between the two forces and casualties on both sides. We expected better sense would prevail. But it was undoubtedly an impossible thing to have expected from China. The Chinese increased their strength and started a massive attack, in order to capture the Dhola Post, where our army was stationed in a somewhat bigger strength. It is true that we were not. prepared for this onslaught. The Chinese Government had given categorical assurances that they accepted our McMahon Line. Our Check-posts were generally manned by small detachments in most of the places.

We felt that even if there is a clash, which often happens on our other borders like Pakistan

etc., it would be a small affair and the dispute

286

would ultimately be settled at the Governmental or diplomatic level. We can certainly be accused of many things. But if the matter is given a dispassionate consideration it would be realised that a peace-loving people as we are, we had no war mentality or a war-approach.

It was one of the happiest days in my life when I visited Tezpur and had an opportunity to meet the Commander and the Brigadier who had just then returned from Sela Pass. It was delightful to meet and talk to them and to see their courage and determination to fight the enemy with all the strength at their command. I do not want to make the Hon'ble Members of this House or the Army complacent as they have still an uphill task to perform. There are many vital points in some of the areas which have to be carefully guarded and we have to build up our strength in full measure. One does not know what the Chinese may be doing on their side. They must be preparing themselves for launching a much bigger thrust, and yet we have not to feel nervous about it, but show them that the Army is prepared to meet their challenge. The Chinese are not keeping quiet. They have been making efforts to advance beyond the Sela. Pass and Walong. Whenever they have tried to do so recently they have been repulsed successfully. Let us hope OM it would be possible for our forces to drive them back from these places and not allow them to advance any further.

While making an attack on the Eastern Front, the Chinese are not keeping quiet on the Western Front. They have launched heavy attacks on the Western border and have occupied fresh territories. They have advanced further, and the latest report is they are somewhat near Chushul. They are advancing from other directions also and they have captured Demchok. Our resistance continues and it has to continue and will continue. It might be said that we were caught napping whereas the Chinese had made such intensive preparations. I do not think that the House is not in a position to appreciate the way we have been trying to manage the affairs of our country. It is known to us and to the world at large that India is pledged to peace and it had not the faintest notion of going an inch beyond

its territory. We had never any aggressive designs nor do we think the temper of our people will ever allow a democratic Government to behave otherwise. We could have definitely strengthened ourselves militarily if our objective was different. As our people had suffered during the foreign rule for a long period and as they were steeped in poverty and misery, the national objective of the Congress Government was not to spend much over defence, but divert most of its funds for the development of the country in order to reduce our poverty and unemployment.

China did otherwise, and we knew about it. We are all aware what the economic condition of their peasantry has been. There have been reports of starvation and famine conditions and yet the Chinese concentrated on building up a massive defence force, including a powerful air force. We may not have made the desired progress we wanted, because our ambitions are high and our problems are enormous, and vet for us to have spent most of our money on defence would have resulted in increasing further the misery of our people. Besides this, it is only China which could have invaded India like this and in such abnormal circumstances, when only a short time before the attack, the Chinese had raised the slogan of Hindi-Chini-Bhai-Bhai.

When you have such a treacherous opponent, you cannot but meet treachery with firmness. Our duty is now clear. We have to resist with the fullest strength. We have to build up our defence forces. We have to increase their numbers. We have to equip them with necessary arms and strengthen them in other ways. We are faced with a grim battle and we have to be prepared to spend a considerable amount on building up our armed strength. I know the country as a whole will be behind us in this move and I am sure our army will produce the desired results.

Our jawans and officers have shown great valour and have made great sacrifices on the front. They have according to our old Indian traditions fought to the last and they did not give way. It is true that the Chinese with their commanding position both in numbers as well as in weapons took the offensive and made a three-pronged attack. Besides what they did on the other fronts, our forces were encircled and isolated at Dhola and this led to a large number of casualties. However the figures given are often wide of the mark. The Prime Minister has already given the figures of casualties. The death of even one soldier is a matter of deep regret and sorrow for us. But even a man like me who might be considered peace-loving, feels that, in war we should not cry or weep over casualties. In the give and take of the battlefield, there are bound to be casualties. Exchange of bullets is not like exchange of coins or exchange of good wishes. To talk too much of these things might create some kind of weakness or demoralisation. We do not know what amount of sufferings we still have to undergo. But they have to be borne cheerfully. We should have only one objective and one determination. i.e., to fight the enemy and drive him out whatever might be the cost,

The Government of India was the first to accord recognition and establish diplomatic relations with China when the Peoples Republic

287

of China came into existence in October 1949. India has throughout since then tried to keep the best of relations with them. But this declaration of good faith was responded to after some time i.e. in July 1954 by the Chinese with a protest against the presence of Indian border forces in Bara Hoti in Uttar Pradesh. This was the first time that the Government of China had laid claim to any part of Indian territory. It was after this that China began laying claims to large areas of India and started on a course of aggression and occupation of Indian territory in the Aksai chin area of Ladakh since 1957.

You will remember how in September 1958 an Indian patrol was captured by the Chinese at Haji Langar and then in October 1959 an Indian Police party was attacked by the Chinese, near Kongkala and suffered heavy casualties. At about the same time, the Chinese forces in superior numbers advanced towards Longju and captured it. Thereafter Chinese troops progressively enlarged the area of aggression in Ladakh. But at that time no claim as such was made in regard to the McMahon Line which is our boundary. IT was as early as November 20, 1950 that our Prime Minister had declared in the Lok Sabha that "the McMahon Line was our boundary. We will not allow anybody to come across that boundary". This definite declaration of policy had never been questioned by the Chinese authorities. It was, however, in September 1959 that Premier Chou En-lai for the first time wrote to our Prime Minister laying claim to over 50,000 square miles of Indian territory, of which 36,000 square miles were in NEFA region and about 13,000 square miles in the middle and western sectors of India's border. After that a number of things have happened about which I need not further go into. At the instance of the Chinese Prime Minister, a meeting between the two Prime Ministers was held in Delhi in November 1959. An official Committee consisting of the representatives of both the countries was set up and this went into the border and boundary problems in great details. The official report was published in India but not in China. In China, however, it was published only 15 months later, i.e. perhaps some time in May or June 1962. The report makes it clear on the basis of a vast amount of evidence that the traditional delimited boundary between the two countries is what has been in the Indian maps and that the Chinese claims are totally unwarranted. Such evidence as the Chinese produced during the talks was scanty and imprecise and often mutually contradictory. Many of the Chinese documents in fact proved the Indian case. The Government of India, however, did not give up their efforts to resolve the differences by peaceful means. In their note dated May 14, 1962 they again repeated the proposal made in the Prime Minister's letter dated November 16, 1959 to Mr. Chou En-lai. But the Chinese again in their reply dated June 2, 1962 not only rejected the proposal but adopted a threatening and an aggressive attitude which could only serve to increase the danger of actual conflict. Correspondence still continued. In fact the Chinese Government formally proposed in their note dated September 13, 1962 that the two Governments appoint representatives to start discussions from October 15 about the Western sector first in Peking and then in Delhi alternatively. Just about this very time the Chinese forces suddenly crossed the Thagla Ridge in the Eastern sector of the Indian boundary on September 8, 1962. This came as a bolt from the blue and left no alternative for the Government but to resist the aggression with all their strength.

We have had a number of et-backs, but it has not surprised me much. After taking the offensive the Chinese came in thousands with deadly arms and weapons. They captured Dhola Post and other areas round about and advanced towards Towang. The army felt that in the circumstances it was unwise to defend Towang and they wisely took the decision to evacuate from Towang, and to build up their strength to resist the Chinese near Sela Pass and Walong. In the middle sector and on the far eastern side, the Chinese have been trying to move up. In fact the strategy of the Chinese was to have a threepronged attack, one from the West, i.e., through Dhola; the second, in the middle in Siang and Subansiri Divisions and third in the East in Lohit Division towards Walong. On the Eastern sector also we have stopped the Chinese advance at Walong. The time at our disposal was short and the problems enormous; yet we have been able to rush up our troops to different vital places. It was an exceedingly difficult job to move up arms and ammunition as well as other materials, and they had been mostly transported by air. Yet it must be said that our Army has done a marvellous job and we have been able to reinforce our forces.

As you are aware, an emergency has been declare and an Ordinance issued. Government will have to come up with a bill in order to convert the Ordinance into an Act. I do not want to take the time of the House at this present moment to deal with the provisions of the Oridnance. The Proclamation that a grave emergency exists, which is before the House for approval, was issued because the crisis was serious enough to justify the declaration of a state of emergency and the assumption by the Government of the necessary legal powers to deal with it. The Defence of India Ordinance,

288

1962 which was promulgated on October 26, 1962 in consequence of the declaration of emergency, provides for special measures to ensure the public safety and interest, the defence of India and civil defence. The Ordinance provides for framing rules by the Central Government for securing the defence of India, the civil defence, the public safety, maintenance of public order for the efficient conduct of military operations and for maintaining supplies and services essential to the life of the community. It also empowers the Central Government to confer powers and impose duties upon the State Government for their respective officers and authorities regarding various matters, irrespective of whether the power to legislate in regard to them vests in the Central or the State Legislatures, or both. Rules under the Ordinance known as the Defence of India Rules, 1962 have been issued. The purpose of he action taken is to streamline the entire apparatus of administration and legislation for achieving the objective dictated by the emergency.

Needless to add, the House and the Country fully realise the importance and need for this kind of a proclamation and arming Government with necessary powers. in fact no one felt concerned over it and the reaction has been entirely to the contrary. It has been welcome throughout the country. I am sure this House will fully uphold the Proclamation of Emergency and the issuing of the Ordinance.

The army is of course there on the frontiers to protect our borders and resist our enemies. But the people as a whole have to stand behind the army. The morale of the country has to be high. It would give added strength and courage to our forces. I do not know how to express our gratitude to our people who have responded to the call of our Prime Minister. The words of his first broadcast are ringing in our ears and the way the people have responded is indeed magnificent. There is no dearth of offers of cash, gold, blood and men and money. The youth of the country is eager to go to the battle front. In fact the recruitment work has become somewhat difficult because of the large number of people coming forward for joining the army. I know there will be no dearth of assistance of offers of any kind from the people, whether from the North or South, East or West. We may have to curtail our Plans and the State Governments are most willing to do so in order to help in production of our defence needs and requirements. Production and greater production is the need of the hour. Most of our production has to be geared to the present needs of the country. Besides foodgrains and other essential necessities of life, each and everyone of us should be prepared to forego other needs and give whatever

is possible for the defence of the country.

In this hour of crisis it is a great encouragement to us to feel that we are not alone and that we have the sympathy and support of a very large number of friendly countries. These friends have recognised that the present fighting is not a mere border dispute but that it involves much vaster issues. We are particularly grateful to those countries that are so readily giving us much needed material help including equipmerit without any strict insistence on preconditions.

We have all to put up a united front and fight shoulder to shoulder in this hour of crisis. The Chinese are trying to create confusion by making offers for negotiations and peaceful approach. They offered on 24th of October, 1962 to withdraw 20 kilometres from what they called "the line of actual control". This offer to withdraw 20 kilometres after having advanced 30 to 40 kilometres into Indian territory on condition that India also similarly withdraws 20 kilometres back from this position could deceive nobody. Subsequently they clarified that what they meant by the line of actual control was roughly the McMahon line in the Eastern sector and the "traditional customary line" as claimed by the Chinese in the Western sector. Since their demands keep on constantly varying and ever-expanding, it is difficult to know exactly what they mean by the traditional customary line. Since they have now proceeded to occupy most of this area, they evidently do not intend to withdraw from it at all. Needless to say it is impossible to consider such a fantastic proposal. In spite of this, the Government of India expressed their willingness to undertake talks and discussions provided the Chinese forces withdrew along the boundary at least to the positions where they were prior to 8th of September, 1962 and the situation prevailing at that time was restored. If the Government of China is really sincere in its professions of peace, they should have no objection in agreeing to this arrangement. There can be no talks as long as the aggressor continues to reap the fruits of his aggression.

We keep the door always open, but we cannot halt our resistance. We have had enough experience of the Chinese behaviour and their pattern of struggle. Our soldiers are resisting the aggression with great heroism and have written glorious pages of Indian history. We cannot betray them. I know each and every young man and woman of this country is wholly behind them and they are prepared to sacrifice their lives if there is need for it. However, I am Sure, that the situation will never be desperate

289

and our forces with the support of our people will be able to repel the aggressor and safeguard our country so that the Indian people may live as a free nation.

India has become one. There are no separate States now. All the Chief Ministers who assembled recently in Delhi have dedicated themselves to a grim resolve to fight back the aggression and have placed themselves at the disposal of the Prime Minister. Under the leadership of our Prime Minister we also should resolve to go ahead and meet the challenge of a powerful and ruthless aggressor. There can be but one outcome and our country is bound to emerge victorious.

Sir, I move this resolution which, I am sure, will have the unanimous support of every section, nay, every member of this House."

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGUILLA PAKISTAN LATVIA TOTO OMAN **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha

Intervening in the debate on the Chinese aggression on Indian territory in Rajya Sabha on November 9, 1962, the Prime Minister made the following statement

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I speak on the Resolution moved by my friend and colleague, the Home Minister. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is necessary for anyone to speak in commending that Resolution because every party and group and every individual in this House, I gather, approves of it and gives it full support. And what is much more important, that support has come in a tremendous and magnificent measure from the people of this country.

I shall, therefore, say something about some points, some outstanding features of this situation, more particularly about the way we have to condition our mentality to face it. Some people have criticised our unpreparedness and may I add that I hope, not now but somewhat later at a more suitable time, there will be an inquiry into this matter because there is a great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension and people have been shocked-all of us have been shocked--by the events that occurred from the 20th October onwards for a few days and the reverses that we suffered. So I hope there will be an enquiry so as to find out what mistakes or errors were committed and who was responsible for them. But for the present that cannot be done and I do not wish to state before the House anything in regard to those matters though I do think that many of the charges made have little substance. The real thing, the basic thing, is that we as a nation in spite of brave speeches now and then, have been conditioned in a relatively peaceful manner, in a democratically peaceful manner which is somewhat opposed to the type of conditioning that a country like China at present has had especially in the last dozen years or so. They have been conditioned, even previously they have been in a sense at war, I should say for 30 years in a condition of war, not war with foreign countries but war in their own country, and the House will remember how constantly this idea of war was being put forward by them. America has been their chief bete noire, their chief enemy and constantly they were rousing up their people against America, against imperialists and the like so as to keep up that mentality of war, that constant preparation for war, for building up for war and all that. We, on the other hand, have constantly spoken about peace

and we are, in spite of sometimes using excited language, a peaceful people and we have pleaded for peace all over the world and in our own country and naturally that conditioning is of a different type than the type of conditioning that China, for instance, has had during the last dozen years. Having conditioned their people, they can turn the direction, they can tura the people's thinking in any way they choose. It was against America; suddenly India becomes enemy No. 1. Not that America ceases to be in their minds the enemy but they turn it round and they turn it round saying that we are the stooges of America. Therefore, all the previous, conditioning against America is turned round to us. For them it is really as if we are doing a job for America, as if it did not directly concern us. Now, in normal times, even apart from this conditioning and the rest, democratic countries do not normally behave like, well, countriesif I may give you an instance-like' Hitler behaved in Germany. Now great countriesnot countries which are pacifists-like England, like France and the rest had powerful armies; yet they were not conditioned in the way that Germany was under Hitler and when war came the result was that in spite of their vast armies. the French army and the British army with the fullest equipment they had with them could not stand up against Hitler and they were swept off. France was humiliated and humbled and then the British army, almost the whole of it, was swept into the English Channel. Not that it was not a good army but the aggressor has an advantage and the conditioning of the aggressor

290

makes it a more fit instrument for the initial attack.

First of all, the aggressor choose's the point of attack, the day and the time of attack, which is an advantage. So this has to be borne in mind. Now, we in the last many years have thought certainly of keeping our army, air force, etc., but we have thought that the essential way of gaining strength is industrialising the country and improving our agriculture because struggles are fought today even more than at the battle front in the field and factory and we thoughtand we still think-that even from the point of view of strengthening Our defence forces the background behind them in the field and factory was essential. Without a proper industry no modern war can be fought. We may get as we are getting-and we are thankful for getting them-arms from abroad because the emergency compels us to do so, to get them. Yet we cannot fight for any length of time with merely aid from abroad. We have to produce the weapons of war here and behind those weapons of war and behind that industry which is so essential is the agricultural background.

No industry can be built up unless agriculture is functioning. So we come back to the growth of agriculture and industry and we have been trying to do that in the last so many years by Five Year Plans and the rest. Naturally the Five Year Plans were meant to raise the level of living of our people, to give them certain amenities, to raise the national income and all that; but essentially, if I may venture to state to this House, they were meant to strengthen the country, to strengthen even the defence forces of the country. Now, many people thought, being used in the past to getting everything from abroad, that this was the easiest way-getting arms and everything from abroad.

Originally our Indian Army before independence consisted of very brave men, hut it was essentially an out-growth of the British Army. Most of the officers, all the senior officers were foreign, were British. Gradually some of our officers rose in rank and a very, very few became Brigadiers. For the rest, I think, Colonel was the topmost rank. All the policy was laid down in Whitehall. They did not bother. They had to carry out that policy.

Almost all the fighting material-not human beings but arms, etc.--came from England chiefly. There was only a slight advance in our arms production during the Second World War, because it became very difficult to supply India from England. Their own demands were terrific and there was distance. Therefore, the British Government encouraged the production of certain arms and ammunition in our Ordnance Factories. Even so, nothing except the most ordinary arms were allowed to be made here. The rest had to come from there. That was the state of affairs when we took charge. First of all, all the policy, direction, etc. changed, from Whitehall direction to Indian direction. We had good people. Yet all the training and thinking was originally derived from Whitehall or from Sandhurst, etc., which is good training. I do not say that it is bad. And they are very fine men. Nevertheless, it was somewhat out of touch with Indian conditions. Gradually we had to bring that round, to fit in more with Indian conditions, but more particularly the whole question of production was before us. We could not rely on foreign sources for arms, etc. After all, when one is forced to do, one gets it from anywhere. as we are doing it today. But that is not a safe thing and that does not produce a sense of self-reliance and self-dependence.

Now, to build up a modem arms industry requires not only some prototype being obtained and copying it. That is difficult enough. But it requires an industrial background in the country. It is out of a background of industry that these things arise, not a specific thing. You make something which may be good for war without any background. We have to have a vast number of scientists, technicians, etc. and long experience of doing it. All these years we have been trying to do that and I think we have made very considerable progress. We have today in our Defence Science Department -I do not exactly know it-I think more than two thousand scientists working. Because you cannot get the real thing here, to get some idea of it, you have to build up your own prototypes and then after building them up you have to experiment with them, try them, and then finally decide in favour and then produce them in large quantities. All this takes time. We have always had this idea that the way to strengthen our Army is to go through these processes.

It is true that in defence one has to fix some period with some idea in one's mind as to when one may be confronted with a war crisis. Suppose we are confronted with a war crisis in a year's time. In our thinking everything else has to be conditioned to that Year. We cannot produce big things within that year. We have to do something. if a war is suddenly thrust upon you, immediately you have to do as best as you can. But in doing the best we can, for the time being, we really lessen our capacity for the future, even to carry on with war for the future, unless we build it up from below, as I have said. That was the problem always before us.

Every country when it thinks of arms, etc.apart from this point of building up the arms

291

industry-has to consider when the time for trial will come. I remember the first time I came into the Government, before I became Prime Minister, I was Vice-President of the Council and one day a problem came up before us about the Army. What Army should we keep? That was just after the World War. This was before Pakistan came into existence and before there was any particular danger. And we were put this question: "When do you expect, what time do you expect to have before a war will take place?" Any war. We had nobody in view. That is to say, we can concentrate more on preparations for it in the sense of long-term preparations. If we think the war is next year, then the approach is different. And it was said: "Let us think for the moment ten years." At that time there was no question of building up the arms industry here. It was only a question of acquiring weapons. Ten years has no particular meaning. It was just a period, so that whatever we required should be spread out over ten years. That was the idea and that should be obtained from abroad.

Later when we became independent we laid much greater stress on production here in this country. There were difficulties. Many people used to old methods, not only for our Army but for everything, for our Railways, etc., preferred just giving a big order-a team going abroad and coming back here-for tanks, for this, that and the other. It was simpler and they knew that tank. And they rather suspected or were afraid that if we made it ourselves it may not be quite as good. It may fail us. But that was not good enough for a long-term effort. We had to do it ourselves and gradually it was built up. And then we had also, you will remember, always certain financial or foreign exchange difficulties, how much we should turn over to defence.

Defence expenditure has gone up somewhat by normal peace-time standards considerably. It affected our whole planning, our First Plan and Second Plan. So, we had to strike a balance somewhere. With all these difficulties and delays, nevertheless, we built up our defence industry, not by any means as we wanted it. The process continued and continues, but I still think with considerable success. If I could show you the rate at which our production in defence industry has gone up, you will notice that it is very considerable. I will not go into those figures. I am merely mentioning these things. Some people criticised that our Ordnance Factories have been making civilian goods. They have been making civilian goods. It was to the tune of about five per cent because when labour was unemployed it had to be turned to do something. And always the normal test is that Ordnance Factories or any arms manufacturing concerns cannot manufacture in peace time as fast as they are supposed to make in war time. Otherwise, you get stocked up with things tremendously. You cannot do anything with them. They get spoiled no doubt. The normal rate is-I forget the exact figurethat in war time you have to advance your rate of production between 15 and 20 per cent of peace time. Because you are spending so much, your ammunition is being fired at a tremendous pace, it must be replaced. In peace time you do it only when there are exercises.

So, all these problems came to us. I was saying that our production has gone up very considerably-not civil production, it is a mere bagatelle, nothing-arms production for the Army, Navy and Air Force and especially for the Army and the Air Force. And now for the last month or two, of course, we have done extraordinarily well. I should like to say a word in commendation of those in charge of our arms production, the Director-General, who is a very able and very enthusiastic man, and all his workers and others. Their scientists and chiefly technicians are working today twentyfour hours a day. There is not a minute's interval when they stop. So, this process went on. It did not go on, I admit, completely, as fast as a country bent on war would do it, because we had always to check it, because the more we spent on it, the less we had for other basic things, even for defence. As I said, I think agriculture is as important as guns in defence. I think the growth of industries is as important as guns. I think that power is as important as guns.

All these things help in producing guns, all these things help in producing a well-fed army and well-fed country. All these things help us in conserving our foreign exchange. All these things are so inter-connected. One must not think of defence as something by itself, training people parading them about and handing them guns for defence. So this process has been going on naturally limited by our resources, limited by many other factors, limited by the growth of our industrial development, and it has made a fairly good progress. It might have made more.

And now I should like to carry this argument to its conclusion. I would like to say that we have today, as everyone realises, a terrific problem which cannot be solved obviously by brave gestures and processions or anything like that, which are good in their own way, but obviously it is something when we are up against one of the biggest powers in the world. We have seen in the past, in the Great War and

292

others, how great powers mauled at each other till ultimately after three or four years or more they were all exhausted, utterly bled, and the greatest powers were defeated, defeated absolutely, France, Germany, Japan, for instance. They did not lack enthusiasm, they did not lack good armies or good navies or air force, they did not lack the industrial background. Yet they were defeated because it was a trial ultimately of something basic, not a question of a few guns or something but of the nerve and basic strength of a nation, the morale of a nation. That is what we have to face, I think we can face it with confidence, but I want you to think of the ordeals before us. We may have, as every army has, as every defence force has, reverses and all that. We have to survive them, we will survive them and not get terribly dispirited because we had a reverse. That is not a right outlook at any time but more specially when we are up against a highly organised and trained military machine' like that of China which has, I believe, the biggest army in the world. Even in Tibet I understand they have got a vast army, leave out the huge legions in China. That is the

problem before us. Now in facing it, we face it today, as we try to do, with all the material we have and all the material we can get from abroad, and we have asked a large number of countries to supply it. The main countries which have supplied us thus far have been the United States and the United Kingdom, and we are grateful to them for it, but we have, if I may use the word, impartially, asked many countries including the Soviet Union. I may add about the Soviet Union that all the previous commitments they made. I believe they stand by them. What further commitments they will make I cannot say. We have asked them, we have not got an answer yet. But on previous commitments they have said that they stand by them in spite of these developments.

So, we have to meet the situation, but if we realise, as we should realise, that this is a longterm effort, this may take I cannot say how long but mentally we must be prepared for a long long time, for years, two years, three years or four years, the people and the country straining themselves to the uttermost---it is not a question of giving some money to a fund, it is not a question of some people being recruited, but every man and woman in the country being strained to the uttermost. If that is so, that can only be carried on if together with it we are thinking constantly of increasing our industrial potential and behind that our agricultural potential, and the industrial potential and the agricultural potential give us the war potential. War potential is not something apart from industrial potential and agricultural potential.

That is why I have said that we dare not even for the sake of this war and the defence of our country slacken our efforts at increasing our industrial and agricultural potential or in other words give up our Five Year Plan. We may give up some bits of it-that is a different matter-which we consider non-essential, but the basic things of that have to continue, if for nothing else, just for the sake of this war situation. That is how I would like the House to consider this problem because it requires, apart from what we do, a certain mental adjustment to it. If we have not got that mental adjustment, we will be constantly having shocks, not being able to do what we can. It is not a hundred vards' race or a hundred metres race where we

make a violent effort and go as fast as we can for a hundred yards in nine or ten seconds. You do it if you are a fast runner and get exhausted at the end of it. It is a very long race, and if you have to run a long race, let us say, of three miles or more, you run differently from how you run a hundred yards' race.

You have to keep your breath and get your second breath and carry on whatever happens, so that in that sense we have to look at this and not exhaust our energy, our capacity in initial spurts and not have the energy left for something else because there is a limit to a nation's energy. To courage you may say there is no limit. Many men show courage unto death. Fewer men show courage living on the verge of death and yet working hard. That is true, but there is a limit to the totality of a nation's, I will not say courage but, strength if you like, and you see that in these great wars that have taken place that limit was reached in the case of some countries like Germany and Japan. They collapsed six months before the other party might have collapsed.

Mr. Winston Churchill, I believe, talking about the First World War said-I forget his words-just it was a pure chance, he said, ultimately which side collapsed It is a very wellworded thing but I do not remember it. However, one has to think ahead and preserve that courage so that we could outlast the other party, our opponent, our enemy. That is the problem before us, and this requires not only tremendous mobilisation of the nation's resources but a mental adaptation to it.

Some of us are not accustomed to facing these questions of a nation's-life and death in war time-and we are not accustomed, let us be clear about it-we have heard of wars, read about wars, the First World War. the Second World War and all that, but we were not emotionally concerned with them in the sense of that type of terrible suffering which people

293

in Europe, people in the warring countries had, whether it was this side or that side, Germany, England, France and Russia. All these countries suffered terribly and to the last ounce of their blood they went on doing it, and then those people survived who had just the last ounce more than the others, they survived. That is the kind of struggle we are in. It is not a joke.

And now of course in a war one has to think of nuclear weapons; not we, we are not producing them and we do not intend producing them. China says it will produce them. It has not done so. It might-in a year's time-and even if it does, it will be an experimental thing, and it will not be a thing which they can use for several years.

However, war now has become a different thing and that is why, apart from our natural desire for peace in the world and in our country, it is too terrible to contemplate, even by people who like war but fear the annihilation of mankind. So we have pleaded for peace, and the world generally has been responding to the call of peace, not our call but the general call of peace all over. Even the great leaders of nations are powerfully affected by it because they faced-as we faced only two or three weeks ago-suddenly a turn of events in Cuba, and the Cuba affair might have led to war, war in 24 hours or 48 hours. Well, they shrank back and wisely decided to avoid it.

Now that has been the past, and we, apart from-I imagine--every thinking person wanting to avoid wars-are particularly trained to some extent, even more, inclined that way because of Gandhiji, not that-I say--Gandhiji made any of us terribly peaceful or made us what he thought be would like to have made us, but we did not reach his ideal. So with all that behind us we pursued a certain policy which at no time--I may tell the House-was a pacifist policy, which at no time meant weakening our Defence Forces but strengthening them to the utmost of our capacity having regard to the resources and finances at our disposal. Our Defence Forces, our Army at the present moment is much larger than the limit placed on it by ourselves. It has simply grown by circumstances bigger. Even so it is a very small army compared to China's millions; there you go into many millions. We do not go into them; we only go into hundreds of thousands and, as I said, we thought of defence chiefly from the point of view, first of all, of defence

science-which is the basis of defence production, of technicians and others. To get all that takes time. For a soldier to be trained, it does not take very much time. And in the same way we take weapons because it is often said that we did not give our people adequate weapons. That is both true and not true; that is to say, we have not an army shifted over completely to automatic weapons; we are in the process of doing it. It is a lengthy process, manufacturing it ourselves, and we did not want, previous to this crisis, to spend large sums of money in getting those weapons from outside. We decided to make them ourselves, and we are making them now. But when the crisis came we had to give them-that is a different matter. We are trying to give them now, and in this connection I might say that even an army like the British Army has only recently got automatic weapons. They are changing over now, in the course of some months, because their thinking is along different lines now, and we largely have followed their thinking; our officers and others who are responsible for this kind of thing have been trained there, have been in contact with them and think that way.

The whole concept of war has changed. First of all, the air arm has become very important. Secondly, the nuclear weapons have become so important that conventional arms get relatively less important and there is an argument whether the conventional army should be built up, or nuclear. All that is going on there. For us there is no choice. We do not have nuclear weapons and we are not likely to have them. But in the confusion of arguments this element of automatic weapons, even in an up-to-date and modem army like the British was neglected in their military thinking; they did not think it was necessary or essential; they preferred some other weapons, .303 rifles, something which we have.

Anyhow for the last two or three years we have been thinking of making the automatic weapons, not only thinking but also moving in that direction. But then all manner of difficult ies are involved in it, because we have to get the prototypes, we have got to get the blueprints of them, and we have to make them ourselves, making some adjustments for conditions here. Then we have tests and trials of them. It takes a long time. Last year we had been carrying this out, and now they are being produced or will be produced next month. Meanwhile we have got many of them from abroad. What I was venturing to point out to the House were the problems that we had to face all the time, and at no time did we think that we can be complacent about this matter, about China or about their doings. But we did think that we should build up the basic thing which will enable us to convert it into a proper war machine when the necessity arose, because if we did not have the base, then the war machine would be without foundations, would be superficial and would

294

depend only on some outside help that we can

get. We got it no doubt as we are getting it now, but it will not be able to carry us through for very long, and also it was, shall I say, a question of judgment as to when this final challenge would come.

Of course, previously Hon. Members here and elsewhere asked us-I remember a speech delivered here too-"Why did we not push them out two or three years ago in Ladakh?" Well, it is rather difficult to go into that because that kind of thing, if one goes to details, may help our enemy, but broadly speaking we wanted to be fully prepared for that. We did not want to go into it half prepared or quarter prepared, and again, the preparation involved roads, a tremendous deal of roads, and big arms factories being built. the old ones being modernised and enlarged and all that, which takes time. So we wanted that. It was no good our hitting out at the Chinese and being pushed back with force and being helpless after that. So we prepared for that and tried to build up the roads and build up the posts, which posts were obviously not strong enough to hold them back if a big army came. A post of a 100 or 200 men is more a signal post, that thus far vou advance and no more, but if they decided to bring in a big army they can sweep it away. That was the position in Ladakh and therefore we tried to hold them there and prepared to make ourselves stronger for a future tussle.

In the NEFA region, as the House knows,

they had not come at all except, originally, to a small village Longju which again-according to them-they claimed to be on the other side of the McMahon Line. It is actually on the border, and even that, according to them, was not coming over the McMahon Line.

Apart from that they had not come over at all during all this period. What they had stated all this time, and their actions, say, in regard to the Burma-China Treaty and others led one to believe that they would not encroach any further. That does not mean that they were satisfied with that. They might proceed further if they liked, but nevertheless there was this idea which was spread abroad by themselves, by their statements and activities. Although they' said that this was an illegal McMahon Line, that they did not recognise it, nevertheless they always said that they would not cross it, and all these years we were in a sense better prepared here than in Ladakh, and specially lately we have built some more roads. But again, however prepared we were, it is a comparative question. No man can say that he is thoroughly prepared to meet anything. A hundred men may be prepared to meet five hundred men, but a hundred or five hundred or five thousand men are not prepared for a hundred thousand men to swoop down upon them or something. It is always a comparative thing. And we suddenly hid to face a thing which certainly was not in our minds and we are, if you like to blame for it, that an army of forty thousand or fifty thousand men will swoop down a small comer of NEFA and faced by our force which were about, I do not know-! do not wish to mention figuresbut very much smaller.

Then, again, they have the facility of bringing large forces at short notice from Tibet. Tibet having a huge reservoir of Chinese army they can bring it by road right up to the edge of the ridge because that is the end of the Himalayas there. They can bring it in, go over a little ridge there and dump it, the ridge being the watershed, while we have to go hundreds of miles of difficult territory. Now, although we have some roads, we have built them, yet almost everything that we had to send to the army had been by air. It is a terrific strain on our armed forces which they have done remarkably well.

So, I want to keep this back-ground before vou that we were all the time thinking of producing conditions, both in our arms factories, in our defence science and die roads, etc. we built, which would enable us to meet them as strongly as possible. It was a question of whether we will be forced to face a big challenge. what time we might be forced and we could hurry these things up, but there is little to your hurrying an arms factory being built. Now we are thinking, and I hope the House will also think, in terms of a long-term effort. We cannot say how long it will be but as things are we dare not allow ourselves to think of a shortterm effort because if we think so, we will be disappointed, and that is a disheartening thing, If you do not make up your mind for a long-term one and prepare for a short-term one, then all your calculations are upset. Also, if we think in a short-term way, we will prepare for a shortterm thing; we would not be able, perhaps, to carry on for a long term. We must think in terms of years.

Also there is a good deal of talk on the Chinese side, a good deal of, what I may say, peace offensives. Now, whatever happens we shall always favour peace provided that peace is an honourable one, a peace that leaves our territory in bur hands. That is a different matter. I hope that we shall never become warmad and forget the objectives that we have, as in the Great War and other wars a certain madness seizes a nation for which they may even win the war but they lose the peace. That is so. We are all for peace Why should we spend

295

vast sums of money ? And money required for these things, for this kind of operations, is such that all the money we spend in our Five Year Plans is bagatelle before it, enormous sums. But here there is no choice left. We have to spend much more for the initial stages of the war and subsequent stages. So while we are for peace we must not ourselves be taken in by these so-called peace offensives which are not peace, which are merely meant to sonic extent to humiliate us, to some extent to strengthen their position for a future advance maybe, because, I am sorry to say it, it has become impossible to put trust in the word of the Chinese Government. Now, even now their descriptions all the time are that we have attacked them and a number of Chinese guards are defending themselves, a number of Chinese frontier guards having come on our territory. We are apparently attacking them and they are defending themselves. Apparently, the idea is that they should have a free run on our country and we should do nothing.

Hon. Members have criticised our publicity arrangements and, if I may say so, there is a great deal of truth in that criticism. We are trying to improve them. I think they have improved somewhat and I hope they will improve because it is not an easy matter to build up these things in a few days, war publicity and all that, and also because we do not quite function, we are not used to functioning quite in the way the Chinese Government are used to functioning, that is, stating complete untruth, one after the other, a set of lies. We are somewhat much more careful about what we say. Take the 20th of October. Before even their own attack had commenced, they started broadcasting that we were attacking them, before that, that is, a little before that, about half-an-hour before, I think, they started that. People said. "Oh, we hurt them first and they afterwards." Even before they attacked they started broadcasting that we were attacking them. Then they attacked. When we learnt of that a couple of hours later they got an advance of two or three hours. So you have to face a machine of propaganda publicity which originally was called "Goebbels' machine in Nazi Germany". There is extraordinary similarity in many things between the Chinese publicity, etc. and the old Nazi publicity. And, of course, that can only be carried on with a certain rigid authoritarian pattern behind it-nobody dare say anything.

Here I do not wish to criticise our newspapers, but very often they say and do things which do not help the war effort although they are very keen in helping it but they do not think in that way. Anybody can say anything in a public meeting. Many people say amazing things in public meetings which certainly do not help the war effort. They shake their fists, "We will drive out the Chinese" and all that. and say all manner of things which prevent the Chinese being driven out.

You have to face the background of a democratic country, democratic freedoms. To some extent they have to be limited. There is the Defence of India Act which is not wholly functioning now but it is meant to. But even the Defence of India Ordinance or Act we do not enforce wholeheartedly, we do not like to do it unless we are forced to. I -do not, know, in course of war it may gradually become stiffer in its operations. That is possible. But at the moment we have got inhibitions in acting, from stopping a man from writing or publishing something. But there it is a completely regimented apparatus in private life and public life. That is helpful in a war effort, but I do not think it is ultimately helpful. I do think that a democratic background ultimately is the stronger of the two, and I think you can see something of it; some glimpse of it you can have here even in the last fortnight, two or three weeks in India, by the wonderful response that we have had from our people. Now, that is not a regimented response. It is a spontaneous response which has come out of the people's minds and hearts and it does show that our fifteen-year old democracy has taken roots to the people, that it is always all very well for us to quarrel with each other and to make all kinds of demands, but when they see, when they feel, that there is danger to their democratic set-up they have come up like this. That is a very healthy sign, a very hopeful sign and something that has heartened all of us. So, I do think that the democratic apparatus is ultimately good even from the point of view of war, provided of course that the apparatus and everything else is not swept away at the first rush. But we can be sure that it will not be swept away. Therefore, it becomes a question of utilising that enthusiasm in a democratic manner with such limitations as war imposes upon us and directing it to defend the country and repel the invader. There again we have to think from a long-term view, and it should not be a question of our panting too soon, losing our breath too soon. We may have to run long long distances and for a long long time we have to carry on with determination and with fortitude. Well, our demonstrations and processions will not help in that. They may be good for rousing enthusiasm here and there, but we require something much deeper, much stronger,

much more enduring for that.

Now one further matter which I should like to mention is that it is really painful and shocking to me---the way the Chinese Government

296

has, shall I say, adhered repeatedly to untruths. I am putting it in as mild a way as I can. What are they doing today? In the other House I said it is aggression and invasion which reminds me of the activities of the Western powers in the nineteenth or eighteenth century. Perhaps I was wrong. It is more comparable to the activities of Hitler in the modem age, because one thought that this kind of thing cannot happen nowadays. Of course, some aggression may take place here and there but this wellthought out, pre-meditated and well organised invasion is what one thought was rather out-ofdate and not feasible. We know the whole Chinese mentality, of the Government at least. It seems to think that war is a natural state of affairs, and here we are disliking it, excessively disliking the idea of war emotionally disliking it apart from not liking its consequences. We have therefore to realise that we are up against an enemy which is well-conditioned, well prepared for the type of action it has taken and which is prepared also to cover it up with any number of falsehoods. And whatever we may do, to some extent this kind of propaganda of the Chinese naturally has some effect on other people in their own countries. I do not say that the Chinese persons are all against India but listening to their own propaganda they are influenced by it, and other countries, the socalled non-aligned countries, getting that propaganda in full measures are affected by it or at any rate are confused by it. Therefore, it is no good our getting angry with them that they do not stand forthright in our defence, in support of our position, because they are confused. Not only are they confused, but sometimes they are a little afraid too. So, whatever the reason, we have to meet this and meet it with truth. Now in war, Sir, unhappily-it has been said-the first casualty is truth, That is perfectly true, and the sad part of a war is not that people die in large numbers-that is sad of course--but the sad part of it is that war brutalises a nation and individuals. Well, death

comes to all of us at its proper time but the brutalising of a country and of people is a more harmful thing. How we have undergone a process under Gandhiji which is the reverse of this. I do not mean to say that we in Indiaour people-are any better than other people. I do not agree to that. We have numerous failings, weaknesses and we are even violent in small matters when other countries may not be. But the fact is that basically we are a gentle people, basically we have been conditioned by Gandhiji especially in peaceful methods and however violent we may become occasionally, at the back of our minds there is that training. And it alarms me that we should become, because of the exigencies of war, brutalised, a brutal nation. I think that would mean the whole soul and spirit of India being demoralised, and that is a terribly harmful thing, Certainly I hope that all of us will remember this.

Now only the other day-two days ago--I saw a statement made, by Acharya Vinoba Bhave for whom I have the greatest respect. I do not agree with everything that he says. Of course, I have the greatest respect for him because I do think in the whole of India he represents Gandhiji's thinking more than anybody else. And it heartened me-what he said about this Chinese invasion. He condemned it in his own gentle language, but he condemned it and he said himself he was not a man of war, he could not take a gun and meet it but inferentially he said India had to do it. But then he added that he hoped very much that even in doing so we would not be full of hatred, our minds full of hatred and ill-will and brutalised and all that. Well, I hope so earnestly. Now what will happen, I cannot say, because war itself is a powerful agent for metamorphosisvaried experiences and brutalities. We may have to undergo all that, not the men. The men in the battlefield who face death all the time still sometimes survive this hatred. It is the people sitting behind who indulge in all this hatred. The energy and courage of the men in the battlefield is exercised in action but the men sitting at the counters in their moneyhouses and who encourage them too indulge in all this hatred business and create this brutalised. mentality. Well, I do hope that somehow we shall escape it; we shall try our best to escape it.

Now (Some people criticise us for having suggested that we are prepared to talk to the Chinese representatives if they withdraw to the position before the 8th of September, And some people say: "No, you must not talk to them, you must not do any such thing until they withdraw completely from Ladakh and everywhere". Now the 8th of September was the day when they came in NEFA across the Thagla Ridge and also attacked Ladakh and went and captured some more territory in Ladakh.) Now let us be brave but let us also be sensible. Our saying to them "We will meet you only when you surrender and confess defeat" is not a thing which is likely to happen. Whatever happens, they are not defeated nor are we defeated. In fact it is very difficult for China to, defeat us and it is still more difficult for us to defeat China. We are not going to march to Peking, Even if we have success here, as we hope to, it does not defeat China and even if they have success in the mountains, it does not mean that they defeat India. You must remember that this type of war is a war which may go on

297

indefinitely, simply sucking the blood of either country and brutalising us. Therefore, to talk of conditions which are manifestly not going to be fulfilled in the foreseeable future is not a wise thing. What do we seek after that? We seek after that, if these conditions that we have set are fulfilled, to talk to them about what? It is to talk to them----our representatives and theirs-as to how we can produce conditions to relax tensions, etc., may be other withdrawals which will lead to the third stage which is talking to them on the merits of the question. We do not agree to anything in between and I think it is a perfectly fair and legitimate proposal, honourable to us. As a matter of fact, as the House knows, the Chinese have rejected it completely out of hand. See the various friends in other countries are putting forward numerous mediatory proposals, more or less all of them based on some kind of a cease-fire immediately and about the Chinese proposals I need not go into them because they are so manifestly meant to favour their aggression and to give them a chance to establish themselves and push us out and then, maybe at a later stage, to commit

aggression again. But these people are confused. They put forward proposals which are very much to our disadvantage. Fortunately, after we had explained these various matters President Nasser of the U.A.R. put forward certain proposals which are very very near our proposals. They are not exactly the same but are very near; basically our proposal is that they should retire behind Thagla Ridge, that conditions before the 8th of September should be produced. That is the basic part of his proposals. That too the Chinese have rejected. I think that the proposals we have put forward are honourable, legitimate and not coming through weakness but strength and they are having a good impression on the rest of the world. The rest of the world also counts in such matters.

Many people have said that we should close up our Mission in Peking and they should close the Chinese Mission here. Now that is a legitimate thing for us to say or to do but we have to balance certain advantages and certain disadvantages and for the moment I need not and I cannot go into all the details. For the moment we do not think it will be advantageous to us to do that. When the time comes, if it is necessary, we shall do that. Again other Members, I believe, have talked about our withdrawing our forces from the Congo and the Gaza Strip. It is true that we would like to withdraw them. We have suggested that we should withdraw them but we have felt that we should not do something suddenly without adequate preparation for it on the other side, something which will upset all the two years' effort in the Congo and cast a heavy burden on the U.N. Therefore, we have told them that we would like to withdraw them and we would like them to make other arrangements but for the present we will not withdraw them till they agree to it. We have certain international obligations. It is true that where the safety of our country is concerned, that is the first consideration. Nevertheless in the balance we thought that we owed something to the international community, to Africa, and withdrawing them in a panicky condition would not be good and the amount of help that we derive from it would be less than the harm we cause by our acting in that manner but of course we want to withdraw them as soon as we conveniently can.

Finally, I should like to say that this is a tremendous challenge to our manhood and our nationhood, something which is far above our party bickerings and party conflicts. Of course parties have their views and they are entitled to them but for the moment this is something bigger than those things and the challenge has also another aspect of it and that is, it is an opportunity to build up our nation, an opportunity to build up on right lines-that is my trouble-lest we in our excitement or in. our folly should go into wrong lines because that would be a tragedy, a deeper tragedy than war. That is not to be corrupted by war, to use war to the utmost of our strength, not to be corrupted and to use that war situation to change our pattern or economic and social structure on right lines. If we do that, then out of this great trouble that we face, good will come for the nation and I would like this House and our Parliament and our Members to give this lead to the nation that. we are not interested in the so-called victory by itself because victory is a hollow thing if you miss the fruits of victory. The fruit of victory is not a little--territory. We have seen great wars in Europe and elsewhere, mighty countries fighting each other and countries have won, won decidedly and yet somehow the fruits of victory have escaped them. That is the lesson of the last two wars. It has slipped out of their fingers and new problems have been created which they cannot solve today and they think of the Third War. Therefore we have to think of the basic things we aim at because something has come in the way, a very bad thing-aggression-which is bad from our national point of view, from every point of view, therefore we have to get rid of it and we will try our utmost to get rid of it but that by itself is not enough. In doing so, because the process of doing so shakes up the nation completely, we have to see that shaking up of the nation is of the right kind and they yield right results.

298

CHINA INDIA USA GERMANY FRANCE LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN RUSSIA JAPAN OMAN CUBA BURMA CONGO

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Debate on Chinese Aggression : Home Minister's Reply

Winding up the debate on the Proclamation of Emergency and the Chinese aggression on the territory of India, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Union Home Minister, made the following speech in Rajya Sabha on November 13, 1962 :

"I am thankful to the House for the unanimous support the House has given to both the Resolutions I moved the other day. My task has been made lighter by the intervention of the Prime Minister who has dealt with many important points and also certain basic matters concerning the Chinese aggression. I shall therefore say a few words on some other points raised by Hon. Members.

It is quite clear that we are all agreed on one matter, that there has been a pre-meditated and well-planned aggression by China on our country and it is the will and desire of every section of this House and of the people outside that we should resist the aggression and try to get back our territories which have been occupied by China. The anxiety expressed in this House has been about our reinforcement, getting adequate arms and equipment and providing other facilities for our armed forces. I can quite appreciate it and very well understand the feelings of Hon. Members.

I can assure the House that the Government is most vigilant about it and not only vigilant but we have already started on this work some time back, that is, about a month or so before, and we feel that we will have to do it on a big scale. on a very big scale indeed.

An Hon. Member was somewhat doubtful that

when we say that it would be a long-drawn-out struggle we might get somewhat complacent and it may have some weakening effect on our countrymen. I might tell him that he need not have any doubt at all of that kind. It is clear to us that we have to reinforce our army both in men and material, in arms, weapons, etc.

We will have to do it in three stages, if I may put it that way. We have to provide especially the necessary arms and equipment, some of them quite a big size immediately. Then, we can find the rest of it within another short period of four, five or six months. And naturally we will also have to depend on our own production. It may take a longer time. So, production in our own country is absolutely important. Thereby I do not minimise the need and necessity of reinforcing our troops as early as possible. In fact,I have used the word 'immediately'. It must be said to the, credit of the United States of America and the United Kingdom, the two countries which have helped us. Of course, there are other countries which have offered their help and assistance. Recently, Australia and Canada have done it.

An Hon. Member : France also.

Home Minister : France also. So, it is difficult to name the countries and some Hon. Members have suggested certain names to be mentioned in the Resolution in an amended form, (Interruption).

Though our general policy is that we take aid and assistance without any strings, we have to pay for them also on reasonable terms, may be lend and lease or whatever the scheme might be. However, as I said, we are especially thankful to the United States of America and the United Kingdom, who have moved in the matter quickly and we have already received a good deal of help and assistance from them. France also I have mentioned.

As I said, it is very important that we should think of our own production in the country. Ultimately, we will have to depend on our own production and for that we have to dovetail the production both in the private sector as well as in the public sector, and also in our ordnance factories. There are a number of public sector undertakings which are producing engineering goods. They could be easily switched on to produce materials or goods which are needed for our army.

In fact, some of our public sector projects have already planned for it. The Defence Ministry is drawing up and have drawn up items of goods which are to be produced in these factories. They may not produce the usual goods for which they are meant or they were built for. Naturally they have to give the first priority to the needs of defence.

Similarly, there are a number of private industries. Some of them are already producing goods for the army, but they have to be switched on to other things, to other requirements' Therefore, it has become essential that all industries, whether in the private sector or in the public sector undertakings of the Government of India and the State Governments, as also the ordnance factories, etc., will have to coordinate their work and activities.

An Hon. Member rightly referred to this point of coordination. It is true that there has to be proper coordination not only in the matter of

299

production, but also in the matter of supplies and other things. The Government have during the last few days given active thought to this matter. I have no doubt that proper coordination will be achieved. Of course, part of it has already been brought about.

We will have a fully planned and well coordinated scheme in so far as actual coordination of work is concerned in regard to our war effort. I can only say that we fully realise that at the present moment the greatest importance has to be given to the supply of arms and equipment and I hope we will be able to meet their needs and requirements.

Something was said about information and broadcasting. I need not go much into that. I entirely agree with the views expressed by Hon. Members of this House for the streamlining of the information and broadcasting arrangements. It seems that we may have to instal a more effective radio apparatus in different parts of our country and the Department has to keep itself in closest touch with the press. We may also have to seek the assistance and help of some professional experts in this regard.

Last evening I received a letter and a scheme from the Minister of Information and Broadcasting suggesting the way they want to reorient their line of work. Without going into the matter further I can only say that we would welcome the help and advice of Hon. Members of this House. In fact, I would be happy if the Minister of Information and Broadcasting will meet some Members of this House and get their views in the matter. It would undoubtedly help him as well as help in the improvement of broadcasts, etc.

Something was said about civil defence. In that regard also I do not want to take much time of the House. I have always said that the army fights on the front and on our frontiers. but we have to be ready in our cities, in our villages. on our roads and in our lanes. And for that the morale of the country has to be built up. If we are courageous, if the nation is determined to go ahead, the army gets sustenance and the army with redoubled strength will pursue their objective with faith and courage.

It is, therefore, essential that we should keep up the morale of our people and prepare ourselves for any eventuality. I have spoken to the Chief Ministers of all the States. I have discussed these matters with them and they have already started taking various steps in this regard, Some of the important points are these. First, of course, I propose to appoint a Director-General of Civil Defence in the Home Ministry.

He would naturally be a high level officer who will have to go to various States, not only sit here in the office but actually see what is being done and how this scheme is being implemented. Of course the other States will also have Directors. We have specially to strengthen our Police Force. I should not mention these things and therefore I would like to avoid mentioning because of the war situation. Of course the Police may have other shortcomings, its own shortcomings or loopholes. But the Police on the borders, wherever they have been posted, have done a remarkable job and they have been extremely helpful, and in the present circumstances we have to expand our Special Police battalion. The expansion would have to be very big indeed.

Besides that, we have to organise Home Guards and especially as I said in the border States and in the border districts we will have to give training in rifle to all able-bodied men, whether it is Garhwal or Almora or whether it is Himachal Pradesh or other areas in the east or west, we must give training to lakhs of our people living in those areas. That work has also to be taken up. I need not refer to the National Cadet Corps and other bodies about which the Prime Minister spoke the other day.

We have also to take special care of our essential installations and means of communication. We have to be extra careful about our electric and water supplies. We have also to see that foodgrains and essential articles in certain areas are always available, whether it is Assam or North Bengal especially-I am referring to those areas, because the means of communication there are fairly difficult in that part of the country.

So we have to take care of essential goods like foodgrains, cloth, oil, salt, sugar, and so on, these are four or five things on which we have to take a good deal of care and there should' be no shortage. For that we will also have to look after the roads because to depend entirely on the railways will not be wise, and therefore we have to see that the roads are workable throughout and that we have enough of vehicles.

Finally, especially in the border districts I have requested the Chief Ministers that they must post the best and the most efficient officers of their States. It is essential because the man on the spot has to take decisions himself. If he has always to refer to the Chief Minister or to the Commissioner, he is just not the man who should be working there.

In those areas every moment and every day people expect some guidance and it is therefore essential that we should have the best of our

300

officers there, and the best of our officers must

be prepared to undergo the suffering or inconveniences in those areas. It is therefore essential and I am glad that all the Chief Ministers have agreed that this will have to be done.

Something was said about Pakistan, and it is true that we have our own differences with Pakistan. But even these political differences have not created that gulf between us as it has happened in the case of the other country, and it would be wrong on our part at this moment to create any situation in which communalism gets an upper hand and we create some kind of division amongst us. I know that it sometimes hurts us to read some of the comments made in the newspapers of Pakistan; they have been very harsh indeed, especially the one which I saw a few days before, the editorial of the "Dawn". Yet it is not the papers which really place the Government point of view.

Hon. Members must have read in the newspapers, and I was glad to see, what the President of Pakistan has written to our Prime Minister, the letter be has sent in reply to the letter sent by our Prime Minister to a the heads of Governments. I am glad about it, and although I will say that the newspapers in Pakistan should not try to gloat over the difficulties faced by any one of us, President Ayub Khan, a great soldier as he is, can rise to the occasion. I am therefore glad to say that what he has written is a nice letter to the Prime Minister. I need not read the whole of it but one of the paragraphs of his letter:

"It is a matter of great regret to me that this dispute should have led to intensified military activities and induction of new war potential thus endangering the peace and stability of the region in which Pakistan is vitally concerned."

So it is not only India that realises the fact that the whole region is in danger, it is not only India that is in danger, but he has also said : we in Pakistan are wedded to a world of peace and friendly relations with all neighbouring countries but especially with India. This is just what was expected of President Ayub, and I know that this letter would be welcomed by this House as well as by the whole country. I might also add that although there has been a somewhat unfortunate or a bit critical statement by the King of Nepal, yet we have to remember the fact that we must have the best of relations with Nepal. Nepal is a close neighbour of ours and we have had other ties from the immemorial past. Therefore, from our side we have all the good wishes for Nepal. We have nothing but feeling of friendship for that country.

There are some people who are trying to create misunderstanding between Nepal and India. Some of them talk as if India wanted to put Nepal in a subordinate position. It is far from the truth, absolutely wrong and full of lies. I do not want to add anything more except to say that we will do nothing which will create any kind of bad blood, and we will definitely like to keep the best of relations with Nepal.

I would now like to refer to the political parties and their attitudes. I am glad that an Bon. Member has just now said something about the political parties, about the Communist Party of India as well as the Jan Sangh. In fact I endorse what he said, but let me say a few words about the Communist Party first. Well, I must pay a compliment to the Communist Party for their resolution which was passed in their National Council. It is something absolutely new, and I do not think that ever before in the history of the Communist Party or the Communist world this kind of defection has happened or this kind of decision has been taken.

It was indeed very bold and courageous on the part of the so-called rightist members, if I may use that word. But I am glad now that Bhupesh Guptaji is also in the right for the first time. He has always been trying to be in the left.

An Hon. Member : It is unfortunate. The Hon. Minister should not make that remark. I am very sorry that he had made that because he is the Home Minister and to say such a thing is very unfair,

Home Minister : I am sorry.

The Hon. Member: I am only in one Lobby and that is the India Lobby and no other Lobby.

Home Minister : I am glad that at last wisdom has dawned. If only a few days before I had said that Shri Bhupesh Gupta was a leftist and was for China, when this massive attack had not come-I think we all greatly welcome the change ... (Interruption). However, I am glad that he does not like those remarks and I do not want to press them.

The Hon. Member : He is misinformed by his police agent. He can call me and ask me. I can trust him. I sit on this side of the House. Fortunately or unfortunately, I occupy this position. The Hon. Minister for whom I have got great regard can always call me and ask for my views. I shall volunteer to give my views at all times.

301

Home Minister : Well, I have complimented Shri Bhupesh Gupta for his views and I said now that he is in the right.

The Hon. Member : I have always been right Home Minister: Still

I take him at his face value. I do not want to question his bona fides. But, in fact, the Communist Party has always made mistakes in the Past. Their judgment and their assessment of the situation, in so far as our country is concerned have always been wrong, not wrong, absurdly wrong, if I might say so, because I have my own personal experience and I know that it is the experience of all of us who sit on this side of the House.

However, there are two things in so far as the principle of Communism is concerned. Well, it can be acceptable to many. It might say that there are others who Will differ. But there may be many in so far as the objective of Communism is concerned, a classless society. But there are two things which the Communist Party will have to give up, if they really want. In fact, I would welcome it if they like to sit sometime on this side of this House, provided they give up

An Hon. Member : Then we will have no House at that time.

Home Minister : There are two things. One is that they should consider about the means. if

they continue to believe in violence and they want to bring about a change through violence, well, it would be most unfortunate.

And the Communist Party has to realise that it is a democratic form of Government, I know that Shri Bhupesh Gupta is going to say that they have already done so. But I might again emphasise. It is a very important matter. If they have to function in a democratic form of government, in a democracy, they have to give up violence or thinking in terms of any violent movemerit or overthrow of the Government. (Interruption) And the second thing is-again I know that Shri Bhupesh Gupta will get angry to give up their extra-territorial loyalty.

These are the two things. Therefore, I greatly welcome what the Communist Party has said, and, as I said, I complimented the Communist Party that they have made a radical departure from the past and I do consider it a very important event in the history of the Communist Party in the world. And therefore if the Communist Party really wants to serve the people, the country, it will have to do these two things, and it will pay to the party and perhaps pay to the country as a whole.

An Hon. Member : I just make it clear. As far as the first thing is concerned, with regard to violence, the constitution of our party which we hold sacred says that the Communist Party will work for social transformation through peaceful means. The fact we have been working in Parliament for ten years would testify, in fact, to what we preach. Therefore, he should be clear.

An Hon. Member: The Communist Party always does its propaganda.

The Hon. Member: We)), we will do our propaganda, That we do but peacefully.

The second point is, we have no extra-territorial loyalty whatsoever. This is what the Americans talk about us and our good Home Minister will not kindly believe it.

Home Minister : Well, the Hon. Member has got somewhat upset. But I know, if only a few days before I had said a word against China, if I had said a word against their policy, if I had spoken even a few words about their programmes, against them, I am quite certainand he will also agree with me-that if he had got the opportunity, he might have pounced upon me. Anyhow, this distance, Madam, and your being in the Chair prevents him from doing that.

One can, Madam, understand internationalism of the Chinese and the Albanians, it is, if I might use harsh language, is just a crude, narrow and bigoted approach. It is imperialism in its veiled form. But what China has done and is wanting to do to others is expansionism in its naked form. Now what better justification could there be for our position than the speech of Bhupesh Guptaji himself? I would very much like that he sends his speech to Peking because if it goes from us, they will not accept it or they might say that we are trying to deceive them. But if it goes from Bhupesh Guptaji we can make arrangements for that if he so likes-it would really be good for China. At least the Chinese will be able to understand how the members of the Communist Party feel about their aggression and the role China is playing.

It should certainly be done. In fact, it had struck me, and I would certainly like that it is put on the radio. However, I have nothing but good words and compliments for Shri Bhupesh Gupta. But my regret is that still there are quite a few members of the Communist Party who do not agree with the approach and outlook of Shri Bhupesh Gupta or some of his other compatriots.

302

It is not some individuals, and it is not restricted to a few. That is my regret. I am sorry for it. But recently, Shri Jyoti Basu wrote to me and said that I had said something in Assam, in Tezpur, and he was rather angry over it because he thought that I had stated something which was not quite correct. I read a statement of Shri Jyoti Basu before I went to Assam and I was really shocked to read it, I saw later on that he had contradicted this statement. So, I accept that when once a contradiction is issued, I have nothing to say not a word more.

An Hon. Member : All the papers of Calcutta

reported correctly except one. That paper you have unfortunately read.

Home Minister : But may I say that even the contradiction really does not take us very far ? And he says,

"We have always stood for the defence of our country including the strengthening of the defence of our border. Can India and China not demonstrate the same statesmanship in a more restricted sphere by at least agreeing to seek the help of friendly mediators, for a peaceful solution? I ask : Why is it not possible for our Government as well as the Chinese Government to agree to seek the help of friendly mediators ?

Look, I mean an Indian speaking in this manner.

"Why should each Government stick to its own point of view ? In case a cease-fire is possible, further talks should be pursued by the representatives of India and China."

just. keeping both India and China on the same level; no distinction between India and China. That is what Mr. Jyoti Basu's contradiction means. (Interruption)

Well, he made a speech and I need not give my own interpretation of it. But even I am not quite sure about his assertion that he always stood for safeguarding the territorial integrity of India. What he really means is not clear, whether he would safeguard the territorial integrity only of that part of territory which is considered by the Chinese as India, or it is something else. Well, it is a difficult thing to interpret. Anyhow I am sorry to say that even his contradiction does not make the position of Shri Jyoti Basu quite clear.

I have also learnt about the provocative speeches made in the South by the members of the Communist Party

The Hon. Member : By Shri Kumaramangalam.

Home Minister : and in fact one of the members said that it was provocative statement

of the Prime Minister before going to Ceylon that led to the attack by the Chinese on India, something fantastic to say. But it has been said and it was also added that India was not fully equipped for a war with a country like China and felt that the McMahon Line itself was imaginary and not properly defined. Even in some other areas also it has been the case and where, of course, the attitude of Bhupesh Guptaji has not been appreciated, and it has been commented that the Party has revolted against international Communism and it is following in the footsteps of the Nehru Government by becoming the tail of imperialists.

Well, if this is the condition, how can they really be enthusiastic about holding anti-China public meetings and collecting contributions for the National Defence Fund? "Vishal Andhra", one of the papers of the Communist Party, continues to highlight statements designed to prove the good intentions of the Chinese. The speech of Premier Chou En-lai at a reception to the North Korean Delegation, and the statement of the Secretary of Bulgarian Communist Party on November 5, declaring that the Sino-Indian conflict would only help war-mongers, reactionaries and imperialists were publicised in the Party organ. This is what some of the party papers are doing, and I am told that there is some kind of talk about the international line which the Communist Party of India should take.

If I may put briefly how they think about the international line, it-is like this, that Marxism-Leninism. holds that bourgeoisie nationalism and proletarian internationalism are antagonistic to each other. Basically, bourgeoisie nationalism, that is nationalism, and their international line and their international approach are contrary to each other. Some self-styled Marxist leaders like Shri Dange have departed from the principle of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The masses of Indian Communists should be true to this ideal.

An Hon. Member: Are you quoting from the "Peoples Daily" ?

We repudiate it. We reject this kind of understanding.

Home Minister: All right, the Hon. Member

rejects it, but anyhow it has been one of the most important and influential papers expressing the views of the Communist Party.

303

An Hon. Member : It is not disowned by the party.

Another Hon. Member : It is still continued ?

Home Minister : Well, continuation, etc., it is an important question, and some Hon. Member on the other side referred to the comments and the way the news has been flashed in the newspapers. I know it has not, and I have full knowledge of those statements, but I must say the House may not generally agree with me but slightly-that our way of doing things is different. I do give a chance to the newspapers and to others also.

May be just for a moment they are upset; they might be angry; they might be annoyed with many things, and let them express themselves as frankly as they like. Even let them be as critical as they like. But that stage has passed. They have done it for one month or so. But in future I would appeal to all the newspapers and to all the other friends that now there is no time for criticism or condemnation. If there are shortcomings and weaknesses, do come and please point out to us and we will try to rectify them, or we will explain our viewpoint and it is just possible we may be able to convince you or convert you,

Some of the papers which have written recently, I mean their comments have been very undesirable and they have created bad blood in the country. So my appeal at the present moment is that they must remain careful in this regard, and nothing should be said or done which will in any way have an adverse effect on our war effort, and of course, if they do not accept the advice, well, Parliament will be giving us powers to deal with such newspapers or with such individuals.

An Hon. Member : We give full powers to you; you can do whatever you like.

Home Minister : When I have referred to

what generally some of the other members of the Communist Party have said, I do not want to be unfair to the Communist Party in toto. I shall now quote from a resolution-in fact this is the spirit which the Communist Party members have to show and demonstrate and this is a resolution part of which I would like to read in this House, resolution of one of the State Communist Parties, and this resolution says,

"The National Council of the Commurust Party of India has welcomed this appeal and assured the Prime Minister that our party will mobilise all its strength in its support shoulder to shoulder with other patriotic forces in the country. At the same time we declare explicitly that even if we are excluded from the collective efforts for national defence, we shall still devote all our energy to the same cause. This is a duty we owe to our country and our conscience. The test of one's sincerity and conviction is action and the coming test will prove our sterling sincerity indeed."

This is further what the party has said :

"In the crucial need of the day the acid test of our patriotism is for each and every citizen in the country to give monolithic support to Prime Minister Nehru, to strengthen his hands and to carry out his behests. He is the country's supreme Field Marshal, the Commander-in-Chief."

This is the spirit and this is the attitude which we must commend to all the other members of the Communist Party.

Madam, I shall now say a few words about the Jan Sangh. I hope I shall not be contradicted if I say that during the last two months the Jan Sangh has been highly critical of the Government and of its action. I do not mean to say that they opposed our action on the frontier. But the criticism of the Government has been so severe during all these days that it has created a lot of misunderstanding amongst the people. I was surprised to get a telephone message from Shri Trivedi, perhaps the loader of the Jan Sangh in the other House, saying-he actually used the words, "Apne Jan Sangh ko gali Diya"-that I had abused the Jan Sangh last evening.

I addressed a public meeting in Delhi. I was amazed to hear the word "abused" because-I hope I am not claiming much-I am almost incapable of using abusive language. Abuse is something vulgar. But, of course, dealing with danda is something different. So I was surprised when he said this. I told him that what I had said was like this. I did say in the public meeting that I was sorry that there had been a good deal of criticism of the Government during the period of emergency and I had said that this was not the time when political parties should try to exploit the situation for their parties interests. I had also added that both the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh had to realise this fact that it would be wrong if some kind of confusion or misunderstanding were in the public mind. It is not only the Jan Sangh or any other party, but even Congressmen and Congress Committees have to realise that this is not an occasion or opportunity when the Congress would or should try to show off itself or

304

its work. The Congress has not to take advantage of the present situation as an organisation or as a political Organisation. Similarly, no other party should do that. It was only this that I had said. I did not use a single harsh word against any individual or against the Party.

But, Madam, I must admit that I have been receiving somewhat depressing or disquieting reports. And it is not today that I am saying this. A few days before I had thought of meeting Vajpayeeji. I know he is an important leader and a very sober leader and I thought I should discuss these matters with him and it is just possible that he might be able to satisfy me and it would really be good if I feel satisfied. But I do want to mention to him certain matters. And I do hope that nothing would be done either by the Jan Sangh or any other political party to be indifferent to the national interests and think in narrow groups.

I do not know if Vajpayeeji said it but this is sometimes a general comment in the ranks of the Jan Sangh that we should have a war-time leader. They try to make a distinction between a peace-time leader and a war-time leader, I hope he will pardon me, if I may say so that unfortunately, the Jan Sangh was not born then when we were fighting the freedom struggle. They have not really suffered for the country and they do not know what determination we had shown under the leadership of Gandhiji to fight the British imperialism.

An Hon. Member: Madam, may I remind the Hon. Home Minister that I was behind the prison bars in 1942 though I was a student of the Intermediate class ? If the Jan Sangh was born in 1951, it is not our fault. We might be younger in age. Is it a crime to be younger in age ?

An Hon. Member : You were a Congressman then.

Home Minister : It is, therefore, Madam-I never said anything about Shri Vajpayee-that Shri Vajpayee is more sober. Those who have been in the movement and those who have fought for the country do realise their responsibility; they have got some experience of the difficulties of administration. However, I hope that it is not presumptuous on my part to say so-we have, of course, been far, far away from Gandhiji. I am nothing but just an humble soldier. I have been and I am even now-yet we have learnt something from him and it is this that we shall stand for. We shall live and we shall die for truth and for our country. And is there any other better leader in this country, any other man. who has stood by these principles during the last fifteen years since Gandhiji's death except Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru?

I do not know if I will have this permission to say that but may I say that recently or some time back a gentleman went and met him, quite an important person. He was rather feeling depressed over the advance China had made. He made certain suggestions. something like "Why not talk and discuss T' You know Panditji's temperament in these matters. Well, it seemed-I mean-he was furious. Perhaps if he had got the strength, He would have thrown him out of the window. He is not prepared to listen to any advice, even a word which would suggest that we should give in or we should negotiate with dishonour.

Well, he is a man who will fight, who has fought for the honour of the country and he will continue to fight for the honour and dignity of the country. I would, therefore, like to say, please do not create any misunderstanding in this special situation about the leadership. I know that except for some people, generally the country is behind the Prime Minister. For God's sake, please do not create misapprehensions or misunderstandings in the mind of the country. And even if we talk to them-talking is never banned-it will be out of strength and with no sense of defeat or weakness.

Well, I am sorry I am taking a little more time of the House. But I was a bit surprised to hear from Shri Vajpayee that the Prime Minister made a mistake when he said that the Chinese would be driven out or he had issued orders for driving out the Chinese

The Hon. Member : I did not say that the Prime Minister made a mistake in saying that the Chinese would be driven out. I wanted to know whether the Prime Minister was informed of our preparedness or otherwise when he asked the army to throw out the Chinese.

Home Minister: All right. Then I shall not deal with it. But it was quite clear and obvious in those circumstances for the Prime Minister to have issued those orders. It meant no doubt sacrifice and suffering on the part of our troops but then if he had not done it, I do not know where the Chinese would have been today. It was essential. There are occasions when our people, when our countrymen and when our troops and forces of the army have to undergo tremendous sufferings and have to make sacrifices in the interests of the nation and it was an occasion and I think he gave just the right and proper lead when he said or when he issued the orders that we must resist them at any cost.

305

About referring to the political parties, I do not want to mention the name of someone--the gentleman does not belong to any political party, he may be an independent and it is a small thing but what effect does it produce ? This is what he said : "The Government, and other top ranking officials are responsible for allowing the aggression to make so much advance."

Then he made a reference to the list of articles necessary for supply to the army personnel and then added :

"The public have got every right to see the account."

He continued saying: "The Congresswallas have not purchased India and the country is not for the Congresswallas".....

An Hon. Member: Who said?

Home Minister : I do not want to mention the name. He is an important person.

An Hon. Member : Is he a Member of this House ?

Home Minister : No, outside. I got it only the day before. Then I get a card today, this morning from Bombay and the speech was made somewhere in the east and this card of almost an illiterate person said : "What am I doing as the Home Minister and could I not prevent or stop these things?" because be says in his letter that this speech has created a very bad effect, adverse effect, on the people in those areas. He has even added that even collections have stopped for the time being because of accounts and everything as if we are swallowing or trying to swallow the whole of the money we get. Therefore I said that these are small matters but these things do create a wrong impression on peoples minds and it has to be definitely avoided.

Before I, conclude I might say that we are fighting a dangerous enemy and we should be prepared for gains as well as reverses. The preparation of the Chinese is on the whole of the Himalayan frontier, their concentration is almost on every important post. We cannot therefore belittle it, whether it is Ladakh or Himachal Pradesh, or U.P. or West Bengal or Assam.

In the whole area in a way, if I might say so, the Chinese are in heavy numbers and we have therefore to be extraordinarily careful and should not get somewhat depressed or dejected if something happens because after all it is our determination which will take us far and which will help us in fighting the- Chinese forces. Within a very short period we have to build up our strength to face the Chinese in all eventualities and we have to stand up to a man if we want to drive out the aggressor and the enemy. should perhaps mention what one of the Canadian papers has said about our struggle. It says

"In the minds of many people of the West there never has been any question as to where India really stands in terms of ideals for which she struggled and traditions she inherited. .

"India has remained the foremost bastion of freedom on the continent of Asia" and therefore, "let us make no mistake. This is our fight India must win it whatever the cost to us of the free world in arms, in materials or in the markets of China."

"The stake in the India-China border fighting is a vast continent. That makes it our tight as well as India's."

Having said all this, I must say that we should pay our heartfelt tribute to all the parties which have lent their full support in the cause of the freedom of our country, in our present crisis and who are determined to carry on this struggle. I was glad to hear the other day the speech of the D.M.K. Party Leader and the whole-hearted support he lent to this Resolution. As I said the other day, I did not actually mean to say that the States do not physically exist. The States do exist, they are there and they have to function effectively. Yet what I meant to say was that mentally in our action we are all one and there is no difference at all between one State and the other.

The problems of religion, the problems of communalism, regionalism language, all that have vanished in no time, and I hope that China will realise what the strength of a democratic Government is, how democracy functions and when there is an emergency, how the whole nation stands behind the Government. So as I said before, I would, before I conclude, request Hon. Members who have proposed certain amendments-I do not say that some of the amendments have no sense or substance, they have but I would request them-not to press these amendments and I would be very happy indeed if this Resolution is hailed and passed unanimously.

I would like to conclude with a word that in the existing situation our Leader, the Prime Minister, and the Government can only promise the people toil and sweat until final victory is won. Let us pledge, let us resolve that we shall not relax, that we shall not rest.

306

CHINA INDIA USA AUSTRALIA CANADA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN NEPAL ALBANIA KOREA NORTH KOREA BULGARIA TOTO

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Nation Dedicated to Repel Aggression: Prime Minister's Speech In Lok Sabha

Winding up the debate on the Chinese aggression, the Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on November 14, 1962 :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since I had the honour of moving this resolution we have had a long debate in this House, almost perhaps a record debate in this House and perhaps in other parliaments also. I do not quite know how many Members have spoken.

Mr. Speaker: 165.

Prime Minister : 165 Members have spoken. While it may have been said that perhaps it very large number of speeches rather take away from the pointedness of the question before the House and our minds wander into details, yet I am glad that so many Members have spoken because the point that stands out is this, not that they have not made various suggestions, various criticisms, but that fundamentally and basically every person who has spoken in this House has spoken in the same refrain more or less, and that our Members have reflected the mood of the country.

CALM AND DETERMINED FACE OF INDIA

I have put forward a longish resolution before this House, and it is clear from the speeches made that the resolution as it is, is welcome to this House and will be accepted as it is, but I have almost felt that it would have been, shall I say, suitable to add a small paragraph to the resolution thanking the Chinese Government for taking some action against us-which, of course, we have resented-which has suddenly lifted a veil from the face of India. During the last three weeks or a little more we have had a glimpse of the strength, of the serene face of India, strong and yet calm and determined, that face, an ancient face which is ever young and vibrant. We have not had seen her face, but rather this House saw a million faces representing that face of India or Bharat Mata.

That has been an experience worth having-for all of us and it has been our high privilege to share in that emotion and experience. Whatever the future may bring, I do not think we shall ever forget this powerful emotional upheaval that India has had in which we have all shared-I repeat, all of us whatever party or group we may belong to. Any person who gives thought to these matters will realise and, I hope, other countries also realise-I hope that even the Chinese Government realises that-what this signifies, because it seems to me obvious that no country which evokes that feeling in a moment of crisis can ever be suppressed or defeated. In fact, many countries of the West and, I hope, many countries of the East also realise that today. They are surprised that such an amazing upheaval should have taken place among our feelings that all our petty controversies which seemed so big to us suddenly become of no moment and are swept aside before the one thing before us, that is, how to meet this crisis and

emergency, how to face this invasion and to repel it. That is the major issue.

MENTAL UPHEAVAL

We may-I am going into that a little more later-have failed here and there. We might not have been quite prepared to meet this invasion. Our mentality may be built towards peace. Although we prepared for any such emergency, nevertheless it is true that the mind of the people and of the Government while preparing sought peace all the time. I am not sorry for that. I think, it was a right urge and it is that right urge that has led to this enormous upheaval in the Indian mind.

Much has been said about our unpreparedness. In some degrees many Hon. Members have referred to it. I shall deal with that matter presently. I do not seek to justify any error that we might have committed, but I do think that many Hon. Members have done an injustice, not to any Minister or others, but to our Armed forces as a whole in making various charges. I hope to disabuse their minds by stating some facts. The one real fact, as I said, is that our whole mentality has been governed by an approach to peace. That does not mean that we did not think of war or of defending our country. That, of course, we had always in mind. But there is such a thing as being conditioned in a certain way and, I am afraid, even now we are conditioned somewhat in that way.

An Hon. Member said-I am not quite sure of his words, but he said something to the effect that now we must

An Hon. Member : Brutalise.

Prime Minister : I had an idea that he used the word 'blood-thirsty'-I am not sure. Anyway, he said that our nation must be brutalised; that Jawaharlal Nehru must be brutalised. I hope that our nation, much less my humble self,

307

will never be brutalised because that is a strange idea that one can only be strong by being brutal. I reject that idea completely. Our strength lies in other factors. Brutality is a thing which we have associated with certain movements, which we have objected to or rejected. By becoming brutal and thinking in those brutal ways we lose our souls and that is a tremendous loss. I hope that India which if, essentially a gentle and peace-loving country will retain that mind even though it may have to carry on war with all its consequences to the utmost.

WE SHALL BE STRONG, NOT BRUTAL

There is a definite distinction between being strong and being brutalised. I need not mention an instance which has lent prestige to our history-the instance of the long period when Gandhiji was controlling the destinies of our movement for freedom. No man can say that Gandhiji was brutal. He was the essence of humility and of peace. No man can say that Gandhiji was weak. He was the strongest man that India or any country has produced. It was that peculiar mixture of strength with sacrifice to the uttermost, yet a certain humility in utterance and a certain friendly approach even to our opponents and enemies, that made him what he was. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him and under him do not claim, of course, to be much better than him. We are humble folk who cannot be compared with the truly great, but something of the lesson that he taught came down upon us and we learnt it in a small measure. In the measure we learnt it we also became strong though, I hope, not brutal. So, I would like to stress that I do not want to become brutal; I do not want that aspect of the cold war and the hot war which leads to hatred and dislike of a whole people and looking upon them as something, below normal.

Some of us who are old remember the First World War and, the tremendous propaganda in it against the, Germans. I do not hold any brief for the Germans---I think, they were wrong in the First World War and, I think, they were wrong in the Second World War-but the type of propaganda against the Huns and all that, against the whole people, not against an individual, was shocking. I have no doubt that the same type of propaganda was being carried on in Germany against the Western allies.

Wars are terrible and millions of people die; much destruction is caused. Yet, after all, death comes to all of us and if it comes a little earlier than otherwise in the. great cause, it is not to be sorrowed for. We have to face it as men. Death in a good cause is not a thing to regret, even though we may regret the parting with of colleagues and comrades. But brutality is so thing which degrades a person. Death does degrade a person. Brutality and hatred and offspring, of these things do degrade a nation and the people. So. I should like to say right at the beginning that, I hope., no such emotion will rise in our country and, if it does rise, it will be discouraged. We have nothing against the Chinese people. We regret many things that their Government has done. We think that their Government has acted infamously towards us. We regret many things that their Government has done in their country. We cannot help them. Anyhow, we must always distinguish between the people of any country-much more so of a great country, great in size, great in history-and its government and not transfer somehow our anger and bitterness at what has been done by the Government to the people,

PEKING BROADCASTS

Perhaps, it I understand, many Members, sometimes, listen to broadcasts from Peking. I have not done so at any time. They have told me of the constant appeals that Peking broadcast makes to the Indian people. It distinguishes the Indian people from the Indian Government or the Indian Parliament. It carries on propaganda that the present Government are just some reactionary people who are sitting and crushing the Indian people and making them do things against their will. I am sorry if they are so utterly mistaken, because even the blind can see that all the Indian people are one today. It does not require much perspicacity. But, I want the House to note the reason for their propaganda, that is trying always to distinguish between the Indian people and the various governmental agencies and parties. There is something in that. We must not lump together the Chinese people and the Chinese Government and everything that is in China together.

I cannot say how the Chinese people feel now, because they have no chance to express their feelings. Even if they had a chance, their minds are. so conditioned by constant propaganda, by one-sided news that they are likely to feel one way even though otherwise they might not have done so. We should always distinguish between governmental action and the people as a whole. Therefore, I have not liked some poor Chinese shopkeepers, some restaurant-keepers being attacked in Delhi or elsewhere as if they were the symbols of the attack on us. Perhaps some people thought so. But, it was wrong for them to think so. It brutalises us and gives us a bad name. I should particularly like to lay stress on this aspect because it does not add to our

308

strength in the least, but, it weakens the nervous energy that we possess by using it in wrong directions.

War in these days is something infinitely more than in the old days. When I say old days, I am talking about India. I am not talking about the Great wars and other things, War involves not only courage. It tends to become total war in which every human being, man, woman, and perhaps child. somehow helps or hinders, may hinder and the total energy, nervous and otherwise of the nation, is involved in it, organised and mobilised.

We have seen in these great wars that. have happened in the past, in the First World War and the Second. very powerful nations, very brave nations, armed to the teeth with the latest weapons, contending against each other, killing millions on either side, yet carrying on, but ultimately the whole nervous energy of the nation collapsing. Perhaps if the one which collapsed could have carried on it little while longer, the other would have collapsed, as Mr. Winston Churchill said at the end of the First World War: it was the sheerest fluke that we won, the sheerest chance, sheerest fluke, Because both sides were determined to carry on. They were trained people in war and they had strength and determination. Ultimately, it becomes a thine of the whole basis energy of a nation collapsing, however it might be. It so happened that the Germans collapsed a little sooner. This is what Mr. Churchill said. Perhaps, if they could have carried on, the decision might have been otherwise. So also in the Second World War. Throughout the War, it almost appeared, except

towards the end, that Germany might win. Yet, ultimately, the other people won. So, we must realise that it is a question not only of a few weapons here and there, but of this entire energy of the nation, the mind of the nation being concentrated to achieve a certain objective and holding to it whatever happens and not wasting our energy or frittering it on any minor things, minor expressions and minor disputes.

MOBILISING THE NATION

I hope, of course, that we will mobilise the nation. We will profit by many of the suggestions made in this House and other suggestions that are continually coming before us. But, even if we make mistakes, as any person is bound to do, the real thing that counts is not an odd mistake leading to an odd reverse, but ultimately keeping up this united front and united nervous energy of the nation to face this crisis.

The fact of the matter is that before these 3 1/2 weeks before the 20th of October, it was not realised by the people at large what dangers possibly might confront us. They thought of frontier incidents. Hon. Members in this House criticised us for not taking steps in Ladakh to drive them out, not realising that it is not such an easy matter. Perhaps they realise it a little more now that these things are not so easy matters, that they require not only the strength of a nation, but properly utilised, properly directed, enormous field of preparation and consideration of military factors. Where these factors are against us, naturally we suffer a reverse, it does not matter what your strength is. Our jawans were very Strong.

I might mention just for the information of the House that it was not today, but some years back-by some years, I mean a couple of years back-that is, after the Chinese started nibbling at our territory in Ladakh, that we had before us the question of NEFA. We considered it. what we should do if they attacked. We hoped that they would not attack there. Certainly we hoped, we expected that they would not attack in such large numbers, as to bring about a regular invasion with several divisions, which they did. Nevertheless, we had to consider if they did. what should be done. The advice that we received then was that it will be disadvantageous for us to try to hold to the exact frontier line, the McMahon Line, but that we should delay them, we should haras's them, we should fight them a little, but the real defence line, should be lower down wherever a strong defence line could be made. Partly because to the last moment we did not expect this invasion in overwhelming numbers, partly from the fact that we disliked it-I frankly tell you that we disliked the idea of our walking back in our own territory, whatever it was-we faced the Chinese there under very disadvantageous circumstances from a military point of view. In addition to that, enormous numbers came over. It is no criticism at all of our officers or men that they were somewhat overwhelmed by this deluge and they had to retire to more defensive positions.

Mr. Frank Anthony, I think, said that we have been enabled to put up some kind of line of defence, because we have received arms from abroad, but that was not correct then; no arms and material and equipment that has come from abroad, but that was not correct then; no arms which were brought had reached our troops by then; they are gradually dribbling in and going there, but by that time when we achieved the present position, these arms, which were brought had not been given and had not reached them. It was with the existing equipment that they brought the Chinese advance to a standstill.

309

So, the real reason, the basic reason for our reverses in the early days of this campaign was the very large forces the Chinese threw in; in a restricted sphere or field, they outnumbered, our forces, by many many times. Even the question of better arms did not arise. We had slightly better arms, but that did not arise so much. They had better mortars to hit at some distance. They still have them, but they had stopped. That was the main reason, and there was nothing that we could do about it, because the geography of the place, the military appraisal of the place was against us in that particular area. The only fault we made, it may be, if it is a fault, was even to stick out where the military situation was not very favourable. It was not that we told them to stick out; it is folly for any politician to say so. But our soldiers themselves have a reluctance to go bark, and they stuck on at considerable cost to them.

I referred to the great unity in the country, which is a wonderful factor. It is not unity of parties so much as the unity of hearts and minds. We can see that in the thousands of faces. When I talked about the face of India, I really should have talked about the million faces of India, because they all bear the same impress today, whatever community or party he or she may belong to.

CPI MANIFESTO

And I should like to say something even about the Communists. Now, the Communist Party's manifesto as a manifesto was, I think, as good as it has been drafted by any non-communist. People may think or say that it does not represent their real views, but because of pressure from outside they did it. Let us suppose that it did not represent some of their views, some, no doubt. Some there are in the Communist Party who even objected to this manifesto, and were overruled. Even so, the fact that conditions in the country were such that they decided to issue that manifesto is a factor of some importance. It shows how these conditions mould people's minds in India, all of us, to whatever party we may belong to, even to a party which for reasons known to Members was inclined in the past to favour somewhat the Chinese, because they are also Communists. Even then, they stood out, and stood up four square against this attack as any hundred per cent nationalist would do. That is a good thing. Why should we not take full advantage of it instead of deriding it and seeking causes why they did it? After all, there are some leaders among the Communists, and they sometimes quarrel amongst each other about ideologies, theses and what not, but the large number of ordinary workers or others who may belong to the Communist Party are simple folk. They are attracted by something in it, and those simple folk are affected just as they are affected by the situation which affects every Indian; they have also been affected by this manifesto of the Communist Party, that is, the ordinary communist members. And that is a great gain. They should be affected in this way. Why should we lessen the effect of that by telling them that it is a wrong manifesto? So, I welcome that manifesto, and we should take

full advantage of it in forging the unity against aggression that we have in fact forged,

Then, I do not wish to go into the hundred and more minor criticisms and suggestions made in this House. All suggestions made by Hon. Members will be carefully examined. Some, as I said, were made because of not knowing that the thing had been done; some perhaps we cannot adopt; others we may adopt.

DEFENCE PREPAREDNESS

I should like rather to lay stress now on the general question of our preparedness, because Hon. Members seem to think, some Members, that we sent our soldiers bare-foot and without proper clothing, to fight in the NEFA mountains. It is really extraordinary to say that they were almost unarmed, and bare-footed.

Some soldiers there were stationed there. Others were sent rather in hurry in September. Our time for issuing winter clothes is September, about the middle of September. When they were sent, they went there, of course, at that time in full uniform, full warm uniform, woollen uniform, and every man had two boots, good boots. As they were going, they were given three blankets apiece. Later on, it was made into four blankets; now, they have been issuing four thick army blankets. But these blankets took up so much room, and as they were going by air, the people decided, that is, the officer in charge, and the men themselves said: 'They take so much room, and, therefore, send them later on to us'. It was not so very cold then. So, they took, each one of them, one blanket, and left the others to be sent later on. That was a little unfortunate, because sending them later, as we did, meant air-dropping them. And air-dropping was a hazardous business in those days. Apart from the fact that the Chinese then could fire at them, air-dropping in those very precipitous areas in the mountains could not be accurately carried out. Often, they went into the khad, into the deep ravine below, and it was difficult to recover them, So, we lost a good deal of our supplies, all these blankets and other things.

310

Then, we even went further. We provided

for high mountain altitude snow-boots; they had good boots, they had two boots. apiece; they had snow boots; these boots had been provided to those soldiers of ours who were permanently located there. The others that were sent were all in Assam; they were not here; but they were in Gauhati and other places. But, again, the difficulty arose of sending them by air.

Broadly speaking, I would say that all our Army in NEFA was well-clad, and well-booted, but towards the end, that is, towards the end of September, realising that the Chinese forces were increasing very rapidly, we decided to send more troops quickly. These troops were sent in a hurry. And sometimes, it so happened that troops that were being sent somewhere else were diverted to NEFA, and these troops certainly had not the full complement of winter clothing then. Of course, it was decided to send them later. Except for these troops that went later and which did not have the full complementand subsequently it was supplied to them-all others had the full Army complement, and many of them had snow-boots also. In any event, everyone had good stout Army boots.

FROST-BITE VICTIMS

Some people have heard stories of frost-bite. All the cases of frost-bite occur naturally due. to the cold and due also to the high altitude. I do not quite remember the number, but I have an idea that out of a large number of people,-I do not quite know,--about two or three thousand, the total number of frost-bite cases was probably about 40, which is a very small percentage considering the conditions there. Of these too, we may say that half was due just to the altitude and not to lack of foot-covering. This occurred not to our regular army serving on the front, but most of this occurred to people when on the 20th October when this fierce onslaught of the Chinese came, our forces in that particular place--one or two places there-were dispersed. They could not return to the base of their army. They dispersed and for some days, they wandered about the mountains and ultimately returned. That was also the reason perhaps for people saying that the casualties were very heavy. Of course, large numbers' of our forces had not returned in order; they were wandering about the mountains, returning a few days later. I think these persons. who returned a few days later were over 1,600. During these few days, these persons, naturally, were not well-protected. When they were wandering, they did not have the facilities of the army, blankets. and other things they would at the base camp. They were not carrying them. They were wandering in high altitudes and they suffered a great deal. That was where the frost-bite cases chiefly occurred, along with lack of other comforts. When they came back, they were put in hospital, and they are doing fairly well.

So I would submit to the House that it is not correct to say that our people were not sufficiently clad or sufficiently booted. It was an unfortunate thing that this was the time for changeover from summer clothing to winter clothing. Surely a small number of our army which was in summer clothing at that time was suddenly diverted to the east without coming back to their base, and the winter clothes took a little time to reach them. As regards boots, they had very good boots. Even snow-boots were supplied. Some people do not have them. We do not supply snow-boots to large numbers, to everybody. We do supply them to people in these high altitudes.

Apart from clothes and boots which were, I do think, excellent, normally our army is not clad for the winter. They were clad, for instance, in the operations in Kashmir with very special clothes, but normally our army is not clad for the winter. They have got all kinds of winter things, but not for these very high altitudes and the cold winter there.

It might interest Hon. Members to know that in Ladakh round about the Chushul area, the temperature at present is 30 degrees below zero. Such is the ferocity of that climate. Ordinarily, it does not matter how many clothes you may have in a temperature 30 degrees below zero at an altitude of over 14,000 ft., unless you are used to it. Now, learning from experience, we have provided, in addition to all the other winter materials that our soldiers have, thick cotton padded coats and trousers. They are very warm. They may not look so smart as with the other clothes, but they are there. We started providing them these within a few days of the 20th, as soon as we felt that they ought to have these and it became colder there. We have been sending these cotton padded coats and trousers at the rate first of 500 a day and later at the rate of nearly 1,000 a day.

AUTOMATIC WEAPONS

The other charge made is about weapons, that they did not have proper weapons. Now the soldiers, jawans, who went there were supplied with all the normal equipment, that is, .303 rifles and the normal complement of automatic weapons such as light machine guns and medium machine guns. They did not have semi-automatic rifles because our army does not possess them. I might point out that many up-to-date armies in west do not possess them yet.

311

Even in England, the change-over to semi-automatic rifles has just taken place. It has just been completed; it took about four or five years; it has just been completed, this year, a few months ago. It is a lengthy process. And the British Army is relatively smaller than ours.

For about four years. now, we have been considering and discussing this matter. Various difficulties arose. Points of view were different. The easiest way is always to order something-ready-made articles. But the easy way is not always a good way. Apart from the continuing difficulty we have to face, that is, lack of foreign exchange etc., it is not the way to build up the strength of a nation. If we get something today, we have to get ammunition for that all the time and we are completely in the hands of some other country. And specially if we have to deal with private suppliers in other countries, the House knows that the arms racket is the worst racket of all; because you need something, they make you pay through the nose.

So we were very much against getting it from private suppliers outside and we thought that we should build up our own arms industry to manufacture semi-automatic rifles. These arguments, specially in peace time take a long period to determine. Of course, if we had this crisis before this, we would have functioned better. But it took about two to three years to determine what type to have. Ultimately, we started the first processes of manufacture and we have just arrived at a stage when within about three weeks or four weeks-in fact, some prototypes have been prepared-they will begin to come in larger numbers and will increase in numbers in another month, two months and three months to a substantial quantity.

It is not a question merely of semi-automatic rifles. As I have said, we had automatic machine guns, LMGs and MMGs-light machine guns and medium machine guns. Every regiment had its complement of these. Certainly, they did not have semi-automatic rifles for the reasons I have given, namely, we wanted to manufacture them ourselves and this change-over to automatic rifles has been relatively a modem development. As I said, even in England, it is a recent thing. But this outlook of ours, about manufacturing things ourselves rather than buying them covered our whole approach to this question. We. are manufacturing a great many things in arms today which we did not previously. I shall give you some figures. The first pressure upon us is always that of finance, that is, foreign exchange. We could not really afford it. Do not compare that situation two or three years ago with the situation today when we have to meet a crisis. When we meet a crisis like this, it just does not matter what happens. We have to face it. We have to buy it here and there! we have to get it from wherever we can. That is a different matter. But normally, the whole approach was to make them ourselves.

How did we make them? The usual thing was that we bought some with the proviso attached that the persons we bought it from would give us the licence and the blueprints to manufacture it here. So we bought some to begin with, and then started with the blue-prints and the, licence we had got to manufacture it, and supply it with everything, whether it is tanks or other things.

INDUSTRIALISATION

Also, it is all very well to build a factory here and there, but really you want to have a strong industrial background. You cannot, out of a relatively agricultural background, suddenly put up a highly sophisticated factory. All this time the work we have done, not in the Defence Ministry, but all over the country, in our First Five Year Plan, the Second and the Third, has been meant to strengthen the nation by making it more modernised, more industrialised and build up this base out of which you can produce the things you require. Perhaps some Hon. Members will no doubt realise this, some may not. You have to have a strong base, industrial base. You have to have indeed not only a strong base, you have to have a literate people. People may think for the time being that education can be stopped. Education is essential for a real war effort. It is essential because you want every soldier today to be a better mechanic; he has to be educated as much as possible. So, it all goes together. The whole basis of our Five Year Plan was to better our people, to raise their level and all that, but it was essential to make India stronger to face any trouble that arose, whether it was invasion or anything. And we are in a much better position today to face this trouble than we were ten or twelve years ago, there is no doubt, because of the growth of our industrial base in the Public sector and the Private sector, both. If we had to face this business ten or twelve years ago, our army was the same as today, a very brave army, but it had no industrial background, and it would have been very difficult for it. We had to develop that industrial background as fast as we could. Now we have at least a base to develop, and I hope, therefore, that no conflict will arise in any person's mind whether we should go ahead with the Third Five Year Plan or devote ourselves to the war effort. That is part of the war effort-I do not say everything in the Third Plan; some things may be avoided, slowed down, even dropped if you like. But take agriculture. It is the base of all industry,

312

FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD

It is only on a strong agricultural base you can build up industry. The industrial base is the foundation of any war effort. So, the two are connected, intimately connected.

Education again. We want today, we shall want, not only a widely educated mass of people, but vast numbers of technically trained people. That comes in. Power is essential for industry, and so on. So, really, all the major things that we want were in the Five Year Plans, and are required today.

But the point I wish to lay stress on is this, that all our thinking, in the past even from the point of view of the army has been concentrated on industrialisation, on making things ourselves.

Today we are getting large numbers of arms and equipment from other countries, and we are very grateful to the United States, to the United Kingdom especially, and other countries. But please remember that this kind of thing, and this kind of response, could not have occurred in peace time. Obviously, it is when danger threatens us, just as we feel in a particular way, others feel too, and they think, as they rightly think, that this is not a mere matter of India being invaded by China, but it raises issues of vast importance to the world, to Asia, and realising that they do it, they help us; that is, they feel, this involves many issues in which they themselves are intensely interested. This could not have happened in peace time.

Some one asked us : we could have bought some of the things at a very heavy price. Today I hope we get them on very special terms, whatever the terms are, they are being worked out, but it is understood special terms, not to put any heavy burden on us today. That kind of thing could not have taken place then. We would have bought these things, or even one-tenth of what we are buying at a heavy cost, which would have made our Finance Minister shiver. But apart from that, in any long-term view, it was a wrong thing. The thing is to make them ourselves.

DOMESTIC ARMS PRODUCTION

What has China done? The main differencethere are many differences between China and India, but one difference is that first of all they started about 20 years before the success of the revolution there, they were fighting all the time. They had a heavily trained army fighting in the mountains. They are especially good at mountain warfare; lightly clad with a bag of rice and a bag of tea in their pockets, they march on, with no questions of supplies or anything for days, with cotton-padded coats and trousers. They were highly trained in that warfare. But what I am saying is this, that they concentrated right from the beginning, apart from other developments in the country, on the development of armaments manufacture. They got a good deal of help from the Soviet Union; vast numbers, thousands of people set up their armament industries. We, although we did go on with our armament industries, did not concentrate on that, certainly not. We though: better build up the whole industrial complex of India, and out of that other things would also be built up. Nevertheless, we did build up, I think fairly adequately, our armament industry, not as much as we would have liked. It was being progressed.

I shall just read out to you some figures of our ordnance factories production. In 1956-57. the issues to the army from the ordnance factories amounted to-I cannot tell you the details, it is not right for me to tell you, I am only telling you how much they cost.

Some Hon. Members : No, no.

Shri Ranga : We know the results anyhow. We do not want all that, it will only help the enemy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru It has grown about 500 per cent. I do not mind telling you. I am not going to give you what they are making, but the issues to the army in 1956-57 were Rs. 8.64 crores; civil orders Rs. 3.52 crores; Air Force and Navy Rs. 1.93 crores. In 1957-58, issues to the army Rs. 12.78 crores; civil orders Rs. 3.27 crores; Air Force and Navy Rs. 2 crores. Then the figures for the army goes up to Rs. 12, Rs. 14, Rs. 19, Rs. 24 and in 1961-62 to Rs. 3 1/4 crores, and at the present moment it is estimated at Rs. 60 crores.

Much has been said about civil orders, that we make thermos flasks and the like in ordnance factories. It is very unkind, that kind of criticism, without knowing anything. Most of the civil orders are of Railways and the Government. A few things are made, some things like thermos flasks, simply because in the process of manufacturing other things, some things are manufactured which can easily be converted into thermos flasks etc., and there was surplus labour about. You will see that civil orders have not progressed much. They have become, from Rs. 3 1/2 to Rs. 6 crores in these eight years, while the issues to the army rose from Rs. 8 to Rs. 60 crores. It has advanced much more, again with the difficulty of trying not to import machinery as much as possible. We did import some. Again, foreign exchange, that awful thing stares us in the face. And the result was that much of the machinery used was revamped, reconditioned machinery, which we got from old stocks; and our engineers ate good men, they made it suit their purposes. Of course, it is far better

313

to get new machinery. We are trying to get new machinery. But it is remarkable what they did with the material they had before them and I should like to pay a tribute to the men in charge of our ordnance factories, not only because they are thoroughly competent but, what is more, they are filled with a certain enthusiasm. They are patriotic and they want to show results. They work night and day and at the present moment they are working 24 hours a day in the factories.

I should like to mention how pressure of circumstances makes one a hard realist. The food we supply to our army, though good, is complicated and not easy to throw about or be supplied from above. In the last two or three weeks both our Armed Forces food department and Defence Science Organisation as also the Food and Agriculture Ministry have been experimeriting with foods which could be concentrated and which could be carried about easily in your pocket also and which should be enough for several days. Only this morning I was looking at an exhibition, demonstration rather, in the Defence Ministry of these foods, quite a large number, very attractive and very palatable. They looked palatable. I did not cat them. There were all kinds of preparations of gur and nuts. They are excellent preparations. I may also tell the House that gur is a good thing for high altitudes. We are making very good progress. We have in fact sent these things to the front to find out the reaction of the soldiers to that.

Some Hon. Member asked a question about the newspaper item about our soldiers getting notices from courts or some such thing. I do not know that. Anyhow, we have immediately taken action to stop any such thing happening and every such thing will have to be postponed for the duration of this emergency.

PUBLICITY ABROAD

Some people criticised our diplomatic missions abroad for not doing as good a job of work as they ought to in putting our case, and countering the Chinese propaganda. My information is that our diplomatic missions abroad, by and large, are doing very good work. But another country's outlook is not determined solely by what we tell them. There may be many factors--may be, sometimes fear, sometimes other things. I think our missions abroad are doing well and, what is more, their work is being rewarded. The first reaction of many countries, many of these Asian and African countries, was regret and surprise at what had happened here and they hoped that it would be quickly ended by some cease-fire and compromise and all that, because they found themselves in a difficult position. Gradually this surprise is giving way; it has given way in the case of the UAR and even Ghana which took up an attitude to out regret originally and later supported the UAR making some suggestions to the Chinese Government. It was very near to the suggestions we made about the cease-fire business. So, I do not think it will be right to criticise our diplomatic missions abroad. You must remember that these countries have their own diplomats too here who report to them, and most of them have got their newspaper correspondents. There are many ways of getting news about what is happening.

PAKISTAN AND NEPAL

This question comes up in various waysabout Pakistan and Nepal. It is difficult for me to say anything definite. But about Nepal I should like to say that latterly the attitude of Nepal has been relatively much more friendly. Naturally, we have always made it clear-it is unfortunate that they thought that we were creating troubles-we have made it clear right from the beginning that we do not want trouble in Nepal. Apart from the Chinese invasion and the trouble there, they are largely internal. Anyhow, now, I think they believe our word and are very friendly and I hope that our relations will continue to be friendly and cordial.

As for Pakistan, there also, I will not quite be definite, but their newspapers have been peculiarly virulent about this matter against us. But I do not think their newspapers reflect very much the opinion of the people of Pakistan or even of those in authority in Pakistan, Gradually they are realising it; at first, apparently they thought this was a small frontier matter and nothing much. Now, they are realising how farreaching are the consequences of this, and they are making a reappraisal.

SOVIET UNION

I should like to say a few words about the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been, as the House knows, consistently friendly to us all along. It has been put in a very difficult position in this matter, because they have been, and are, allies of China, and hence the embarrassment to them as between a country with which they are friendly and a country which is their all . We have realised that and we do not expect them to do anything which would definitely mean a breach over there. It is not for us to suggest to any country. But we have had their goodwill and good wishes all along, even very recently, and that is a consolation to us and we certainly hope to have that in future.

The Chinese Government has been making a lot of propaganda about our Defence of India Act as if that was specially passed to deal with some Chinese here. It has obviously been 314

passed because of the situation we have to deal With. Everybody who is a mischief-maker, if it be a Chinese who makes a mischief, he comes under its purview; otherwise not. The difficulty with the Chinese is that they have a singularly perverted opinion and perverted view of what happens in the rest of the world. It is an old characteristic of the Chinese. Being a great nation with a vast territory, it begins to think all outside the limits of its frontiers are subhuman types and not so advanced as they are.

One thing more. There has been some criticism about our offer for a cease-fire. We have said that before we discuss anything, the Chinese forces must go back and restore the position as it existed before the 8th September, that is, a little over two months ago, when they first came over the Thagla Pass. They have suggested something different, and something that is apt to delude the people. They say, let us go back to the position of November, 1959. Now, the people who do not know this might well wonder, the), are going back three years, not now. But November, 1959, was roughly the date or period when the first claim was made by the Chinese Government, by Mr. Chou En-Jai, to these territories according to their maps. Previously, they were included in their maps, but nobody had made any official claim. In fact, officially they have said that their maps are old and not up-todate, and they Will revise them, But in 1959. for the first time, they claimed them, meanwhile, of course, they having gone into a good bit of Ladakh.

In 1959, our counter-measures started taking effect. In 1959, 1960 and 1961, we went into Ladakh much more and more and established many posts there. Now, we realised, as I think I told this House then, that the object of these posts is to prevent their further advance unless they fight it out. It was difficult for us to have a major armed conflict with them there, because they had great advantages. Their roads came right up there. They could bring all kinds of weapons, tanks, etc., there from Tibet which is near, which is relatively a flat country, while for us, although we made some progress and the road is recently made-at that time even that was not made-it is very difficult; it meant months of effort to get there. Nevertheless, we put up those posts to check their advance and they did check their advance. In fact, we pushed them back a little. In the NEFA area, we had previously put up our posts at the border or just under it, because one cannot have a highridge post. Even in Thagla. Pass, our post was two or three miles on this side, but not on the Pass itself.

Now, if we accept their proposals, which seem so innocuous, they would retire, they said, up to the McMahon Line, but then they add that their idea of McMahon Line was different from ours; and it is on this side of the ridge" and we should have to retire from where we are todayanother 20 kilometres, that is, leaving about 40 kilometres of territory which was not occupied either by their armies or ours. That is to say, they would have a fixed base on this side of the Thagla Pass, an open territory which they can walk across any moment, they like. It was impossible for us to agree to. And in Ladakh, it meant our withdrawing still further from where we are, and their, not exactly marching immediately, but our facilitating their advance in the future if they want to come. So, we rejected those proposals.

We said there should be a reversion to the-8th September line both in NEFA and in Ladakh. That meant in NEFA not only their going back but our going forward to those posts that we held, with no vacant space left.)

Some people say, "How can you say that? you must not negotiate. You must not have any talk with them till you completely push them out from the Indian territory." That is a very good thing. But one does not talk with anybody whom one has defeated completely and pushed out. The question of talks does not arise. If we have gained our objective without talks, the question of talks does not arise. I would suggest to House to remember that in these matters, one has to take a strong view, but a realistic view. The suggestion that we have made, they have rejected, because it strengthens us and weakens them. What is more, the suggestion we have made about the 8th September line is one which has been appreciated in a great part of the world-non-aligned countries and othersbecause merely saying that we shall not talk to you till you have confessed defeat is not the kind of suggestion that any country makes to another. So, I hope that the House will realise that what we have suggested is a right suggestion and will support it fully)

Some Members talked about our stating that we are going to liberate Tibet.

An Hon. Member: Mansar village is in India, the population there is Indian (Free translation from Hindi).

Prime Minister : Some others even mentioned. I think the Hon. Member who just intervened said something about Mansarovar.

315

An Hon. Member : Mansar village.

Prime Minister : Unfortunately, history is not

made by men like the Hon. Members opposite. It is really amazing to see that some other Members and others outside talk that we should lay down that we would liberate Tibet. It is a very happy idea if it is liberated. But our undertaking that job at the present moment or at any moment seems to be extraordinary and fantastic and having no relation to reality.

I have said that in a war between India and China, it is patent that if you think in terms of victory and defeat-there might be battles and we might push them back, as we hope to-but if either country thinks in terms of bringing the other to its knees, it manifestly cannot and will not happen. Let us be realistic. Are we going to march to Peking ?

An Hon. Member: Are we going to allow them to march to Delhi?

Prime Minister : I am sorry I cannot enter into an argument. But I appreciate that a war like this cannot be ended as far as I can foresee by surrender by either party. They are two great countries and neither will surrender. Therefore, some way out has to be found to finish the war in terms honourable to us. We have said that we will finish the war when we liberate our own territory which is in their possession. Our saying that we are going to liberate Tibet is a thing which we cannot do; even if we had the atom bomb, we could not do it. It is manifestly absurd to talk about it, and it justifies everything that China has said about it, in the sense.

OUST THE AGGRESSOR

They have always been saying that their chief grouse against us is that we have been encouraging a revolt and rebellion in Tibet. That is the thing which ultimately turned them against us. If we say that, it will justify their argument, which had no foundation, and give them in international circles and everywhere considerable strength. It will mean our saying something which we cannot possibly, feasibly do. It is impossible. We have got a big enough task, a tremendous task, which we should realise, to push them back to their own territory from our own country. We are going to do it. It is going to be mighty difficult; it might take us a long time. So, I hope that while we should be strong and determined, as we must be, we must not just for the sake of appearing braver than others say things which' are, I regret to use the word manifestly nonsense.

Now, the resolution I have placed before the House is a fairly comprehensive one. It is a resolution of resolve. of determination, and of dedication. I hope, therefore, that in accepting the resolution, as I hope this House will, the House thinks in terms of dedication, not in bombast, not in tall talk, but realising that we have a very difficult task before us, we are determined to fulfil it, however long it may take and whatever the consequences might be. And, in doing so, we will be heartened by the biggest thing that a country can do and which India has done thus far, and that is, produce this enormous emotional upheaval that we see all over India among men, among women and, perhaps more than all, among children. So, I put forward this resolution before the House in the hope, faith and with the strong determination that all those who are present here and the country will abide by it and will act up to it.

An Hon. Member : Mr. Speaker, may I just, by your leave, ask this one question) The Maharajkumar of Sikkim is reported to have said in ...jeeling two days ago that there has been a tremendous Chinese military build-up on Sikkim's borders during the last few days or week. Is the Prime Minister in a position to assure the House and the nation, in view of the agreement which India has with Sikkim for the responsibility of its defence, that 'our army is better prepared to resist the Chinese aggressor in Sikkim than it was, unfortunately, in NEFA a few weeks ago?

Prime Minister : I regret, Sir, that such questions are put to me. I will give no assurance of any kind. How can I give assurances ? I can give no assurance except that we are taking all measures that we can if such a thing occurs there. How can I give assurances about the future in matters which are determined not by my assurances but by other factors ? But I do not think that the Chinese, if they venture to invade and come from Chumbi Valley, will be allowed to come or will find it an easy job.

One thing I have to mention-it is unconnected with this question. I have received today a letter

signed by 35 Members of Parliament offering their services to serve anywhere. I am very grateful to those 35 Members and I welcome their offer. I do not quite know how we can immediately profit by it. But I am sure as our Organisation progresses work would be found for more and more people in all grades and departments of life.

316

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY OMAN UNITED KINGDOM PERU RUSSIA GHANA NEPAL PAKISTAN TOTO

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

No Compulsory Military Training at present: Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Intervening in the debate on a resolution urging compulsory military training to all young men in the country, the Prime Minister made the, following statement in Lok Sabha on November 15, 1962 :

Mr. Deputy Speaker : I am intervening at this early state of the debate to indicate what Government's views are in this matter. Obviously, I take it that no one in this House can be opposed to this Resolution as such. Even apart from the crisis, it is a good thing for every young man to have some training. It will make him a better citizen and will make him better fitted for any other duty that he might perform. But at this stage for us to say what we cannot do effectively would not be desirable.

I imagine that the persons who would be affected by this, if. this Resolution is passed, would be about 30 million in India. To pass a Resolution or to decide on a measure without fully being able to implement it would not be proper. We are, as a matter of fact, increasing the numbers that are going to be trained very considerably in various ways. The Hon. Member who has just spoken referred to the NCC. At the present moment it consists of about 4.2 lakhs, that is, over 400,000. We are increasing it, the NCC and the NCC Rifles, to cover practically every university student in India.

Then there is the Territorial Army which we are increasing fairly rapidly. Then there is a Lok Sahayak Sena. In addition, there are the Home Guards. If all those are totalled up, the figure comes to a formidable figure. That is As much as we can take in hand considering the need of officers and trainers and others. As the Hon. Member says: "Give them Wooden rifies". That, I accept, may be necessary here and there. But we should like to give a majority of those people some rifle training so that they may know the weapons fully and later on, if necessary, they can utilise them. At this moment we are expanding and extending our training programme very greatly, as much as we can possibly deal with. With all my sympathy for this Resolution, therefore, we are unable to accept it at this stage because we just will not be able to do it in view of the number of officers and trainers required. This would probably rather come in the way of the more intensive and better training that we are giving to those lots of people who come under the various categories that I have mentioned.

I did not mention, of course, the additional recruitment programme for the Regular Army which is very considerable. It will mean our dispersing our efforts and possibly will rather impair the kind of training we are giving.

I entirely agree with the Hon. Member who has just now spoken about our recruiting people from Nagaland and from all the border areas specially. We hope to touch all these people and to increase our capacity in regard to trained people very, very considerably. In fact, even now our capacity for training is stretched to the utmost.

We should remember that fortunately for us in India there is no lack of volunteers. The question of compulsory training- have no objection to it--comes in when volunteers are lacking. If and when that need arises, we can certainly go in for conscription. But at the present moment we have millions of people at our disposal, as much as we can train.

I suggest, therefore, that it is better to concentrate on the steps that we are taking and gradually expand our programme; ultimately, if need arises even accept a Resolution of this kind. But at the present moment it would not be wise to accept a resolution which we cannot give effect to.

An Hon. Member : May : seek a clarification from the Hon. Prime Minister? In view of the fact that this war is going to be a long-drawn out war, as the Hon. Prime Minister has said so very often, why is it that we cannot spread out the programme to impart military training over a number of years, take them from now on and adopt this Resolution ?

Prime Minister : But we are spreading it out very fast, as much as we can deal with. I have no objection to spreading it out more and more, but merely saying that we will include almost everybody in India does not mean that we will be able to do more than we can. We cannot.

I had forgotten to mention another scheme of voluntary rifles. There are four or five major schemes where we could give effective training, not with wooden rifles and things of that kind but with regular rifles and all these comprise millions and millions of people.

An Hon. Member: May I seek some information? Will the Hon. Prime Minister allow voluntary organisations under Government supervision for this military training? I had an experience in 1947 when we had raised about a lakh of people without Government assistance under completely voluntary work and with finances also. So, I will again say that without

317

Government assistance of a penny but under Government supervision we shall do our best without bringing in any question of economy. With the enthusiasm that has been aroused in our country people should be given the fullest opportunity in the rural areas. I think, they should not be deprived of their enthusiasm. in their self-defence and even in civil defence they should be completely trained with voluntary efforts. So, I propose that the Hon. Prime Minister invite voluntary organisations or volunteers and if they want to give civil defence training, they should be allowed to do this.

Prime Minister : There is plenty of opportunity for them in the volunteer rifles that we are raising and the Home Guards which is something even more than civil defence. The Hon. Member can utilise all the enthusiasm be can find for this. If he wants to raise some other volunteers, it is difficult for me to say unless I see the scheme how it fits in because one of the difficulties will be, when millions and millions of people are being trained, to provide them with arms. We may not immediately be able to do so. But I will suggest to him that there are very large opportunities of training in the various categories that I have mentioned.

CHINA USA INDIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Broadcast

Following. is the text of the Prime Minister's message to the nation broadcast by AU India Radio on November 19, 1962 :

Nearly a month ago I spoke to you on the Radio and told you of the Chinese invasion of India that came across our frontiers in the North East Frontier Agency, at first in small numbers and then in ever-increasing numbers. Suddenly on the 20th October they made a massive attack with overwhelming numbers on our military posts and forces stationed there. That was a severe setback for us and it naturally grieved us. Now, today, I have to. tell you of further setbacks which have occurred for the last two or three days and even today. Huge Chinese armies have been marching in the northern part-of the NEFA, and we have had several reverses at Walong, on the Sela Ridge and today Bomdila, a small town in NEFA, has also, fallen. In the north also, in Ladakh, in the Chushul area, the Chinese have been attacking fiercely. They have been held.

Now what is happening is very serious and very saddening to us. I can well understand what our friends in Assam must be feeling because all this is, happening on their doorstep one might say. I want to tell them tha we feel very much and that we shall help them to the utmost of our ability.

We may not be able to always succeed in what we are trying now because of various factors and overwhelming numbers of the Chinese forces but I want to take the pledge here and now that we shall see this matter to the end, and the end will have to be victory for India. We are not going to tolerate this kind of invasion of India by any foreign country. This is the first war of Independent India to maintain her independence and India is not going to loose this war however long it lasts and whatever harm it may do us.

Therefore, on this day, it has been a sad day for us-bringing news of reverses and setbacks-I want to send my greetings to the people of Assam, especially to the people of NEFA and to the rest of India, and to tell them that we most not get worried about this; sad we must be necessarily but we must train ourselves and steel ourselves to meet all these reverses and even to make our determination still firmer and to do all that we can to repel and throw out the invaders from India. We shall not be content till the invader goes out from India or is pushed out.

We shall not accept any terms that he may offer, because he may think that we are a little frightened by some setbacks. I want to make that clear to all of you and more specially to our countrymen in Assam to whom our heart goes out at this moment. There has been a great deal of expression of determination in India-a great enthusiasm which has heartened us. People, even poor people, have been contributing to our Defence Fund and in many other ways people have shown their determination.

I hope that this will continue in an everincreasing measure and any setbacks that may come in this war which has been thrust upon us, will not permit us to waver in our determination because we will not waver; we shall carry out this fight to the end and that end is going to be a victory for us whatever in between there might be.

So, with this pledge to you I want to end. I do not wish any person to doubt what the end will be. I do not want any Indian, man or woman or child, to get dismayed because the

318

Chinese forces have won some Successes in the beginning. This is war and in war successes come and failures come also. What counts is the end and not the intermediate stages of the war. So at present I shall only say this to you. I shall not say much.

I hope in future to keep in touch with you a little more frequently to tell you what is happening and to mobilise the nation to meet this grave menace; for this menace is not only for Assam or Ladakh or India alone; it is a menace for Asia and a menace for the entire world.

We see the grossest form of imperialism functioning here across our borders in India. China has said often enough that it is anti-imperialist. Now we see this so-called anti-imperialist country becoming itself an imperialist of the worst kind and committing aggression and invading a friendly country without rhyme or reason or excuse and justifying it by saying that they are being attacked.

I must confess that I have seldom come across such a travesty of truth And decency in international behaviour. We must stand up to it; not only we, but all decent-minded persons, and decent-minded countries who value their freedom anywhere in Asia or Africa, Europe or America.

I should like to say that we are grateful for the speedy help that came to us from our friendly countries abroad more especially from the United States and the United Kingdom. We shall require more help and we will ask them for it and we shall certainly use all the help they can give us because this is a matter of survival for us. It is not a game that we are playing : or if you like it is a game of life and death-life and death of a nation and life and death of millions in this country. We are going ahead whatever happens with the firm conviction in the righteousness of our cause and that success and victory will be ours. I want you to join in this conviction and not to be down-hearted at any time. And so let us all say today with the real meaning and repeat our old cry "Jai Hind",

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on Border Situation

The Prime Minister made the following statement on the border situation in Lok Sabha on November 19, 1962 :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to give grievous news to this House. Both Walong and the Sela Ridge in NEFA have fallen to the enemy. In the Chushul area fighting is proceeding

In Walong, the enemy attacked on the 15th/ 16th night. This was a two-pronged attack. The battle continued till the morning of the 17th. The enemy succeeded in shelling this air field, which was the only source of supply to our forces. In the 17th afternoon, our troops started withdrawing to defensive positions in the rear.

In the lung area. the enemy attacked our positions on the 17th November. Their attack was repulsed four times. Ultimately there was an attack in greater strength, and this Jung position had to be given up. Our troops fell back to the main position at Sela. In the meantime, the enemy bypassed our main post by a wide flanking movement between Sela and Bomdila. They attacked in the early hours of the 18th November, and cut the road between Sela and Bomdila. The infiltrators were forced to withdraw. They formed up again and renewed the attack. The situation is somewhat confused, and fighting is going on, but our Commander had to withdraw from Sela.

In the Chushul sector in Ladakh, heavy artillery attacks were made on the Chushul air field and the outposts. Our post at Rezang La was attacked on the 18th morning. After fierce fighting, this post was overwhelmed. A part of another post six miles east of Chushul was also attacked.

Other attacks in the Chushul area were repulsed. Fighting is still going on.

This is bad news. I cannot go into further details at this stage. I should like to add that in spite of the reverses suffered by us, we are determined. not to give in in any way and we shall fight the enemy, however long it may take to repel him and drive him out of our country.

CHINA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister on Border Situation

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement on the border situation in Lok Sabha on November 20, 1962 :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I gave some

information to the House about the position on our fronts where fighting has been taking place.

319

Since I spoke in the House yesterday, a report was received in the evening regarding the fall of Bomdi La. Bomdi La actually fell into the enemy's hands on the 18th evening, but as the situation was confused a report about it did not reach Delhi until yesterday evening. The Chinese are now advancing on the Bomdi La foothill road. Defensive positions have been prepared in front of them and our troops will give them battle there.

In Chushul, the post six miles cast of Chushul was attacked by the Chinese in overwhelming strength for the fifth time yesterday afternoon. There was fierce fighting for more than an hour and a half and heavy casualties were inflicted on the Chinese attackers. But finally the post was over-run. Two other posts in the close vicinity of this post were also attacked and had to withdraw. Chushul, however, remains firmly in the hands of our force.

I should like to inform the House that General P. N. Thapar, our Chief of Army Staff, has this morning applied for long leave on grounds of health. He has been granted leave and on his recommendation the senior Army Commander, Lt. General J. N. Chaudhury is being appointed to officiate as Chief of the Army Staff.

CHINA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on Reported Chinese Announcement regarding Cease-fire

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Lok Sabha on November 21, 1962 :

Sir, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to certain developments that have taken place.

The Government of the People's Republic of China, it appears from Radio broadcasts, has announced that they will have a cease-fire from mid-night of 21/22 November and will start withdrawing their forces from the positions they occupy from the 1st December. This is a unilateral announcement. We have thus far received no official confirmation of it. As soon as we receive any official message from the Chinese Government, we shall give it full consideration. Till then I would not like to express any opinion in regard to the Chinese proposals. Our position in regard to any negotiations continues to be what we have previously stated, that is, that the position as it existed prior to September 8, 1962 shall be restored. We shall continue our efforts to obtain aid from friendly countries and strengthen our country's defences and its economic potential.

We should like to express again our gratitude to the many friendly countries who have offered us aid and sympathy and support during the time of our distress.

We have made it clear previously and we repeat that we have no desire for any territorial expansion in any direction and our aim is to live in peace and amity with our neighbours.

CHINA USA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Air Services between India and Soviet Union: Diplomatic Letters Exchanged

Diplomatic letters on the amendments to the India/USSR Air Services Agreement were exchanged in New Delhi on November 13, 1962 between H. E. I. A. Benediktov, Ambassador of USSR and Shri M. M. Phillip, Secretary of the Communications Department, Government of India.

The amendments to the Agreement were agreed earlier during discussions between the delegations of the Government of India and the Government of USSR. The amendments provide a satisfactory arrangement for the extension of Aerofloat's services on the Moscow-Tashkent-Delhi route to Rangoon and Djakarta and that of Air-India on the Delhi-Tashkent-Moscow route to points beyond.

320

At present Air-India, operates one service per week between Delhi and Moscow while Aerofloat. operates two services every week between Moscow and Delhi one of which goes to Djakarta via Rangoon.

Background : India and USSR entered into an agreement on Air Services in 1958. The Agreement initially entitled the Airlines of the two countries to operate scheduled air services between the two countries. Air India and Aerofloat are operating air services since August, 1958. These services are run in a commercial Pool Agreement between the two Airlines. The discussions about the amendments for which diplomatic letters were exchanged today took place in February, 1961.

INDIA USA RUSSIA UZBEKISTAN INDONESIA

Date : Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

Shipping Services between India and USSR: New Agreement Signed

India and the Soviet Union, November 20, 1962 signed a new Shipping Agreement further strengthening the Indo-Soviet Shipping Service. Under the new agreement the total number of ships is being increased to twenty as against fourteen at present, each side placing ten vessels. The new agreement was signed on behalf of India by Dr. Nagendra Singh, Director-General of Shipping, Government of India, and on behalf of the Soviet Union by Mr. V. 1. Jarkov, Chief of the General Shipping Department and Member of Board at the Ministry of Marine Fleet, The signing of the agreement followed negotiations between the two sides last month.

Both sides have agreed to make an endeavour to reach parity in cargo liftings and freight earnings. The freight rates governing the service have also been reviewed and revised where necessary.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Text of Notes Exchanged between U.S. Assistant Secretary of State and Indian Ambassador

Following is the text of notes exchanged in Washington on November 14, 1962, between Mr. Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State, and Mr. B. K. Nehru, Ambassador of India:

Excellency : I have the honour to refer to the agreement between our two Governments

effected by an exchange of notes on March 7 and 16, 1951, at Washington as amended by an agreement effected by an exchange of notes on April 16 and December 17, 1958, at New Delhi.

In response to requests from the Government of India, my Government is prepared to furnish assistance to the Government of India for the purpose of defence against the outright Chinese aggression directed from Peking now facing your country. It is the understanding of my Government that, with regard to defence articles made available to the Government of India under special arrangements to be concluded between representatives of bur two Governments and including defence articles provided between November 3 and November 14, 1962, the Government of India consider the assurances contained in the agreement effected by the exchange of notes of March 7 and 16, 1951, to be applicable and that the Government of India is prepared :

- (1) to offer necessary facilities to representatives of the Government of the United States of America attached to the United States Embassy in India for me purpose of observing and reviewing the use of such articles and to provide them with such information as may be necessary for that purpose; and
- (2) to offer for return to the Government of the United States of America such articles furnished by the Government of the United States of America which are no longer needed for the purposes for which originally made available.

321

A reply to the effect that these understandings are correct will constitute an agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the United States of America, which shall come into force on the date of the note of reply from the Government of India.

The reply dated 14th November, 1962, from Mr. B. K. Nehru, Indian Ambassador, quotes in full the note from Mr. Phillips Talbot and concludes with the following paragraph "I have the honour to confirm that the understandings set forth in the above quoted note are correct. I agree that your note together with this reply shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments which comes into force on the date of this reply".

USA INDIA **Date :** Nov 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

P.L. 480 Agreement Signed

The Governments of India and the United States concluded an agreement in New Delhi, November 26, 1962 providing for the sale for rupees to India of 375,000 bales (400 lbs gross each) of long staple cotton valued at \$ 46.6 million (Rs. 22.19 crores) under U.S. Public Law 480. The cotton is urgently needed by the industry at this time.

Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, signed for India and the American Ambassador, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, signed for the United States.

The long staple cotton which will be supplied by the United States will help the Indian textile industry to maintain production at a satisfactory level and provide relief from shortages faced this year. A similar agreement for 180,000 bales was signed on May 17, this year. It was valued at \$ 28.2 million (Rs. 13.4 crores).

The \$ 46.6 million covered by today's agreement includes \$ 44.5 million for the purchase of cotton (the 375,000 bales) and \$ 2.1 million to pay the cost of ocean transportation. Eighty-five per cent of these sales proceeds will be loaned to the Government of India for economic development purposes; 5 per cent will be available for loans in the private sector under provisions of the Cooley amendment of U.S. Public Law 480. The remaining 10 per cent will be used to pay United States obligations in India.

Today's agreement is the seventh U.S. P.L. 480 agreement made between the two countries. Under earlier agreements, the U.S. had supplied 1.6 million bales of cotton. Today's agreement brings the total of commitments under the seven U.S. P.L. 480 agreements between the two countries to \$ 2,423.2 million (Rs. 1,153.9 crores).

Speaking at the signing ceremony, Prof. Galbraith said

I note, Mr. Secretary, that this is the seventh Title I P.L. 480 agreement signed between our two countries. It comes, moreover, at a rather critical time-when the textile industry of India is in need of a continued and firm source of supply in order to maintain full production. So, I am doubly pleased not only to be taking part in one of these ceremonies at which you and I have so often appeared, but to be able to complete arrangements which will be of benefit to an industry of such importance to the Indian economy.

Replying, Shri Jha said

Thank you Mr. Ambassador. Next to foodgrains, cloth is the most important item from the point of view of the masses in this country. Under your P.L. 480 programme, the United States Government have helped us with tremendous supplies both of foodgrains and raw cotton as well as a few other, things. The total value of P.L. 480 assistance, including the agreement which we have signed today, amounts to more than Rs. 1,150 crores. Our textile industry today is facing a rising domestic demand and must have more raw material to cope with it. We greatly appreciate the timely help to augment our cotton supplies which this agreement provides for.

USA INDIA Date : Nov 01, 1962

December

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affai Vol. VIII	rs Record DECEMBER	Dec 01, 1962	No.12
	CONTENTS		
BURMA		PAGES	
Trade Agr	eement Signed in Ra	angoon	323
CONGO			
President I by China	Kasavubu's Sympath	ny with India "Mer 323	ciless Aggression"
CZECHOSLO Financial a	OVAKIA and Technical Colla	boration	324
	EPUBLIC OF GER Agreement	MANY	324
	IE UNITED NATIC for International Co		N. Chakravarty's
IRAQ Trade Agreement Signed in No		ew Delhi	327
PAKISTAN	anan Cinahla Cuasah	at Inda Dalvistan I	dinistorial
Conference	aran Singh's Speech e	at Indo-Pakistan I 327	viinisteriai

Joint Communique	331			
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHIN	IA			
	Lok Sabha on India-China Border			
Situation	331			
Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on India-China Border				
Situation	335			
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS				
Defence Minister's Statement of	on Supply of MIGs 337			
YUGOSLAVIA				
Strengthening of India-Yugosla	avia Relations: Dr. Zakir Husain's			
Speech	337			
Faith in Non-Alignment Confirmed: Yugoslav Vice-President's				
Speech	339			
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL	AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION			
GOVERNMENT	OF INDIA			

BURMA CONGO INDIA CHINA NORWAY SLOVAKIA GERMANY IRAQ PAKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA USA

Date : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Trade Agreement Signed in Rangoon

The level of annual trade each way between India and Burma is likely to be between Rs. 110 and 140 million during the three years from 1962-63, according to a three-year trade agreement signed between the two countries. An understanding has been reached in regard to the measures to be adopted for securing a substantial increase in the volume of trade between the two countries. Payment will be made by each country in free convertible currency and efforts will be made by both the countries to achieve as near a trade balance as is practicable.

An Indian Trade Delegation, led by Shri V.

Shankar, Secretary, Department of Food, Ministry of Food and Agriculture, concluded in Rangoon the trade talks which had been initiated earlier in Delhi during the visit of the Burmese Trade Delegation, led by Col. Chit Myaing, Member of the Revolutionary Council and Vice-Chairman of the State Agriculture Marketing Board of Burma. The agreement was signed on 24th December 1962.

The agreement provides for the export by India of a number of commodities like cotton textiles, jute goods, sacking material, fish and prawns, coal, engineering goods, chemicals and pharmaceuticals and the import by India of rice, timber, piglead and other mineral ores, seed potatoes, etc. from Burma. India has agreed to purchase a minimum of 150,000 tons of Burma rice each year during the period of the agreement, and has also concluded a specific agreement for the year 1963 for purchasing the said minimum quantity, as also such additional quantity as may be required and as may be available.

As a result of the trade talks, it is also expected that there will be closer techno-economic cooperation between the two countries for the mutual development of their economies.

BURMA INDIA **Date** : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

CONGO

President Kasavullm's Sympathy with India : "Merciless Aggression' by China

Replying to the address of the Indian Ambassador to the Republic of Congo, while presenting his letter of Credence, Mr. Kasavubu, President of Republic of Congo said:

"I have received with great pleasure the letter

by which His Excellency the President of the Republic of India has accredited you to the post of the first Ambassador to the Congo.

"I thank you, particularly, for the friendly and encouraging words you have had for my Country and its future. I can assure you that it is for us, Congolese, a real satisfaction to know that a great Nation like yours, which has Played such a preponderant role in the field of high ideals and in pioneering the emancipation of the peoples of Asia and Africa, is on Our side, to assist us with her experience and material help in our struggle for the consolidation of our independence and in the amelioration of the conditions of our population. I must pay homage here to the loyalty and heroism of your brave soldiers serving under United Nations Command.

"In this respect, moreover, India's role in the United Nations action in the Congo is of great

323

significance and the debt we owe her we duly appreciate.

"Today, when this noble Nation has to face a merciless aggression and when she finds herself so poorly recompensed in her loyal efforts towards reconciliation, understanding and maintenance of peace, we cannot refrain from telling you how much we are moved by the misfortune that has befallen your country, how we wish her territorial integrity should be completely and permanently restored, and how our hearts and wishes are with those who in the foothills of the Himalayas., while. defending their ancestral land are also, at the same me, defending liberty and peace in the entire world.

"it is in this spirit that I undertake, Mr. Ambassador, to assure you of the best welcome among us and to inform you how much I am convinced that the excellent relations already binding our two countries, consolidated by your presence, will only be further strengthened thereby contributing ultimately to the greatest good of our two peoples."

CONGO CHINA INDIA USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Financial and Technical Collaboration

A Supplementary Agreement was signed, New Delhi, December 28, 1961 for Financial and Technical Collaboration between Czechoslovakia and India in setting up the Central Machine Tools Institute in Bangalore.

The Institute will be a research design and standardisation Organisation for the machine tools industry. It will also build and test prototypes of machine tools.

The foreign exchange costs of the Institute will be met out of a grant of Rs. 6 million given by the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as part of a larger agreement for economic cooperation between the two countries. Under the Supplementary Agreement, TECHNO-EXPORT, the Foreign Trade Corporation of Czechoslovakia will supply the required machinery and machine tools, train Indian technicians in Czechoslovakia and make available the services of Czechoslovakian experts in India.

The agreement was signed by Mr. J. Jukl of TECHNOEXPORT, and Shri R. V. Ramiah of the Ministry of Steel and Heavy Industries. A preliminary agreement was signed in Prague earlier this year by Professor Thacker as President of the Institute.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM CZECH REPUBLIC **Date** : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

New Loan Agreement

The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and India signed an agreement, New Delhi, December 12, 1962 for the utilisation of DM 470 million (Rs. 559 million) given to India for the current year of the Third Five-Year Plan. The agreement was signed by the German Ambassador. Mr. G. F. Duckwitz. and Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.

Speaking after signing the agreement, Ambassador Duckwitz said : The fact that we are today signing another agreement concerning the financial participation of the Federal Republic of

324

Germany in India's Third Five Year Plan, gives me an immense satisfaction.

My Country has always taken a keen interest in the economic and political development of India. After a successful economic build-up as envisaged in the first two Five-Year Plans, India has now, by means of the Third Five-Year Plan, placed new goals before herself. The realization of these targets shall certainly lead to a further advancement in the economic, social and political structure of the country.

The Federal Republic of Germany has always assisted in the realization of these targets to the best of its ability by means of credits, loans and industrial 'cooperation. My Country is ready to participate actively in the economic development of India in the future as well. The Federal Government particularly considers it to be its duty to assist India at a time when the freedom and integrity of this country are being threatened by the Chinese aggression.

The German people admire the courage of the Indian soldiers fighting at the northern front as well as the heroic efforts made by the entire nation to strengthen the defence potential. This is for us a clear indication that the energy and determination shown by this country ensures that its subsequent efforts for the economic developmerit will be intensified.

I would like to express the hope. Mr. Secretary. that the Agreement signed just now may also help in achieving this goal.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

U.N. Year for International Cooperation: Shri B. N. Chakravarty's Speech

Speaking on the draft resolution on the United Nations Year for International Cooperation submitted by 21 countries, Shri B. N. Chakravarty, India's Permanent Representative, said :

On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, which have co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/L.419, I have the honour very briefly to introduce this draft resolution and explain its objects and purposes.

In the Charter of the United Nations the peoples of the world have proclaimed their determination to. save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. For this purpose the Charter enjoins upon us all to practise tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. Although mankind has succeeded over the last seventeen years in avoiding worldwide conflict, the period since the end of the last World War has enjoyed what one might describe at best as troubled peace. Local wars could not altogether be avoided. As Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, said in this Assembly on 10 November 1961 :

"We live in this world of conflicts and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals. The essential thing about this world of cooperation, and even today, between countries which are opposed to each other in the political or other fields, there is a vast amount of cooperation. Little is known, or little is said, about this co-operation that is going on, but a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the co-operating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict." (A/PV.1051, pages 13--15 and 16.)

My Prime Minister then went on to suggest that in order to emphasize this aspect of cooperation, which is admittedly a larger element of our lives than that of conflict, this Assembly might resolve to call upon all countries of the world to devote a year to the furtherance of

325

cooperative activities in numerous fields in which it is in fact now taking place. As the problem requires calm and careful consideration, he suggested that perhaps the Assembly might like to appoint a committee to consider the matter further and to make suggestions as to how this objective might be achieved. He thought that we should undertake this vast task of encouraging this new thinking, this new approach, the approach of co-operation not on a mere ideological basis but on a practical basis of sheer survival in this world.

These ideas which have been stressed 'also by other eminent leaders from all over the world prompted my delegation at the sixteenth session to propose the inclusion in the agenda of the Assembly of an item entitled "The United Nations Year for International Co-operation". We were further emboldened in this endeavour by the clear and unequivocal manner in which the very first Article of our Charter has laid down the purposes of the United Nations. Paragraph 4 of this Article lays down that one of the purposes of this Organization is "To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends"; and by these common ends it means those specified in the preceding three paragraphs of that Article. It is therefore entirely in the fitness of things that this Organization should focus the attention of the entire world on the living fact of widespread international cooperation.

The explanatory memorandum contained in document A/4972 of 16 November 1961 of the sixteenth session explains in some detail the object and purpose we had in view. The main proposal related to the designation by this Assembly of one specific year as the United Nations Year for International Co-operation, so that the co-operation daily practised in a thousand different fields by the peoples and nations of the world could be focussed upon and emphasis shifted from conflict to co-operation. Under agenda item 95 of the sixteenth session, a draft resolution (A/L.382) was submitted by the delegations of Afghanistan, Ghana, India and Nepal. The item was to have been discussed and debated in the plenary session, but as there was not much time lift before the adjournment of the session, the Assembly decided to postpone this item for consideration at the seventeenth session.

This postponement has enabled the co-sponsors to have consultations not only with other delegations but also with personalities and organizations even outside the United Nations. This exchange of views has resulted in a clearer understanding of the problem before us. The different views that have emerged out of these discussions have now been crystallized and a large number of delegations representing various regions of the world have now tome together in presenting a draft resolution in an amended form. My delegation, on its own behalf, and also on behalf of the co-sponsors, would like to express its special appreciation to all those who were good enough to make the valuable suggestions which have now been incorporated in the present draft.

The main change that has been incorporated in relation to the draft resolution submitted at the last session is the one pertaining to the designation of a specific year as the International Cooperation Year. It was agreed by the co-sponsors that the designation of any specific year without enabling the preparatory committee, that we hope the Assembly will agree to establish, to consider the matter in greater detail would be prejudging the issue and would deprive us of the valuable advice which such a preparatory committee would undoubtedly render after a detailed examination of the question. While the year 1965, the twentieth year of the United Nations, might be an excellent choice, as we could then combine in this concept the celebration of an important anniversary of our Organization, the co-sponsors were of the view that excellent as the suggestion is, the preparatory committee should be entrusted with the making of a recommendation as regards the desirability of doing SO.

Primarily, our intention is to call upon Member States and on the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency to organize measures and activities to celebrate the International Co-operation Year. On reconsideration of the proposal made last year, we also came to the conclusion that a decision not to invite non-governmental organisations concerned would deprive us of some extremely valuable assistance these organizations may render by way of suggestions, ideas and organizational capacities.

Thus while last year's proposal attempted to cover this category of specialized international organizations under the phrase "international organizations, we have considered it advisable in the present draft resolution to make a specific invitation to non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the ECOSOC, the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency. This does not mean that other international organizations that may be interested in this matter would be altogether excluded. Operative paragraph 4 provides for a definite invitation to "other organizations in Member States which are concerned", for we realize that without the widest possible co-operation this venture, which should draw in literally everyone concerned, cannot hope to be a complete

success.

326

It is also dear that even though the main burden of the celebration is to fall on Member States, this Organization must inevitably be involved in some expenditure even though that may be small. Accordingly the preparatory committee has been requested to report to the eighteenth session of the General Assembly on the financial implications of this proposal. Our draft resolution recommends a preparatory committee of up to twelve members. That phrase has been advisedly chosen so that the President of the Assembly should feel free to appoint a smaller committee should that size in his opinion be able to provide a satisfactory basis for an efficient and representative committee.

In requesting the Committee to meet at United Nations Headquarters, our object is Primarily to enable the Secretary-General to provide headquarters facilities that are readily available so that no additional appropriations would be involved in the functioning of the preparatory committee.

The phraseology of our draft resolution has been drawn up after careful thought and, effort and we hope the meaning is clear beyond doubt. I shall not therefore attempt any more to explain the object and purposes of our draft resolution, which we hope will receive the widest possible support of this Assembly.

INDIA AFGHANISTAN AUSTRALIA BURMA CANADA CYPRUS USA ETHIOPIA FINLAND GHANA INDONESIA LIBERIA NEPAL NEW ZEALAND NIGER NIGERIA SUDAN TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO TUNISIA VENEZUELA YUGOSLAVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

IRAQ

A new trade agreement between the Governments of India and Iraq was signed, New Delhi, December 13, 1962. The Minister for International Trade, Shri Manubhai Shah, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Nadhim. Al-Zahawi, Minister for Trade and leader of the Iraqi delegation, signed on behalf of the Republic of Iraq.

The agreement will be valid for a period of two years initially and will come into force immediately on ratification by the two Governments.

The agreement seeks to promote closer trade and economic relations between India and Iraq. The two countries have agreed to accord to the trade of each other the most-favoured-nation treatment.

The agreement seeks to promote closer trade between the two countries in traditional items as well as for trade in some new items. The main commodity of import from Iraq is dates. Iraq, which is a developing country, offers large opportunities for Indian engineering products. It is also an important market for tea, jute manufactures, textiles and spices.

Speaking after the signing of the agreement, Shri Manubhai Shah expressed India's gratitude to the Republic of Iraq for their friendship and co-operation. He said that India would be happy to extend its collaboration for the industrial and economic development of Iraq.

Replying, Mr. Nadhim Al-Zahawi described the agreement as a corner-stone in the strengthening of friendly relations between the two countries. He hoped that both the countries would implement the provisions of the pact in a spirit of cordiality and mutual benefit. He added that the Iraqi Government on their part would do what was required of them to fulfil the obligations in full.

IRAQ INDIA RUSSIA USA **Date** : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Sardar Swaran Singh's Speech at Indo-Pakistan Ministerial Conference

The following is the full text of the speech made by Sardar Swaran Singh, leader of the Indian Delegation to the Ministerial Level Conference held in Rawalpindi in response to the opening speech by Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, leader of the Pakistan delegation :

I am very happy to be in Rawalpindi again and to take part in discussions envisaged in the

327

joint statement issued by your distinguished President and my Prime Minister on November 29.

Great responsibility attaches to the honour of having been deputed for this duty. It helps me to bear that responsibility to know that Pakistan representatives with whom we have to conduct these meetings should be so distinguished and responsible as you, Sir, and your colleagues here, to all of whom I bring the greetings and good wishes of my government.

Nearly three years ago, it was my privilege to conduct negotiations with your government on what, till then, had been one of the most serious problems affecting our two countries, namely, the regulating of disputes along our borders and it is encouraging to recall that, except for difficulties arising in regard to problems that were then left unsettled, the agreement reached at that time has been working well. I feel sure that frankness and mutual understanding which enabled these negotiations to succeed will characterise our present meetings, may I also venture the hope that these will lead to an even more fruitful outcome? I am also very conscious of difficulties that have to be faced. The magnitude of challenge to wisdom, patience and statesmanship of our respective governments is brought out by words in which the joint statement has set forth our purpose : 'to make renewed effort to resolve outstanding differences between their two countries on Kashmir and other related matters so as to enable India and Pakistan to live side by side in peace and friendship.

Mutually beneficial co-operation based on friendship and developed in peace should be the normal relationship of our two countries. This is what was hoped for 15 years ago when we realised our independence. Whatever our past and present differences, I am sure you will agree that such an idea was not unnatural considering our geography, our common historical experience and our many ties and close associations.

Unfortunately that hope was still to be realised and passage of time is not always a help. I hope and trust that unhappy memories are fading on your side as they are on ours but alas happy memories may also fade. What is more, old attitudes harden and new problems arise. I do not wish to enter into profitless analysis of who is responsible for all this; I readily agreed that there have been faults on both-sides. But the realization that terms in which we may have thought about each other in the past have long ceased to apply may help us to view our problems in better perspective. Today Pakistan and India are two separate independent countries and must resolve their differences as do other mature sovereign states.

Our differences am, of course, real, important and difficult. Overshadowing all others is Kashmir but other major problems taken together would constitute a formidable list. There is a whole complex of problems restricting our trade and commerce to one-fifth of what it was before partition. In addition, there are major border disputes; in particular, along Tripura and East Pakistan boundary and Assam and East Pakistan boundary. There are also the serious problems arising out of infiltration into Assam and Tripura from East Pakistan. There are obstacles faced by people who wish to visit each other's country. There is still a live and painful dispute over the evacuee property and the thorny question of financial arrangements. Most of these are the old familiar controversies, too old and too familiar, that is the difficulty. The point to notice about them is that they are not just debating questions between the governments but problems which affect the daily lives of vast numbers of persons and through them our whole population. These problems have to be solved, now or later on, in the course of these talks as they are also major causes of tension between the two countries. Fundamentally what we have to do is to devise in each of these contexts and in a larger general way arrangements which will encourage our respective peoples to live with the minimum of friction or more positively with maximum of cooperation. The prerequisite for such cooperation is the desire for it and the realisation of its advantages in effect, understanding and goodwill.

There have been occasions in the past fifteen years when it was readily seen that such understanding and goodwill were about to help us break through the vicious circle of mistrust and suspicion, charges and counter charges. But each time the promising trends were lost and we were left as we are now to start all over again. I do not at all want to get involved in a controversy over reasons for all these disappointments but I venture a diagnosis in the hope that we may this time find the cure.

I suggest that in the past the main reason for the disappointing end of the promising beginnings has been that goodwill and understanding necessary for success have not been sufficiently developed. I know it is frequently said that goodwill can only grow when problems are settled. but I also know that problems cannot be settled unless there is goodwill. I do not mean goodwill only between us present here or between the leaders of our two countries; what is needed is a deliberate sustained effort to encourage goodwill among the ever increasing sections of our society. The tragedy of our relationship is that instead of making such an effort we have been subject to contrary influences. While I do not

328

wish to recriminate, I hope you will forgive me for mentioning that in the context of our present meeting, the recent press and public campaign against India in Pakistan has been, to say the least, disheartening. In the past few weeks my country has been trying to cope with the severest of crises. I do not wish to say too much here about the nature of our conflict with China because I know your government is on record as enjoying and valuing good relations with that country We too at one time enjoyed and valued good relations with China; no government could have done more than mine to try and establish and develop such relations. In return we were first misled, then our territory was encroached upon surreptitiously and when we tried to protect ourselves, we were attacked in force and have been deprived of vast areas of our country. WC had to prepare expeditiously to deal with this danger which, we believe, we shall have to face for a long time to conic. It seems sonic people in Pakistan believe that there is no such danger; that. is their privilege I can only say that not very long ago it was Pakistani leaders who drew attention to the threat that China posed to the sub-continent and the world. While we cannot help opposite views being held about the nature of our struggle with China, we cannot but regret and deplore the fact that our efforts to defend ourselves against China are misrepresented as preparations to attack Pakistan in the future. My Prime Minister has precisely and fully stated in public and in personal correspondence with your President, the reasons why we are trying to- strengthen ourselves; he has categorically and repeatedly emphasised the policy of my government never to attack you. In this context, I would like to remind you of the significant passage in my Prime Minister's letter of November 12, 1962, to your President where he said : 'the idea of any conflict with Pakistan is one which is repugnant to us and we on our part will never initiate it. I am convinced- that the future of India and Pakistan lies in their friendship and cooperation for the benefit of both'. Nevertheless we are accused far and wide in this country of intending to use our increased strength against Pakistan. Such a charge frankly surprises us and diatribes of this nature are not exactly calculated to create goodwill and understanding necessary for us to resolve our differences.

In spite of our heavy preoccupations and other discouraging circumstances my government sincerely welcomes the idea of these talks. You will remember we have in the past frequently suggested that the best way to resolve our differences on Kashmir is by having a frank discussion on all aspects of the question. Now we are at last come together and I cannot over emphasise the genuineness of the desire on India's side to proceed in a constructive way. As I said earlier the most important of all our problems is Kashmir and our utmost efforts are necessary to try and deal with it. With your permission I would like to set out few ideas an the subject.

The question of being familiar with the views of our respective governments if anyone is in any doubt there are innumerable volumes which can enlighten us without our having to spell it all out here. I would merely like to recall few basic facts which I hope may help us to see the problem in proper perspective.

So far as we are concerned Kashmir has become an integral part of the Republic of India by internationally accepted practices of law and of democracy. It is established and greatly valued part of our national life, symbolic of the secular ideals we are genuinely trying to realise. You are yourselves familiar with divisive forces of particularism and secretarianism that tend to disrupt the unity of newly independent countries and we in our multi-racial, multi-lingual and multireligious society have to be particularly careful to guard against such disruption. What happens in and to Kashmir is therefore of vital importance to our whole nationhood. I am aware of course of the arguments advanced from your side to justify Pakistan's claim to the territorywhich are based on your own concept of statehood. Our differences in regard to Kashmir have thus become a projection of our respective political philosophies, which have been in sharp conflict over the years and have tended to make the resolution of them increasingly difficult.

I submit, Sir, that the only reason why we are anxious to explore with you the possibilities of reaching modus vivendi with you on Kashmir question is because we ardently wish to five in peace and friendship with Pakistan. I suggest that our approach should take into account the political realities in the subcontinent and developments that have taken place since both countries became independent. First of these is that the problem of Kashmir cannot be considered in isolation. It is argued that if Kashmir could be settled all other differences between the two countries could also be settled. That may well be true, but it is also true that none of the differences can be settled, especially Kashmir, unless a great deal of spadework first clears away the deeprooted misunderstandings and mistrust between us. This-is not a startling new formula that I am suggesting; we have both agreed on this point many times in the past. It has been stressed in the past agreements and there have been specific arrangements for evolving better. atmosphere such as the joint press code, Unfortunately they have not proved effective; unless they do, goodwill essential for political settlements

329

will be lacking What we must do now is to make' such arrangements come alive. I would go so far as to say that it should be the first task of our respective Governments to launch on a concerted effort to build up goodwill not only by preventing excesses that have marred public comments about each other but by advocating more considerate attitudes and by highlighting good aspects of our relationship. We should, for example, have moratorium on criticism and abuse and organise instead a campaign of goodwill recommended under the high auspices in both countries. Simultaneously we could try and work with each other in practical fields of cooperation remove irritants along our borders and obstacles to freer physical movements of our people, work out ways of sharing our natural resources, build up our trade and economic partnership. We might also consider ways and means of keeping open constant channels of direct understanding and dealing with problems as they arise. I feel sure that if we embark on such programme both our countries will be immeasurably benefited. By all these steps our political problems will become easier of solution. And these problems include Kashmir. Let me make it quite clear that the programme of friendly cooperation I have in mind will not be meaningful unless we first agree to settle Kashmir question. But I also wish to point out that settlement on Kashmir has meaning only in the context of such programme. If we try to bring about a settlement relating to Kashmir in terms of purely a territorial dispute our discussions will only repeat views that have been endlessly expressed

in last fifteen years and lead to no result. I am quite sure you desire such an outcome as little as we do. What both our countries should seek now is a new approach designed to reach an honourable and equitable settlement.

To achieve such a fruitful outcome it is advisable to channel our discussions along the right fines avoiding unnecessary pitfalls and obstacles. We must steer clear of paths that lead away from the solution and at the same time look for guide posts which will help us on the true course. As our objective is the settlement of the Kashmir problem enabling India and Pakistan to live in peace and friendship, it follows that the solution must first of all be a peaceful one strengthening friendship between the peoples of India and Pakistan; secondly, it must not affect the stability and progress already achieved but must reinforce them; and thirdly, it must not leave over settlement of any major issue. In short it must be peaceful; it must. be both realistic and constructive; and it must be comprehensive and final.

Just over three years ago after my Prime Minister came to this very city he and your President issued e notable joint communique in which

They agreed that their Governments and peoples should work for the promotion of friendly and cooperative relation's between their two countries and eliminate old emotional strains and tension. They recognised that reduction in tension and development of friendly neighbourly cooperative relations will enable each of their countries to devote its energies to the achievement of their basic objectives of economic and social development'.

That was most statesmanlike approach and it has once again found expression in the joint statement of November 29. What we must ensure at all costs is that our two countries should not fall away from these high objectives. I have conic here charged by my Government to make every possible efforts to sustain them and I know that you are similarly determined. The main difficulty in doing it is that the problems which we are going to deal within these talks have been discussed almost threadbare for years and consequently we tend to be resistant to arguments that are advanced. However, on this occasion we must endeavour to clear our minds of set notions and start afresh. I would like to think that. we can do so and that what I have suggested may be appropriate and useful.

To sum up, therefore, I suggest our approach should be on the following lines :

- 1. We should start at once on a large scale programme to remove suspicion, mistrust and even ill-will by appealing to our peoples and leaders of public opinion to reverse the unhappy trends of the past and by undertaking practical arrangements for encouraging a more sympathetic attitude towards each other.
- 2. We should also embody in the solemn agreement our desire 'to live side by side in peace and friendship? and to solve all our problems peacefully and to our mutual benefit.
- 3. We should proceed with utmost speed to resolve our 'outstanding differences on Kashmir' in a practical and realistic manner.
- 4. We should also consider ways and mean. of removing major existing irritants and developing bias for practical cooperation.

And realise that this is a large and comprehensive programme; but I believe it will help us solve all our disputes including Kashmir above all. If we can work out preliminary arrangements to implement this programme, I believe we will have brought about the most fruitful achievement.

330

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC **Date** : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

The following is the text of the Communique on the Indo-Pakistan talks issued in New Delhi and Rawalpindi on December 29, 1962:

On November 29, 1962, the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India agreed in a joint statement 'to make a renewed effort to resolve outstanding differences between their two countries on Kashmir and other related matters so as to enable India and Pakistan live 'side by side in peace and friendship.

In pursuance of this- decision, Sardar Swaran Singh, accompanied by his advisers, arrived in Rawalpindi on December 26 to initiate discussions with Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, Pakistan's Minister for Industries, and his advisers.

On the afternoon of his arrival, Sardar Swaran Singh called on the President of Pakistan, the Foreign Minister and Mr. Bhutto.

The two Ministers and their advisers met in a formal session on the morning of December 27. The two Ministers held five meetings on December 27, 28 and 29 at which various aspects of the Kashmir problem were discussed. At the last meeting, the Ministers were assisted by some of their advisers. The discussions were marked by a spirit of cordiality and understanding and there was a free and frank exchange of views.

Sardar Swaran Singh extended an invitation to Mr. Bhutto to visit New Delhi to continue the discussions initiated at Rawalpindi with a view to finding an equitable and honourable solution. The Pakistan Minister accepted the invitation and indicated that he might be expected to arrive in New Delhi on January 15.

The Ministers agreed to make a joint appeal to leaders, officials, press, radio and other media of publicity in the two countries to help in creating a friendly atmosphere for resolving outstanding differences on Kashmir and other related matters and to refrain from any statements, criticism of propaganda which might prejudice the success of these negotiations or tend to create discord between the two countries.

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Moving that "the border situation resulting from the invasion of India by China be taken into consideration", the Prime Minister made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on December 10, 1962:

About a month ago, on the 8th of November, I placed a resolution before this House on the proclamation of emergency resulting from the aggression and invasion by China. This was followed by another resolution dealing with this aggression and invasion and how China had betrayed the friendship and goodwill of India as well as the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed between the two countries. After recording the high appreciation of the House of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our Armed Forces and paying its respectful homage to the martyrs who had laid down their lives in defending the integrity of the motherland, this House recorded its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and crisis that had arisen. The House affirmed the firm resolve of the Indian people to rid the sacred soil of India of the aggressor, however long and hard the struggle may be.

There was a long discussion on this resolution and a very large and record number of Hon'ble Members spoke on it.

On the 14th of November, this resolution was passed not only unanimously but in an unusual

manner by all members standing and pledging themselves to what it contained. By that pledge we stand.

Two or three days later, the Chinese forces

331

mounted a massive attack on our position at the Sela Pass and at Walong. This resulted on the 18th November in our forces having to withdraw from Sela and Walong and somewhat later, from Bomdila.

On the 21st November, the Chinese Government issued a statement making a unilateral announcement of cease-fire as from the midnight of November 21-22 and a withdrawal of their forces from December 1. On the 23rd, we asked for some clarifications and received a reply on the 26th November. On the 30th we sought further clarifications.

On the 22nd November, the Government of Ceylon announced that they had called a conference of six non-aligned countries in Colombo. The date for this was subsequently changed and it is due to begin or rather has begun in Colombo today.

On the 28th November, a letter was received from Premier Chou En-lai urging the Prime Minister of India to give a positive response, that is, to accept the Chinese offer of cease-fire and withdrawal with all the other provisos contained in it. I replied to this on the 1st December.

These letters have been given in full together with some maps in the pamphlet issued by the External Affairs Ministry entitled "Chinese aggression in war and peace".

The cease-fire took effect as stated, though there were a number of breaches of it on the Chinese side in the first few days. It is not yet quite clear how far the withdrawals of the Chinese forces have been effected. To some extent, this has been done, but considerable Chinese forces are apparently still in some forward positions.

On the 5th of December, the Chinese Red

Cross handed over 64 wounded and sick prisoners of war to the Indian Red Cross Society at Bomdila. They have stated that they will Wad over more such wounded prisoners within the next few days.

Soon after the Chinese attack on the 20th October, a three-point proposal was made by the Chinese suggesting a cease-fire and a withdrawal of their forces provided India agreed to these proposals; otherwise the fighting may re-start. On the 27th October, we stated that we were unable to accept this proposal and that our proposal for the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September was a simple and straightforward one. This was the only way of undoing at least part of the great damage done by the latest Chinese aggression.

The Chinese proposal made on the 21st November for cease-fire and withdrawal was a repetition of their proposal of the 24th October with the addition of a unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal.

I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on December I indicating that the three-point proposal made by the Chinese violated the principles that the Chinese had themselves been advocating in their documents and correspondence. We could not compromise with this further aggression we permit the aggressor to retain the position he had acquired by force by the further aggression since 8th September 1962, as this would mean not only letting him have what he wanted but exposing our country to further inroads and demands in the future. To this letter, no direct answer has been received from Premier Chou En-lai. But the Peking Radio has broadcast yesterday a long statement rejecting our proposal about the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September. There was a further broadcast later yesterday which stated that our Charge d'affaires in Peking has been given a note asking the Government of India three questions. Those questions are:

- (1) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree to a cease-fire?
- (2) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the Armed Forces of the two sides should

disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control? and

(3) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of the Armed Forces of each party to form a de-militarised zone, establishment of check posts as well as the return of captured personnel?

Before I answer these questions, I should like to remind the House of the past history of these incursions and aggressions. I shall not. go back five years or more when these aggressions started in Ladakh. That has been repeatedly stated in this House. But I should like to remind the House that. before the 8th September 1962, there was no active aggression on the NEFA frontier by the Chinese except in regard to the small frontier village of Longju. Not only was no further aggression there, but, in the past, repeated assurances were given that the so-called McMahon Line would not be crossed by the Chinese, and that, although they considered this Line an illegal one and imposed by the then

332

British authorities, they would acknowledge it as indeed they acknowledged the continuation of this Line in Burma.

Thus the aggression across this Line near the Thagla Pass on the 8th September 1962 was not only at variance with these assurances, but constituted a major crossing over of their frontier for the first time in history. This was a clear case of imperialist aggression and expansion. The Chinese forces continued to cross the frontier in large numbers. and, on the 20th October, they delivered massive attacks on the Indian positions and overpowered them by superior numbers.

In the five-year long, story of Chinese aggression this was the first instance when massive attacks were made by large forces and a regular invasion of Indian territory took place. No longer were these mere frontier incidents, as previously in Ladakh. A well-organised and well-prepared invasion on a big scale had been mounted by China. On the same day, a similar invasion took place in, the western sector in Ladakh. Thus, it was obvious that this was a fully coordinated attack along various parts of our frontier.

Soon after, that is on the 24th October, the Chinese made their three-point proposal which, if agreed to, would have given them the benefit of their recent invasion and placed them in an advantageous and dominating position for further aggression in the future. We could not possibly accept this and consequently we rejected it,

I would like to repeat that these invasions which took massive shape on the 20th October, can only be described as imperialist aggression. It is to be noted that the Chinese Government, which often states that it is against imperialism, has itself committed one of the grossest acts of imperialist aggression. The fact that the Chinese had never entered into the NEFA territory previously is very relevant. But, for the moment, we may set aside the question of the merits of their claims. Even according to them, the McMahon Line was indicated about fifty years ago. This was not a line drawn up by McMahon, but a recognition of a previous fact, that is, the watershed was the frontier. Even since then and, in fact, long before that, it' is clear that the Chinese were not there. Since our independence, we have tried to develop this area of NEFA and built schools, roads, hospitals, etc. Suddenly the Chinese break through our frontier and deliver massive attacks. Is this the way of peaceful negotiation and settlement by peaceful methods? I repeat that whatever the claims may be, this well-prepared invasion was at variance. with the Chinese professions and can only be described as blatantly imperialist-expansionism and aggression In answer to this, we stated that we could not proceed with any talks with them until at least this latest aggression was vacated and the status quo prior to 8th September 1962 is restored both in NEFA and in Ladakh. This was the least we could do, and that is the position we have consistently held during the last few months.

Anxious for peace as we are, we suggested this minimum condition which might lead to a peace-

ful approach. They have rejected our proposal. The result is that at present there is no meeting ground between us. We have repeatedly laid stress on our considering this matter by peaceful methods, but it is not possible to do so when aggression continues and we are asked to accept it as a fact.

As for the three questions that have been asked oil behal: of the Chinese Government, the first one is whether we agree or do not agree to a cease-fire. The declaration by the Government of China was a unilateral one. But insofar as the cease-fire is concerned, we accepted it and nothing has been done on our behalf to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration.

The second question is, do we agree or not that the armed forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw twenty kilometres each from November 7, 1959 line of actual control? We are in favour of the disengagement of the forces of the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement. But such an arrangement can only be on the basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory on the 8th September 1962. If the Government of China disputes that this was Indian territory, this is a matter for a juridical or like decision. The fact, however, is that it had long been in Indian occupation, and this cannot be disputed. The Government of India have given their understanding of the so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959. They do not agree with the Chinese interpretation which is not in accordance with actual facts. It should be easy to determine the facts even from the correspondence between the two governments during the last five years. The Government of China cannot expect us to agree to a so-called line of actual control of November 7, 1959, which is manifestly not in accordance with facts. What we had suggested is a simple and straightforward proposal-that of restoration of the status quo prior to the 8th September 1962 when further aggression began. This is clearly factual and is based on the definite principle that the aggression must be undone before an agreement for a peaceful consideration can be arrived at. We have dealt with this matter fully in the correspondence which has 333

taken place. with Premier Chou En-lai which, I take it, members of the House have read.

The third question is, does the Indian Government, agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of Armed Forces of each party to form a de-militarised zone etc.? It is obvious if the officials are to meet they must have clear and precise instructions as to the cease-fire and withdrawal arrangements which they are supposed to implement. Unless they receive these instructions, which must be the result of an agreement between the Governments of India and China, they will be unable to function. Therefore it has to be determined previously which line is to be implemented. 'Between the line of actual control immediately prior to the 8th September 1962 and that on the 7th November 1959 as defined by China, there is a great difference of about 2,500 sq. miles of Indian territory which China occupied as a result of invasion and massive attacks during the last three months. The Chinese Government by defining this line in its own way wants to retain the advantages secured by the latest invasion.

Any person who studies the painful history of the last few- years, more particularly of the recent months, will come to the conclusion that Chinese interpretation of various lines changes with circumstances and they accept the line which is more advantageous to them. Sometimes they accept part of a line and not the rest of it which is disadvantageous to them. It is perhaps not-easy in the course of a discussion in this House to go into the many and changing factors which have governed the situation during the last five years. Nevertheless, the major, facts are quite clear and, apart from any claims that the Chinese may have, it is on these facts that any temporary arrangement can be made not on changing lines which the Chinese put forward as the lines of actual control.

There has been, the House must have, no doubt, noticed, an amazing cynicism and duplicity on the Chinese side and on these developments and these discussions. They accuse. us of being aggressors. We are supposed to aggress on our own territory and they come as defenders on our territory. They come to a place where they have never been, so far as I know of history, at any time of history. And, they preach against imperialism and act themselves in the old imperialist and expansionist way. Altogether, their policy seems to be one of unabashed chauvinism. They have referred, as Hon. Members may have noticed, to their frontier guards being attacked by Indian forces and acting in self-defence. It is curious that acting in self-defence they have occupied another 20,000 square miles of Indian territory. The whole thing is so manifestly and so outrageously, what shall I say, improper and wrong, and utter misuse of words, that it is a little difficult to deal with persons who use words with different meanings, what we may call, double talk. I regret to say that I have been forced to the conclusion that the word of the Chinese Government cannot be relied upon.

The Chinese threat against. India is a longterm one and the last five years, and even more so the last three months, have brought out the basic expansionist and imperialist attitude of China. This is a continuing threat to the independence and territorial integrity of India. We cannot submit to this challenge and must face it with all the consequences that it may bring.

As the world knows, we are a peaceful people and have always tried to adhere to peaceful methods. It is not any choice of ours that we have been driven to war-like activities. But the defence of our motherland is the first essential duty for every Indian, and imperialist and expansionist challenge to that is not only a challenge to us but to the world, as it is a flagrant violation of international law and practice. If this aggression is tolerated and acquiesced in today, it will continue to be a threat not only to India but also to other countries in Asia and will be a bad precedent for the world. We will, therefore, endeavour to the utmost of our ability to face this challenge and to protect our motherland. But, at the same time, we shall always seek peaceful methods to resolve any dispute but conditions for a peaceful approach have to be created if this is to yield any fruit.

What China has done is an insult to the conscience of the world. That is clear from the great response that we have received from a large number of countries. We still hope that our peaceful and reasonable approaches will be agreed to. Otherwise, this conflict may spread and bring disaster on a widespread scale, not only to India and China but to the world. Once these preliminary conditions that we have suggested are met, we can consider further the peaceful methods that should be used for resolving the basic disputes.

Hon. Members may have read the pleas which we have repeated several times in our Communications to the Chinese Government or the Chinese Premier that we should explore avenues of peaceful approach; apart from meeting each other, explore other avenues of settling these questions peacefully. I am prepared when the time comes, provided there is approval of Parliament, even to refer the basic dispute of the claims on the frontier to an international body

334

like the International Court of Justice at The Hague. I submit that there is no fairer and more reasonable approach than what I have indicated. But that also can only come when the aggression is vacated and the position as it was before the 8th September is restored.

The Colombo Conference which is meeting today is considering what recommendations honourable to both sides they might make to resolve the differences between India and China. We recognise their friendly feelings and their well-meant attempts to solve, or at any rate to lessen, this crisis, I trust, however, that they will appreciate that there can be no compromise with aggression and an expanding imperialism and that the gains of aggression must be given up before both 'the parties try to resolve their disputes.

We have long followed a policy of nonalignment, and, I believe firmly that this was a right policy, It means our not joining any military bloc for military purpose. I think that policy should continue. But we must take all necessary measures to defend our motherland and take the help of our friendly countries who are willing to assist us in this sacred task.

We are very grateful to the countries which have come to our aid at this moment of crisis and have extended their full sympathy and support to us, I believe that even they appreciate that it would be wrong for us to abandon the policy of non-alignment. It is odd-it is well to remember-that the one country that does not approve of non-alignment for us or for anybody is China; they take some satisfaction in that. They go on repeating that by circumstances they will compel us to abandon it and so we have abandoned it. So, it 'is clear and Hon. Members can themselves realise how the Chinese outlook in this matter is utterly different not only from ours but from that of most countries in the world.

All of us in this House and in the Country, naturally, and, if I may say so, rightly feel strongly on this subject. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to speak in a moderate language because I have felt that the issues are grave and cannot be dealt with lightly or merely by abuse. The future of our country is at stake. We have to rise- to the occasion to consider the mighty problems that face us. They have' many aspects-Military, economic, the future relations of two of the greatest countries in Asia and the future of world peace. Though We may feel passionately about these problems, we may not allow our passions to run away with us and lead us to wrong courses. But it is clear that the future for us is a hard one and our people must therefore prepare themselves in every way to meet it. We shall have to strengthen ourselves in every way and mobilise our country for it. We are trying to do that.

Even though there is no actual fighting at present, the emergency and the danger continue and will continue so long as China's present policy and military postures continue to be a threat to our independence and integrity. Let us, therefore, give all our strength to meeting this threat and, at the same time, not forget that we have to win the peace and further the cause of peace.

Soon after the Chinese invasion of the 20th October, the House may remember, I indicated that this struggle or war, whatever shape it might take, will be a long one. It may even last five years or more. I think, the country and all of us should bear this in mind. It is a long and big effort that we have to make. I feel-and I speak in all honesty-confident that we shall win in the struggle. But it will require our. hardest effort and many sacrifices and a refusal, whatever happens, to bow down to these imperialist tactics of China. We have to remember above all that we fight not for fighting's sake but to save our country. It is a matter of survival of freedom and a free society in India and to further the cause of peace in the world because it would be a poor thing if in attempting to save our country we somehow helped in the process of converting this into a terrible world war. We have to keep all this in mind. But, for the moment the major thing before us is to protect our country and our freedom which we achieved after so long and after so many difficulties and sacrifices. This House has already expressed itself in the Resolution which it passed on the 14th of November and clearly stated what it is determined to do and took the pledge. 'By that pledge we shall stand and I hope we shall honour it in full.

CHINA INDIA USA SRI LANKA TOTO BURMA

Date : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on India-China Border Situation

The Prime Minister made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on December 12. 1962, on the India-China border situation : As the House knows, on the 21st November, the Chinese Government issued a statement making a unilateral announcement of cease-fire as

335

from the midnight of November 21-22 and a withdrawal of their forces from December 1.

On the 23rd November, we asked for some clarification from the Chinese Government and

received a reply on the 26th November. On the 30th November, we sought further clarification.

On the 28th November, a letter was received by me from Premier Chou En-lai urging us to accept the Chinese offer of cease-fire and withdrawal. I sent a reply to this on December 1. The cease-fire took effect as stated; though there were a number of breaches of it on the Chinese side in the first few days. Some withdrawals of Chinese forces have been effected, but it is not yet clear to what extent these have taken place, especially from the forward areas.

On the 5th of December, the Chinese Red Cross handed over 64 wounded and sick prisoners of war to the Indian Red Cross Society at Bomdila. They have stated that they will hand over 175 more sick and wounded prisoners on the 12th and the 13th December at Muchukha, Darang Dzong and Walong.

On the 24th October. the Chinese Government made a three-point proposal suggesting a cease-fire and a withdrawal of their forces, provided India agreed to these proposals. These proposals were not accepted by us, and we suggested that our proposal for the restoration of the status quo prior to the 8th September, 1962 was a more simple and straightforward one. The Chinese proposal of the 21st November for ceasefire and withdrawal was a repetition of their proposal of the 24th October with the addition of a unilateral declaration of cease-fire and withdrawal.

On the 9th December, the Peking Radio broadcast a long statement rejecting our proposal about the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September 1962. Our Charge d'affaires in Peking was also given a note asking the Government of India three questions as follows

- Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree to a cease-fire? Although the declaration of the Government of China was a unilateral one, insofar as the cease-fire is concerned, we accepted it, and nothing has been done on our side to impede the implementation of the cease-fire declaration.
- (2) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the Armed Forces of the two sides should disengage and withdraw 20 kilometres each

from the November 7, 1959 line of actual control?

We are in favour of disengagement of the forces of the two sides on the basis of a commonly agreed arrangement, but such an agreement can only be on the" basis of undoing the further aggression committed by the Government of China on Indian territory since the 8th September 1962. It is a fact that all this territory has long been in Indian occupation. The Government of India do not agree with the Chinese interpretation of the line of actual control. These facts can easily be determined even from the correspondence between the two Governments during the last five years. Our proposal of the restoration of the status quo prior to the 8th September 1962 is an obviously simpler and factual one, and is based on the definite principle that the aggression must be undone before an agreement for peaceful considerations can be arrived at.

(3) Does the Indian Government agree or does it not agree that the officials of the two sides should meet and discuss matters relating to the withdrawal of armed forces of each party to form a demilitarised zone etc.?

It is obvious that if the officials are to meet, they must have clear and precise instructions as to the cease-fire and withdrawal arrangements which they are supposed to implement. Unless they receive these instructions, which must be the result of an agreement between the Governments of India and China, they will be unable to function. Thus it has to be determined previously which line is to be implemented. There is a difference of about œ500 sq. miles of Indian territory between the two lines, that of actual control immediately prior to the 8th September 1962, and that on the 7th November 1959 as defined by China.

These are our answers to the three questions put by the Chinese Government. We do not wish to impede the implementation of the cease-fire and we would, of course, welcome the withdrawal of Chinese forces. As for the officials of the two sides meeting to consider the question of withdrawal of armed forces, we shall be prepared for this when it is agreed what line is to be implemented.

Meanwhile since 10th December a conference of six non-aligned powers is meeting in Colombo to consider the conflict between India and China. We recognise the friendly feelings of these Powers, and I trust that they will appreciate that there can be no compromise with aggression and that the gains of aggression must be given up before the parties can try peaceful methods to resolve their disputes. We are always prepared to consider any peaceful methods provided the ground for them is prepared by vacation of the aggression since the 8th September. I have suggested in the Lok Sabha that when the ground is so prepared, we might even be prepared to refer the question of the merits of the boundary disputes to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

336

Six days ago; I visited Assam and some of the forward areas of our troops on the borders of NEFA. I was happy to find that both our troops and the people of Assam generally were in good heart.

According to the latest information we have, 9811 officers and men of our forces have returned to Tezpur from the Sela-Bomdila area. From Walong 2350 officers and men of our forces have also returned. Some more are expected to return. Indeed every day some of these men return to the Tezpur area.

The total number of known casualties among' the Army personnel from the 20th October 1962 up to the 10th December 1962 in both Ladakh and the whole of NEFA are 197 killed (including 11 officers and 13 JCOs), 291 wounded in battle, and 6277 still unaccounted for. This figure of 6277 will be reduced by 175 personnel and one dead body which the Chinese say they will return on the 12th and 13th December. The Chinese also declared earlier that they have 927 personnel as prisoners with them. Taking these figures into account, the total unaccounted for up to the 11th December will be 5174 officers and men.

Whatever the outcome may be of the effort,, being made to continue the cease-fire and ensure the withdrawal of the Chinese troops with a view to peaceful methods being employed later for the settlement of the boundary questions on the merits, it is clear that we shall have to continue fully our efforts at strengthening our Defence Forces in every way. We propose to do so.

CHINA INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM TOTO SRI LANKA **Date** : Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Defence Minister's Statement on Supply of MIGs

The following statement was made by the Minister of Defence, Shri Y. B.Chavan, in Lok Sabha, December 4, 1962, in response to a Calling Attention Notice by Shri Mani Ram Bagri and six other Members of Parliament in regard to the reported news about the communication from the Government of U.S.S.R. expressing their inability to supply MIGs to India:

"The agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the U.S.S.R. was principally for the building up under licence in India of a plant for the manufacture of aircraft.' It was further agreed to supply a few MIGs in December 1962, and some next year and some later.

"Our Ambassador in Moscow has been in touch with the Government of the U.S.S.R. and he has reported that the agreement for the building up of the plant will be proceeded with according to schedule. Also that the MIGs will be supplied in December 1962, or a little later."

USA INDIA RUSSIA **Date :** Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Strengthening of India-Yugoslavia Relations : Dr. Zakir Husain's Speech

The following is the full text of Vice-President Dr. Zakir Husain's speech, at the dinner given by him to H. E. Edvard Kardelj, Vice-President of Yugoslavia, at Rashtrapati Bhavan, December 18, 1962:

It gives me very great pleasure, indeed, to welcome Mrs. Kardelj and yourself and the officials accompanying you to India on behalf of our Government and people and on my own behalf. We are happy that you have found it convenient

337

to visit our country because it gives us an opportunity to express once Again the warm feelings of friendship we cherish towards your country and its people.

I am sure that the exchange of views which will take place during the course of your visit will further strengthen and promote this friendship and cooperation between our countries.

Your visit will enable you to see something of our country and of the manner in which we are trying to deal with the problems confronting us. Though your stay is very short, I hope that you will be able to see something of our way of life and acquaint yourself personally with our aims, ideals and aspirations.

We have the happiest recollections of the visits of your President to India in 1954 and again in 1959 and of the warm hospitality extended to our Prime Minister during his visits to Yugoslavia in 1955, 1956 and 1961.

Your visit, Mr. Vice-President, will add one more link in the chain of friendship which has

been forged as a result of these visits.

On this occasion, I cannot help recalling the history of the long and courageous struggle of your people for the achievement of their independence and for safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of your country. I also recall that there is hardly any other country whose history makes the significance of mutual accommodation, unity and cooperation among its constituent culture-groups, so directly and immediately obvious as the history of your country. I recall also the belief of your Government in the principle of peaceful co-existence which includes non-aggression and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of every State. You can well appreciate, therefore, the resolve of our people to resist the unwarranted aggression committed by the Chinese Government against our country.

The Chinese invasion of India was undertaken after long and careful preparation in violation of the principles of peaceful co-existence and is in fact an attack on non-alignment itself in which we both believe. We are a people deeply wedded to peace, But this conflict has been forced upon us and we have taken the grim resolve to see it through, for we value peace only with freedom and national self-respect. We feel strengthened in this resolve by the sympathy and support of people all over the world.

We hope that the Chinese Government will see the error of its ways, abandon its expansionist imperialistic policy and return to the path of peace in the interests not only of India and China but also in the interests of peace in the world.

As your Excellency rightly enuficiated it in a recent Press interview, any attempt to impose a certain solution of State differences on India unilaterally by the use of force "must provoke extraordinary negative consequences to the cause of peace and social progress in the world". We sincerely appreciate the friendly understanding by your people of our position throughout these last three years of our growing differences with China-We are deeply grateful, Mr. Vice-President, for the sympathy expressed by your Government in this hour of national 'trial for us.

Yugoslavia and India have been cooperating

with each other in many fields, both for their mutual benefit and for the sake of creating a world in which peace would be secure and inequality, suffering and misery banished from human society. In the United Nations, we have voiced our common dedication to peace and advocated peaceful methods for settling international disputes. In the various organs of the United Nations, we have raised our voices against imperialism in any shape or form and against such odious practices as racial discrimination.

We believe in the necessity for general and complete disarmament under international control and for a complete ban on nuclear tests, if humanity and its civilisation are to survive. We realise the urgency of finding adequate solutions to the problems of development of under-developed countries and are engaged in exploring the most fruitful, avenues for resolving these problems.

The commercial and cultural relations. between India and Yugoslavia have been developing satisfactorily and I am sure that these ties would continue to grow steadily in the future. Our relations are based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit and have, therefore, served to create respect, understanding and appreciation among our peoples for each other.

I am acquainted, Mr. Vice-President, with some of the learned books you have written and I know that you are the author of the draft Constitution for your country, which is now under discussion. It promises to be a significant document, not only as a Constitution of the State but as a Constitution of Society, providing alike for social solidarity and individual freedom. Your country is indeed fortunate in having such an eminent scholar and thinker, a great theoretician and statesman, who combines wisdom with practical experience, as its Vice-President. We wish you ever-increasing success in your efforts to provide your people with a fuller and richer life.

We have, like you, tried to build up democracy from the grass root's level. Our village panchayats are analogous in some respects to your village communes. You will perhaps see something of

338

the work we have done in this field during the

course of your visit.

I am sure that the friendship and cooperation between two such countries as ours, which are engaged in trying to raise the standard of living of their peoples, would serve to remove the shackles which have bound the people in the past and contribute to the fullest development of human personality.

I hope, Mr. Vice-President, that you will enjoy you stay with us. Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would now request you to join me in drinking a toast to the health of His Excellency the Vice-President of Yugoslavia and Madame Kardelj.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA **Date :** Dec 01, 1962

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Faith in Non-Alignment Confirmed: Yugoslav Vice-President's Speech

Replying to the toast raised in his honour by the Vice-President at a dinner at Rashtrapati Bhavan, December 18, 1962, H. E. Mr. Edvard Kardelj, Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia said :

"I wish to express, first of all, my thanks for the warm speech and kind words you have addressed to my country and to the President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. I am particularly gratified that I have had the honour of making your acquaintance' and of meeting again the Prime Minister. Mr. Nehru, who enjoys in our country universal respect and prestige as a consistent fighter for peace and the better future of mn and nations. I am also pleaseyd to see, at the very "outset of my visit to India, a number of other acquaintances; from earlier encounters. Furthermore, so much about the life, work and aspirations of Indian people and their attitude towards contemporary developments is known and close to us, Yugoslavs, that it should work spontaneously towards the establishment of ties of mutual understanding, intimacy and friendship and make us feel, from the very first moment. that we are in the company of our closest friends. The whole development of friendly relations between our countries so far is a reflection of the solidarity of our peoples in the struggle for independence as well as of our attachment to the cause of peace and progress in the world.

The efforts exerted in that sense have, no doubt, yielded good results. Much has already been done in the field of bilateral cooperation. A lively exchange of views and other forms of cooperation in the political, economic and cultural field is taking place. There exist all the conditions for an ever more successful development of all these forms of cooperation in future, in the interest of the peoples of the two countries.

The cooperation between our two. as well as other, non-aligned countries in the field of 'international relations has also been very successful

This has been clearly confirmed by the most recent course of events in the world. Of course, the greatest responsibility for the situation in the present-day world is borne by the States which dispose with decisive power in the world. Actually, he who has greater power has, at the same time, greater obligations towards the common interests of mankind. But other countries, too, bear their share of responsibility. Here lies the significance of the Policy of peaceful coexistence, pursued by non-aligned countries, whereby they are contributing towards narrowing, as much as possible, the area where the existing world antagonisms might be seriously aggravated and transform themselves into a threat of nuclear war. The cooperation of our Governments along these lines should continue to contribute towards peace and should enable contemporary mankind to find a progressive way out of the existing contradictions. without exposing present and future generations to the catastrophe of a nuclear world war.

I am happy to be able to note that cooperation between our two countries is evolving precisely on the basis of such principles and in line with such aims. I am convinced that such cooperation among nations will be necessary and useful as long as the world continues to be faced with a problem of considerable urgency, namely, the dilemma of coexistence or war.

It is through this prism that we also view the efforts exerted for the purpose of ensuring that world economic cooperation should develop on the basis of equal rights, mutual interest and nondiscrimination as well as with a view to gradually overcoming the wide gap separating the so-called developed regions of the world from the insufficiently developed ones. The Yugoslav Government hopes that the World Economic Conference in whose preparation our two Governments have successfully cooperated from the outset, alongside with other non-aligned countries-will constitute a significant Contribution towards the lessening of some of the contradictions which are burdening the world at present. To make such

339

a step forward constitutes the same historical necessity as the final liquidation of colonialism in all its manifestations.

Distinguished Mr. Vice-President, the peoples and Government of Yugoslavia have always highly appreciated the efforts that the Government of India has been exerting in order to promote world peace and the methods of peaceful negotiation and cooperation among nations. As a result of these efforts, India has won many friends throughout the world.

We are, therefore, all the more concerned over the situation created by the armed conflict on your northern border. I wish to repeat. on this occasion, what President Tito, in his letter addressed to the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, and the Yugoslav Government have been repeatedly pointing out. We have always condemned the attempts at solving disputes of this kind by recourse to arms, considering that such conflicts constitute not only a threat to peace and security in the world, but also inject hatred among peoples, without solving any problems. It should cause particular concern when a country like India, which has been one of the firmest strongholds of world peace from the very first days of her independence, finds herself in such a situation. Everyone knows that the prolongation of this conflict would give rise to ever graver consequences in the field of international relations as well as in the sphere of contemporary progress of mankind in general. We hope, therefore, that ways and means will be nevertheless found, in this case also, for the creation of honourable conditions which will make negotiations and the reaching of an agreed solution of the dispute possible.

May 1, in conclusion, express my warm thanks to the Indian Government for the opportunity which has been offered to us to get closer acquainted with India and her people, with a country which is one of the focuses of world culture and civilisation and with a people who have behind them such a great and, at the same time, arduous past marked by their struggle-for independence. I am glad that we shall have the opportunity to see a number of monuments of Indian culture as well as the achievements of the labour and endeavours of the present-day Indian men and women, who are-through the- successful implementation of your economic plans--creating a sound material basis for accelerated economic advancement.

Expressing my best wishes for the further successes of the Indian people, on their road to prosperity and peace, I propose this toast to your health, Mr. Vice-President, to the health of the Prime Minister Mr. Nehru, to the health of your colleagues as well as to the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between our peoples.

340

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA **Date :** Dec 01, 1962